



Estates Committee

Informatics Forum, 10 Crichton Street, Room 4.31/33

Wednesday 13 September 2017, 9.30-12.30pm

AGENDA

- 1 Minute (closed)** **A**
To approve the minute of the previous meeting held on 24 May 2017.
- 2 Matters Arising**
To raise any matters arising.

SUBSTANTIVE ITEMS

- 3 Estates Annual Capital Plan 2017-18 to 2026-27 (closed)** **B**
To note a paper from Director of Estates.
- 3.1 Interim Ten Year Forecast (September 2017) (closed)** **B1**
To note a paper from Director of Finance.
- 4 Edinburgh College of Arts Masterplan (closed)** **C**
To approve a paper from Head of College of Arts Humanities and Social Science.
- 5 Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies Extension - Global Academy of Agriculture and Food Security (closed)** **D**
To approve a paper from College Registrar, Medicine & Veterinary Medicine.
- 6 Old Kirk Postgraduate Student Centre (closed)** **E**
To approve a paper from Head of Estates Planning and Special Projects
- 7 Masson House Hotel Phase 2 Refurbishment (closed)** **F**
To approve a paper from Director of Accommodation, Catering and Events.
- 8 Central Breeding Hub Review (closed)** **G**
To note a paper from Director of Corporate Services.

ROUTINE ITEMS

- 9 Estates Committee Sub-Group Approvals** **H**
To homologate a paper from Depute Director of Estates.
- 10 Development & Alumni Capital Project Update (closed)** **I**
To note an update from Director of Philanthropy and Donor Relations, Development and Alumni Services.
- 11 Space Strategy Group** **J**
To approve a paper from Depute Director of Estates

ITEMS FOR FORMAL APPROVAL/NOTING

- | | | |
|-----------|---|-----------|
| 12 | Estates Risk Register
To <u>note</u> a paper from Director of Estates. | K |
| 13 | Estates Committee – Revised Terms of Reference (closed)
To <u>endorse</u> a paper from Convener. | L |
| 14 | Strategic Acquisitions and Disposals (closed)
To <u>note</u> a paper from Director of Estates. | M |
| 15 | College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences Summary Report (closed)
To <u>approve</u> a paper from Head of College of Arts Humanities and Social Science. | N |
| 16 | College of Medicine & Veterinary Medicine Summary Report (closed)
To <u>approve</u> a paper from College Registrar, Medicine & Veterinary Medicine. | O |
| 17 | College of Science and Engineering Summary Report (closed)
To <u>approve</u> a paper from College of Science & Engineering. | P |
| 18 | Support Groups Summary Report (closed)
To <u>note</u> and <u>approve</u> a paper by Director of Estates. | Q |
| | 18.1 Proposal to Re-name the Old Medical School Quadrangle (closed)
To <u>approve</u> a paper from Head of College of Arts Humanities and Social Science. | Q1 |
| 19 | Investing in Drinking Water
To <u>approve</u> a paper by the Assistant Director of Estates and Head of Estates Operations. | R |
| 20 | Date of next meeting: Wednesday 6 December 2017 - 09:30 – 12:30 to be held in the Raeburn Room, Old College. | |

Venue – Informatics Forum, 10 Crichton Street, EH8 9AB - Room 4.31/33 Location map is located at: <http://www.ed.ac.uk/informatics/about/location>

If you require this agenda or any of the papers in an alternative format e.g. large print please contact Angela Lewthwaite on 0131 651 4384 or email Angela.Lewthwaite@ed.ac.uk



ESTATES COMMITTEE

13 September 2017

Estates Committee Sub-Group Approvals

Description of paper

1. This paper provides a consolidated list of decisions taken by Estates Committee Sub-Group (ECSG) since the last Estates Committee meeting on 24 May 2017. The paper also presents a list of contracts awards (greater than £250,000) over the period 11 May 2017 to 1 September 2017

Action requested

2. Estates Committee is asked to homologate the decisions taken by ECSG referred to in point 5.

Recommendation

3. The Committee is recommended to homologate ECSG decisions taken since Estates Committee last met on 24 May 2017.

Background and context

4. This paper enhances the 'transparency' in relation to the operation of the ECSG, highlighted in the effectiveness review.

Discussion

5. Since the Estates Committee last met, ECSG approved the following contract awards and acquisitions:

Fully Approved (fully funded) Projects

- Institute for Regeneration and Repair - Main contract awarded to Balfour Beatty Construction Ltd in the sum of £36,074,118.81. The works commenced on site on 21 August 2017 with contract completion scheduled for 18 October 2019.

6. A list of works contracts awards (greater than £250,000) over the period to 11 May 2017 to 1 September is included in the Appendix.

Resource implications

7. Fully Approved (fully funded) Projects – No additional implications. Projects already contained in the Fully Approved (fully funded) Estates Capital Plan.

Risk Management

8. There are no specific risks identified.

Equality & Diversity

9. No specific Equality and Diversity issues are identified.

Next steps/implications

10. The Estates Department will oversee any procurement processes.

Consultation

11. Convener, Director of Finance, Director of Estates, Head of Estate Development, Head of Estates Planning and Special Projects and Head of Estates Finance.

Further information12. Author

Graham Bell,
Depute Director of Estates
1 September 2017

Presenter

Graham Bell
Depute Director of Estates

Freedom of Information

13. This is an open paper.

Works Contracts Awards = > £250,000
11 May 2017 - 1 September 2017

Appointed Contractor	Project Description	Contract Award
Ashwood Scotland Ltd	New TV Studio Facility, Forresthill	£ 339,613.06
Morris and Spottiswood	Edinburgh Cancer Research Centre refurbishment	£ 1,090,998.87
Ecosse Sports Ltd	Peffermill Phase 1 - Hockey Pitch upgrade	£ 307,208.53
Maxi Construction	Joseph Black Building, Social Space	£ 607,551.53
Balfour Beatty Construction Ltd	Institute for Regeneration and Repair	£ 36,074,118.81
Taylor and Fraser	New College Boiler Replacement	£ 300,973.00
Ashwood Scotland Ltd	New College, Stonework Repairs	£ 406,629.34
Taylor and Fraser	Boiler Replacements, Minto House, Peffermill and Forresthill	£ 449,505.00
Unigrow Ltd	Building A New Biology Enabling Works - Waddington 2 Grodome and greenhouse	£ 1,146,406.20
Total		£ 40,723,004.34

Services Contracts Awards = > £250,000
11 May 2017 - 1 September 2017

Appointed Consultant	Project Description	Contract Award
Sheppard Robson	Design Team Services, King's Building Nucleus	£ 1,131,000.00
Total		£ 1,131,000.00

Goods Contracts Awards = > £250,000
11 May 2017 - 1 September 2017

Appointed Supplier	Project Description	Contract Award
Total		£ -



ESTATES COMMITTEE

13 September 2017

Space Strategy Group

Description of paper

1. This paper reports on the key points discussed at the meeting of the Space Strategy Group (SSG) held on 23 August 2017.

Action requested

2. Estates Committee is asked to:

- approve £1m funding from University Corporate Resources to progress the Teaching Accommodation Programme for 2018/2019;
- note the outcome of the post-graduates and undergraduates analysis requested by Estates Committee at the May meeting (Point 11 refers)

Recommendation

3. Estates Committee is asked to approve £1m to progress a programme of teaching accommodation upgrades for 2018/2019 and note the key points discussed at the Space Strategy Group meeting.

Background and context

4. The Space Strategy Group is tasked with delivering the Terms of Reference agreed by CMG on 8 November 2016. The purpose of the Group is primarily to optimise the use and improve the quality of space across the estate through joined up working across the University community. More specifically, the Group provides clear oversight of teaching and learning spaces. This aligns with the University's strategic enabler to improve the student experience.

5. Discussion

Teaching accommodation programme 2016/17

The programme of works is nearing completion for the beginning of Semester 1. In total, 34 rooms are being refurbished and / or being re-equipped at a cost of £1.9m.

6. In addition, the former Lister and Pfizer buildings on Hill Square are being redeveloped to create the new centrally bookable Lister Learning & Teaching Centre at a cost of £9.5m. This has been the most challenging of the 2016/17 projects and following discovery of an uncharted electrical cable, the programme was revised and the building is now being delivered in 4 Phases. Phase 1 was completed time on 8 September and delivered 16 teaching rooms, 11 of which had bookings committed for Semester 1.

7. Teaching Accommodation Programme 2018-19

Over the last two years, a Teaching Accommodation Improvements Programme has been developed with the primary aim of raising the quality and number of teaching spaces across the estate. This is in line with the University's strategic enabler to improve the student experience.

Over the period, the Estates Department and Information Services have refurbished / equipped 89 rooms at an overall cost of £3.65m.

8. It is proposed to continue with an annual upgrade programme and a shortlist of teaching rooms for upgrade for 2018-19 is currently under consideration including:

- Ashworth 1, Lecture Theatre 3
- Grant Institute Lecture Theatre
- Anatomy lecture theatre
- Medical Education Centre – Western General Hospital
- Chancellor’s Building, Little France - Seminar rooms 1 to 6
- Swann Building level 7 - rooms 7.14, 7.19 and 7.21
- Crew Building – rooms 301 and 304
- Chrystal McMillan Building – seminar rooms 4 and 5
- Minto House – Elliot room – light touch refurbishment
- Adam house – Basement auditorium – feasibility for full refurbishment
- 2 no. Pilot teaching rooms – Central area and King’s Buildings

9. In order to improve accessibility, fabric, furniture and audio visual equipment, £1m funding is requested to commence the 2018-19 programme in order to maintain programme of improvements and complete work in time for the start of Semester 1 in 2018.

10. Teaching Integrated Scenario Planning 2016-2025 – Update

At the Estates Committee in May, EC requested that some further modelling be carried out to ascertain the frequency of use between post-graduates and undergraduates.

11. An exercise was carried out and the analysis confirmed that the core teaching hour split broadly reflected the demographic split.

	16/17 Head count		16/17 All core teaching (hrs)		16/17 General teaching only (hrs)	
UG	22,860	73.2%	154,634	69.2%	145,777	72.3%
PGT	8,363	26.8%	68,821	30.8%	55,770	27.7%
Total	31,223		223,455		201,547	

Table 1: UG/PGT core teaching split

12. The following observations emerged:

- In overall teaching terms, there was a slight weighted increase towards PGT teaching.
- When ‘general’ teaching space was assessed in isolation, the split more closely resembled the demographic split, which implied a greater use of ‘specialist’ space for PGT teaching.

Resource implications

13. £1m funding is requested from University Corporate Resources to progress the 2018/2019 teaching programme.

Risk Management

14. The main risk is future disruption to University business continuity due to insufficient or inappropriate space which will impact on the student experience.

Next steps/implications

15. If approved, to undertake the programme of teaching accommodation upgrades for 2018/2019.

Consultation

16. Space Strategy Group and Teaching Space Oversight Group members.

Further information

17. 15. Author

Assistant Principal Professor Sarah Cunningham-Burley,
Convener of SSG

Gillian Nicoll, Learning & Teaching Design Manager

Angela Lewthwaite, Secretary to Space Strategy Group

1 September 2017

Presenter

Graham Bell

Depute Director of Estates

Freedom of Information

18. This is an open paper



ESTATES COMMITTEE

13 September 2017

Estates Risk Register

Description of paper

1. The Estates Department's risk register has been updated in accordance with the University's risk management process of identifying risks, consequences and mitigation activities, together with score. The risks that are scored as red and amber are attached for the Estates Committee to review.

Action requested

2. Estates Committee is asked to note the red and amber risks that are contained in the risk register.

Recommendation

3. Estates Committee is asked to note the red and amber risks and the mitigation activities that are in place to manage these risks.

Background and context

4. The Department reviews its risk register each year in accordance with the University's risk management process.

Discussion

5. At the Estates Committee in March 2016, the lay members of Court asked that the Estates Department risk register be presented to the Estates Committee. It was agreed that the red and amber risks are set out in the Appendix.

Resource implications

6. There are no specific resource implications related to this paper, but individual risk and mitigation actions may have resource requirements and these will be managed on an individual risk or project related basis.

Risk Management

7. The risk register is managed in accordance with the University risk management process.

Equality & Diversity

8. There are no equality and diversity considerations related to collation of the risk register although the management of individual risks within the register may have; these will be managed on an individual project or related basis.

Next steps/implications

9. The Estates Department will continue to review and manage the risks proactively.

Consultation

10. The Estates Management Group have contributed to the update of the risk register and it has been shared with the Director of Corporate Services.

Further information

11 Authors

Graham Bell, Depute Director of Estates

22 August 2017

Presenter

Gary Jebb, Director of Estates

Freedom of Information

11. The paper is open.

	Risk	Consequences	Inherent Impact	Residual Impact	Residual Prob'ity	Risk Level	Risk Movement since last year	Management Processes and Mitigating Activities
			Severe(5) Major (4) Moderate (3) Minor (2) Insignif't (1)	Severe(5) Major (4) Moderate (3) Minor (2) Insignif't (1)	Very High(5) High (4) Medium (3) Low (2) Very Low (1)	Red >15 Amber 10-15 White<10	Increased ↑ Un-changed- Reduced ↓	
1	Failure to provide compliant, robust and resilient infrastructure for internal engineering systems and building fabric across our large and complex estate (e.g. for Combined Heat and Power and High Voltage networks) and with regard to dependencies on regional infrastructure such as roads, broadband, electrical and gas supplies, water drainage and standby generation.	Impact on achievement of key strategic goals Business disruption Loss of or inadequate operational processes Major disruption to research, teaching and learning student administration etc. Inability to manage University e.g. finances, pay staff etc. Reputational damage	5	4	4	16	Increased The scale of vulnerability of legacy infrastructure is being assessed as a priority as there requires to be investment into making buildings and core systems more resilient particularly in terms of accessibility and where single points of failure are identified on critical systems. Compliance is improving however there is significant work ahead to review the University infrastructure against statutory and mandatory standards	Current Regular liaison with third party stakeholders Interruptible gas supply Revert to oil backup where available and ensure regular infrastructure services to sustain oil as a failsafe Review of accessibility to all buildings in line with standards Future Further development of existing relationships with key stakeholders and providers Identification of critical buildings and services and additional investment in resilience measures as required (KB, Easter Bush, BioQ, Central Area) Work to improve building commissioning and handover processes Establish a comprehensive knowledge base of necessary records e.g. drawings and O&M manuals
2	Failure to meet or be compliant with legislation or regulations related to the operation of the estate.	Potential litigation and prosecution Reputational damage Financial loss Inability to conduct University business Impact on staff Compensation	5	4	4	16	Increased Increasingly demanding regulations, a complex legislative environment and university priorities has led to an increased score.	Current Building surveys and risk assessments Prioritised maintenance and compliance work programme Training and awareness Audit PPM and testing regimes review Compliance management module Asset surveys and tagging Embedding new teams, staff structure and systems to deliver better outcomes the requirement for additional funding has been flagged in the planning submission Future Building inspections Risk assessment Implementation of compliance management module for better reporting and management information against KPIs Implementation of training records database Evaluating compliance and securing additional resource to address backlog
3	Failure to deliver an estate of appropriate size, capable of supporting growth, particularly in terms of the teaching and residential estate, and one that is flexible and fit for purpose and provides an excellent student experience that can be easily adapted to meet changing needs and particular locational challenges e.g. resilience of infrastructure at King's Buildings and Pollock Halls.	Impact on achievement of key strategic goals Financial loss Loss of confidence by funding bodies, partners and contractors, staff and student communities Disruption Loss of reputation Student dissatisfaction and poor NSS results	5	4	4	16	Unchanged Due to changing environmental context and impact on strategy, funding context and demographic of student body	Current Regular meetings with Local Authorities and stakeholder groups Continued investment in the teaching estate Appointment of site co-ordinators to assist in co-ordination of the Capital Programme Design review process implemented Future More active role for the Space Enhancement and Management Group (SEMG) Revised estate strategy and masterplan/frameworks
4	Failure to deliver a credible capital programme of significant scale and projects within it in terms of: • Being able to reassure the University Court of the Department's capacity to deliver the programme • Being able to respond to special projects/mergers/acquisitions • Management of capital programme and financial plan, spending profiles and financial control management • Securing planning and other statutory consents • Preparation of robust business cases and dependencies • Corporate decision making/integrated planning with academic colleagues and Development and Alumni • Delivering a scaleable operational model that evolves with the capital plan	Financial loss Loss of confidence by funding bodies, partners and contractors. Loss of confidence within staff and student communities Disruption Reputational damage	5	4	3	12	Reduced A range of mitigation measures have been put in place since last year. However the scale and complexity of the capital plan projects over the next 10 years, and changing institutional priorities around delivery brought about by a changing environment leads us to conclude this continues to represent a risk, but one which continues to be actively managed.	Current PWC Capital Programme Readiness Assessment Report (PWC Report) Concluded recruitment of an additional EDM and ongoing PMs recruitments. Establishing a Programme Management Office (PMO) to improve delivery capacity, scenario planning and reporting. Recruited a capital management accountant to improve forecasting and accounting Review project methodologies and processes and acquire the EPPM IT system to improve scenario planning and management of delivery Revisions to project governance supported by PMO Continued dialogue between EDMs and their representative areas Refreshed committee arrangement Regular meetings with Local Authorities and Historic Environment Scotland to retain and develop strong business links Publication of estate vision statement and masterplan/frameworks by spring 2017 Future Implementation of the EPPM system by Autumn 2018
5	Failure to find solutions that deliver systems to address the age, fragility, integrated nature and complexities of existing Estates Department systems at a pace that can deliver the change needed to underpin core business, including corporate linkages and dependencies with IS and other corporate departments.	Sub-optimal operational processes Inability to provide data needed for key business areas Inability to manage University wide processes Reputational damage Frustration	5	4	3	12	Unchanged The scale of transformation required to process and systems has become clearer and the pace of delivery is challenging given expectations on a small number of key individuals to deliver change	Current Planning round processes to identify projects Ongoing resilience improvement programmes and infrastructure upgrades Refreshed approach to IT planning in the Department including a senior manager led governance structure Systems implementation trialling and load testing Appointment of an Estates IS Programme Manager Risk assessment for each project Partnership working arrangement with IS and recruitment of a Programme Manager Review of existing process and procedures/ undertake business analysis Phased delivery plan for implementation of IT plan Working collaboratively with other business areas within corporate services and across other Support Groups
6	Failure to manage change in a period of significant change in the people, systems, process, culture/organisation agendas.	Impact on achievement of key strategic goals Impact on staff morale Loss of financial control, Business continuity Reputational damage	4	4	3	12	Reduced The scale of change required to transform processes and systems has become clearer since last year and the pace of delivery required is challenging so our risk exposure has increased	Current Clear strategic direction being articulated and appointment of a Change Management Advisor and Communications Manager to oversee and guide the department through a period of significant change New governance structures for major changes processes e.g. hard services review Communication activities to aid project management processes Improvements to business case and wider use of gateway approach Capital Programme Strategy via project governance Future Review of Website Appointment of Estates PMO Manager

	Risk	Consequences	Inherent Impact	Residual Impact	Residual Prob'ity	Risk Level	Risk Movement since last year	Management Processes and Mitigating Activities
			Severe(5) Major (4) Moderate (3) Minor (2) Insignif't (1)	Severe(5) Major (4) Moderate (3) Minor (2) Insignif't (1)	Very High(5) High (4) Medium (3) Low (2) Very Low (1)	Red >15 Amber 10-15 White<10	Increased ↑ Un-changed- Reduced ↓	
7	Failure to follow and comply with procurement legislation or to manage an increasingly demanding legislative environment brought about by: • Additional legislative burdens • The scale of the capital programme compounding the legislative compliance burden • The need for greater oversight of contractor management and performance	Loss of confidence by funding bodies, partners or contractors Potential litigation and prosecution Reputational damage Financial loss and clawback Compensation Inability to conduct University business	5	4	3	12	Unchanged Our exposure has risen since last year but further mitigation measures has kept pace with the increase in exposure	Current Departmental restructuring to enable the Depute Director to oversee all procurement activities Implementation of the Procurement Protocol and Estates Tender Review Panel Improved appointment and management process of contractors through the use of Frameworks Appointment of a resource to streamline and standardise measured term contracts (MTC) Supplier management review Dedicated and additional procurement resource embedded within estates and access to procurement legal experts <i>PWC Report</i> Revised and updated Procurement Protocol and training being rolled out Future Use of intend for procurement
8	Failure to deliver an Estates Business Continuity Plan (e.g. if there was a fire in Infirmary Street leading to loss of building or systems).	Business disruption Financial loss Inability to conduct University business Potential litigation or prosecution Loss of equipment and information Compensation	5	4	3	12	Unchanged	Current Implementation of serious and major incident plans Future Review of estates business continuity options and development of a plan
9	Failure to manage the volatility in Energy/Utilities pricing and consumption impacting on attainment of key targets and confidence in the quality of data. Failure to deliver the energy consolidation project given its complexity.	Application of the carbon tax Reputational damage Unable to deliver a system to meet business requirements	5	4	3	12	Unchanged	Current Collaborative working with Sustainability and Social Responsibility (SRS) office Performance against University KPIs/targets monitored Review of energy systems requirements and data governance standards including full business analysis Waste and recycling initiatives in relation to carbon reduction Sustainable campus fund available now and into the future Review and embed new resources to provide a structure that can achieve demands and priorities Future Energy systems consolidation project arising from systems review will, following a initial pilot, will provide better consumption data capture, management and reporting
10	Failure to deliver a world class estate to meet increasing student expectations firstly during a period of major refurbishment and secondly from an operational perspective.	Increased risk in civil claims relating to the 'students as customers' approach. Poor ratings in the NSS Impact on student admissions targets	5	4	3	12	Unchanged	Current Continued investment in the learning and teaching estate Close working with College Registrars to understand better College and School priorities Future Implementation of Teaching Spaces Oversight Group (TSOG) recommendations and innovative teaching programme and appointment of teaching spaces manager Ongoing scrutiny of customer surveys and taking action on outcomes arising from the survey
11	Failure to deliver and implement the Central Bio-research Services (CBS) strategy and levels of investment.	Reputational damage Unable to meet key University research goals	5	4	3	12	Unchanged	Current Delivery of CBS strategy and understanding of requirements Future Detailed planning for commissioning and implementation of any new facility
12	Failure to be prepared to deal with a major incident, including fire, in terms of accuracy of drawings, system linkages, liaison with internal stakeholders and external agencies (in particular management of Multiple Occupancy Buildings (MoBs) and Personal Emergency and Evacuation Plans (PEEPs))	Widespread damage to property and buildings Serious injury or death Business disruption Financial loss Inability to conduct University business Reputational damage Potential litigation and prosecution Loss of equipment and information Compensation	5	4	3	12	Increased Major incident plan and Emergency response procedures are being drafted but there is a need to have emergency planning cascaded within the University and provide training - dedicated Emergency Planning Officer to be recruited	Current Major and serious incident plans and roll out with associated training and development of staff Fire/security policies Fire detection systems Security staff & procedures Training & awareness Insurance inspections Insurance cover Programme of training, audit and fire risk assessments Planned preventative maintenance inspections, surveys and testing Complete Health & Safety (H&S) management audit programme annually H&S compliance audit programme Comprehensive review of business continuity planning Communications strategy review Review of building opening hours Future Business continuity plans Revision to the lone working policy Vice Principal led group on PEEPS



ESTATES COMMITTEE

13 September 2017

Estates Committee – Revised Terms of Reference

Description of paper

1. This paper sets out a proposed revision to the Estates Committee Terms of Reference.

Action requested

2. Estates Committee is asked to endorse the revised Terms of Reference as detailed in Appendix 1 (previous Terms of Reference - Appendix 2).

Recommendation

3. Estates Committee is recommended to endorse this proposal and to recommend to Policy and Resources Committee that it approves this amendment.

Background and context

4. The previous Estates Committee Remit was amended and approved by Court on 22 June 2015.

Discussion

5. The changes are:

- Minor revisions to job titles (point 2.3)
- Up to two lay members of Court may be appointed (point 2.5)
- The Assistant Director (Head of Estates Operations) added (point 2.9)
- Up to two experienced professional experts may also be invited to attend meetings (point 2.10)
- The quorum of the Committee has been amended to remove the requirement for the lay members of Court (point 3.2)
- Renaming the Space Enhancement & Management Group to the Space Strategy Group (point 4.8)

Resource implications

6. There are no specific resource implications associated with this paper.

Risk Management

7. There are reputational risks, the revised Terms of Reference ensures good governance practice in taking forward estate matters.

Equality & Diversity

8. There are no specific equality and diversity issues associated with this paper. Cognisance is taken of equality and diversity issues in making appointments to the Estates Committee.

Next steps/implications

9. Once endorsed, the Estates Committee Terms of Reference will progress to Policy & Resources Committee for approval.

Consultation

10. Director of Estates, Head of Court Services and Convener of Estates Committee.

Further information

11. Author

Graham Bell,
Depute Director of Estates
1 September 2017

Presenter

Professor Jonathan Seckl
Vice-Principal Planning,
Resources and Research
Policy and Convener of EC

Freedom of Information

12. Open Paper

Estates Committee - Revised Terms of Reference

1 Purpose

To advise on the University's estate in order that it can deliver a world-class estate to support academic, teaching, research and public engagement activities.

2 Composition

2.1 The Committee shall consist of up to twenty members.

2.2 The Vice-Principal Planning, Resources & Research Policy, the University Secretary, the Director of Corporate Services, the Deputy Secretary, Strategic Planning, the Director of Estates and the Director of Finance shall be *ex officio* members of the Committee.

2.3 The other members of the Committee shall consist of: Vice-Principal Philanthropy and Advancement, Chief Information Officer, Director of Accommodation, Catering and Events, Heads of Colleges or their nominated senior officer.

2.4 The Students' Association shall appoint, on an annual basis, a representative to be a member of the Committee. This will normally be the President of the Students' Association who will remain a member of the Committee for the length of her/his term of office.

2.5 Up to two lay members of Court or external members may be appointed by the Nominations Committee and Court informed of those appointed.

2.6 The term of office of lay members will be no longer than their membership of Court unless otherwise determined by Court and shall normally be for a maximum of three years.

2.7 Previous members are eligible for re-appointment up to a normal maximum of two consecutive terms of office.

2.8 The Vice-Principal Planning, Resources & Research Policy shall be the *ex officio* Convener of the Committee.

2.9 The Depute Director (Head of Estates Development), Assistant Director (Head of Estates Operations), Head of Estates Planning and Special Projects, Head of Estates Finance and Committee & Administration Officer shall always be invited to the meetings and receive all papers. Other Senior Officers of the University may be in attendance at the Committee.

2.10 Up to two experienced professional experts from within or outwith the University may also be invited to attend meetings.

2.11 All members of the Estates Committee are expected to comply with the University's Code of Conduct as set out in the University's Handbook and declare any

interests which may conflict with their responsibilities as members of the Estates Committee.

3 Meetings

3.1 The Committee will meet as required to fulfil its remit and meet at least three times a year.

3.2 Five members of the Committee shall be a quorum. This number must include the Convener, or the Director of Corporate Services or the Director of Estates, or the Director of Finance. One of the *ex officio* members (see 2.2 above) shall be appointed Convener should the Convener be absent for the duration of the meeting.

3.3 Minutes, agendas and papers will normally be circulated to members of the Committee and those in attendance at least five working days in advance of the meeting. From time to time it may be necessary to distribute/table late papers, this would be at the discretion of the Convener.

3.4 Papers will indicate the originator/s and purpose of the paper, the matter/s which the Committee is being asked to consider and any action/s required and confirm the status of the paper in respect of Freedom of Information legislation.

3.5 A formal minute will be kept of proceedings and submitted for approval at the next meeting of the Committee. The draft minute will be agreed with the Convener of the Committee and in the case of the absence of the Convener at a meeting the Committee member appointed to act as Convener for the duration of that specific meeting.

3.6 The Committee may also function between meetings with critical matters being progressed through the Estates Committee Sub-Group (ECSG) and any decision/s taken formally ratified at the next meeting of the Committee. ECSG will comprise the Convener, Director of Finance, Director of Estates, both lay Court members, and occasionally other members as relevant to the specific issue at hand.

4 Remit

Strategic Direction

4.1 To develop and oversee the University Estates strategy, and modify this periodically, taking account of the overall strategic direction of the University.

4.2 To monitor progress on targets and goals set out in the Estate Strategy and the implementation of capital development plans.

4.3 To assist the development and delivery of the Estates Strategy, ensuring broad compliance with University strategic commitments and statutory duties to manage and reduce carbon emissions and broader sustainability commitments.

4.4 To consider and endorse or reject estates business plans and make recommendations of their priority.

Financial

4.5 To endorse acquisitions, disposals and leases of land and property in accordance with the levels set out in the approved Delegated Authorisation Schedule (DAS).

4.6 To endorse the award of and acquisition of all goods, services and works on approved estates-related business plans and formal acceptance of contracts in accordance with the levels set out in the approved DAS.

4.7 To endorse an annual capital estates programme for consideration by the University's Policy and Resources Committee, to monitor progress in taking forward the agreed programme, to advise on any matters of concern and recommend proposals for subsequent amendments to the programme as appropriate.

Policy and Advice

4.8 To endorse proposals from the Space Strategy Group.

4.9 To endorse estates policies.

4.10 To consider estates management implications associated with changing legislation, local government planning and governance requirements.

4.11 To consider and advise on significant matters related to the size of and deployment of Estates recurrent budget and operational matters for which the Director of Estates wishes advice or support.

5 Other

5.1 The Committee will from time to time undertake a review of its own performance and effectiveness as part of the overall review of the effectiveness of Court and its Committees and report thereon to Court.

5.2 In order to fulfil its remit, the Committee may obtain external professional advice as necessary.

5.3 The Estates Committee will report after each meeting to the Policy and Resources Committee and as appropriate consult with and provide separate papers to other Committees and Groups in particular the Central Management Group and Court.

5.4 Agenda, papers and approved minutes will be published on the University's website in accordance with the University's agreed publication scheme and freedom of information legislation. This will include details on the membership of the Committee.

ESTATES COMMITTEE - Amended and approved by Court on 22 June 2015

Terms of Reference:

1 Purpose

To advise on the University's estate in order that it can deliver a world-class estate to support academic, teaching and research activity.

2 Composition

2.1 The Committee shall consist of up to twenty members.

2.2 The Vice-Principal Planning, Resources & Research Policy, the University Secretary, the Director of Corporate Services, the Deputy Secretary, Strategic Planning, the Director of Estates and the Director of Finance shall be *ex officio* members of the Committee.

2.3 The other members of the Committee shall consist of: Executive Director of Development and Alumni, Chief Information Officer, Director of Accommodation Services, Heads of Colleges or their nominated senior officer.

2.4 The Students' Association shall appoint, on an annual basis, a representative to be a member of the Committee. This will normally be the President of the Students' Association who will remain a member of the Committee for the length of their term of office.

2.5 Two lay members of Court shall be appointed by the Nominations Committee and Court informed of those appointed.

2.6 The term of office of lay members will be no longer than their membership of Court unless otherwise determined by Court.

2.7 Previous members are eligible for re-appointment up to a normal maximum of two consecutive terms of office.

2.8 The Vice-Principal Planning, Resources & Research Policy shall be the *ex officio* Convener of the Committee.

2.9 The Depute Director of Estates, Head of Estates Planning and Special Projects, Head of Estates Finance and Committee & Administration Officer shall always be invited to the meetings and receive all papers. Other Senior Officers of the University may be in attendance at the Committee.

2.10 Other individuals from within or outwith the University may also be invited to attend meetings from time to time, as required.

2.11 All members of the Estates Committee are expected to comply with the University's Code of Conduct as set out in the University's Handbook and declare any interests which may conflict with their responsibilities as members of the Estates Committee.

3 Meetings

3.1 The Committee will meet as required to fulfil its remit and meet at least three times a year.

3.2 Five members of the Committee shall be a quorum. This number must include the Convener, the Director of Corporate Services or the Director of Estates, the Director of Finance, and one lay member of Court. One of the *ex officio* members (see 2.2 above) shall be appointed Convener should the Convener be absent for the duration of the meeting.

3.3 Minutes, agendas and papers will normally be circulated to members of the Committee and those in attendance at least five working days in advance of the meeting. From time to time it may be necessary to distribute/table late papers, this would be at the discretion of the Convener.

3.4 Papers will indicate the originator/s and purpose of the paper, the matter/s which the Committee is being asked to consider and any action/s required and confirm the status of the paper in respect of Freedom of Information legislation.

3.5 A formal minute will be kept of proceedings and submitted for approval at the next meeting of the Committee. The draft minute will be agreed with the Convener of the Committee and in the case of the absence of the Convener at a meeting the Committee member appointed to act as Convener for the duration of that specific meeting.

3.6 The Committee may also function between meetings with critical matters being progressed through the Estates Committee Sub-Group (ECSG) and any decision/s taken formally ratified at the next meeting of the Committee. ECSG will comprise the Convener, Director of Finance, Director of Estates, both lay Court members, and occasionally other members as relevant to the specific issue at hand.

4 Remit

Strategic Direction

4.1 To develop and oversee the University Estates strategy, and modify this periodically, taking account of the overall strategic direction of the University.

4.2 To consider and endorse or reject estates business plans and make recommendations of their priority.

4.3 To monitor progress on targets and goals set out in the Estate Strategy and the implementation of capital development plans.

Financial

4.4 To endorse acquisitions, disposals and leases of land and property in accordance with the levels set out in the approved Delegated Authorisation Schedule (DAS).

4.5 To endorse the award of and acquisition of all goods, services and works on approved estates-related business plans and formal acceptance of contracts in accordance with the levels set out in the approved DAS.

4.6 To endorse an annual capital estates programme for consideration by the University's Policy and Resources Committee, to monitor progress in taking forward the agreed programme, to advise on any matters of concern and recommend proposals for subsequent amendments to the programme as appropriate.

Policy and Advice

4.7 To endorse proposals from Space Enhancement & Management Group.

4.8 To endorse estates policies.

4.9 To consider estates management implications associated with changing legislation, local government planning and governance requirements.

4.10 To consider and advise on significant matters related to the size of and deployment of Estates recurrent budget and operational matters for which the Director of Estates wishes advice or support.

5 Other

5.1 The Committee will from time to time undertake a review of its own performance and effectiveness as part of the overall review of the effectiveness of Court and its Committees and report thereon to Court.

5.2 In order to fulfil its remit, the Committee may obtain external professional advice as necessary.

5.3 The Estates Committee will report after each meeting to the Policy and Resources Committee and as appropriate consult with and provide separate papers to other Committees and Groups in particular the Central Management Group and Court.

5.4 Agenda, papers and approved minutes will be published on the University's website in accordance with the University's agreed publication scheme and freedom of information legislation. This will include details on the membership of the Committee.



ESTATES COMMITTEE

13 September 2017

Proposal to Re-name the Old Medical School Quadrangle

Description of paper

1. This paper presents a proposal to re-name the Old Medical School Quadrangle in honour of Dr Elsie Inglis.

Action requested

2. Estates Committee is asked to approve the proposal.

Recommendation

3. It is recommended that Estates Committee approve the proposal to re-name the Old Medical School Quadrangle in honour of Dr Elsie Inglis.

Background and context

4. Dr Elsie Inglis was a significant and innovative Scottish doctor and an alumna of the University. She was born in India in 1864 and studied medicine at the University of Edinburgh originally at the medical School founded by Sophia Jex-Blake. She qualified as a licentiate of both the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons in Edinburgh and the Faculty of Physicians and Surgeons of Glasgow in 1892 after completing her training under Sir William MacEwen at the Royal Infirmary in Glasgow.

5. She returned to Edinburgh in 1894 setting up a practice with fellow student Jessie MacGregor, and a maternity hospital known as "The Hospice" on the Royal Mile. She graduated from the University in 1899 and continued working at The Hospice until it joined forces with Bruntsfield Hospital in 1907.

6. She played a leading role in the Suffrage movement and this became closely linked to her war work when she was instrumental in setting up the Scottish Women's Hospitals for Foreign Service (SWH). The SWH was affiliated to, and funded by, the suffrage movement to provide all female relief hospitals for the Allied war effort. Particularly active in Serbia, where her presence and work in improving hygiene reduced typhus and other epidemics. In 1915 she headed a team going to Russia but had to return a year later as she was suffering from cancer. She died on 26 November 1917, the day after she arrived back in the UK.

7. Dr Inglis displays many very admirable characteristics that are aligned to the values that the University promotes. She was an innovative doctor committed to improving the lives of her patients with particular interest in the needs of her female patients and also the victims of war. She was a philanthropist who often used her own funds to help her patients or waived fees. Although against military action she was a leader of the women's suffrage movement in Scotland and worked with great determination for the campaign for women's votes. This determination was even more in evidence during her work on the frontline during the First World War.

8. The University has already recognised Dr Inglis in a number of ways by having a Chair in her name, a plaque in her memory was unveiled in 2015 in Old Surgeons'

Square and the student, staff and public lounge area in the Chancellors building is also named in her honour.

Discussion

9. Dr Elsie Inglis died on 26 November 1917 at the age of 53, 2017 is therefore the centenary year of her death.

10. The notion of giving her greater recognition has broad appeal with initiatives to do so proposed by a range of people. Recent debate in the local newspaper the Evening News about the lack of recognition in Edinburgh for women, with the vast majority of the City's civic monuments and statues to men, have also been prominent.

11. The City of Edinburgh Council, through the Office of the Lord Provost, are also championing a campaign to see greater recognition for Elsie Inglis particularly in the year that marks the centenary of her death. We understand that the Scottish Government are also involved in organising a celebration of her life later this year.

12. The proposal to rename the quadrangle as the "Dr. Elsie Inglis Quadrangle" would arguably represent a more visible manifestation of our respect for her and her continued relevance as a role model, not just for those striving to enter the medical profession but also more widely. It would also serve to recognise that her life and achievements are a remarkable combination of medical and social/political achievement and thus reflect the past, present and future work of the University in Teviot.

13. Although not technically a building, the University policy on naming buildings has been consulted and discussions taken place with Vice-Principal Philanthropy and Advancement Chris Cox. Vice-Principal Cox confirms that this proposal is unlikely to have any negative impact on any other potential philanthropic opportunities for this space and he is therefore supportive.

14. The Lord Provosts Office have also confirmed that members of Dr Inglis family have been consulted and are supportive of this proposal.

Resource implications

15. It is anticipated that the resource implications will be minimal as there is unlikely to be any change regarding directional signage or postal addresses. There may be some adjustment necessary to some of the campus maps but there is unlikely to be anything beyond this.

Risk Management

16. No risks identified.

Equality & Diversity

17. Equality and Diversity matters have been considered from the perspective of the positive role model the re-naming would signal.

Next steps/implications

18. If Estates Committee approve the change, then the proposal will then be presented to Policy and Resources Committee for approval and the Estates Department would be asked to implement the change. Confirmation of the decision would be communicated to the Lord Provost by the Principal and liaison would continue with Principal's Office over the arrangements.

Consultation

19. Consultation has taken place with the two Colleges most closely associated with the space, Vice-Principal and Head of College of Arts, Humanities and Social Science, Professor Dorothy Miell and the Head of the Edinburgh Medical School, Professor Moira Whyte, who are both supportive. In addition the views of Vice-Principal Planning, Resources and Research Policy, Vice-Principal Philanthropy and Advancement, Mr Chris Cox and Vice-Principal People and Culture, Professor Jane Norman have been sought and they are supportive.

Further information

20. Author

Ms Fiona Boyd
Principal's Office
28 August 2017

Presenter

Professor Dorothy Miell
Vice-Principal and Head of College Arts
Humanities and Social Science.

Freedom of Information

21. Open paper



ESTATES COMMITTEE

13 September 2017

Investing in Drinking Water

Description of paper

1. This paper requests funding to install new and upgrade existing drinking water points around the estate.

Action requested

2. Estates Committee is requested to consider the proposal and approve funding of £400,000 from University Corporate Resources in order to progress an installation and upgrade programme of drinking water points.

Background and context

3. The University of Edinburgh has a policy on Drinking Water setting out our commitments and expectations in this area. This is being updated following a recent review and included as Appendix 1 for reference. The University's Good Food Policy commits us to "provide free tap water in all the catering outlets and buildings and encourage staff and students to use tap water in preference to bottled water".

4. Estates commissioned a project (with Students Association, SRS and ACE involvement) in 2017 to review both staff and student concerns in relation to drinking water and to better understand whether this was a communications gap or an infrastructure gap. A paper was presented to CMG in August 2017 with the detailed analysis and recommendations.

Discussion

5. The review demonstrated that there are improvements to be made both in terms of our provision of water and in terms of how we communicate water availability.

- Gaps in provision of water supplies across locations were identified.
- Staff and students expressed a preference for tap water (bottled water was 'last option').
- Our water is safe and high quality. Samples tested and complied for potability.
- Drinking from single use plastic bottles means water for students is more expensive.
- Single use plastic bottles costs the University both financially and environmentally. Approximately 20 percent of waste and recycling uplifted is plastic bottles.
- Some universities have put plastic water bottle bans in place for many years.

Proposed Actions

Infrastructure

- 256 new installations and 74 upgrades required. This would address gaps where water provision is insufficient and upgrade existing fountains to stations (subject to water pressure).
- A rolling water testing programme to be established.
- New developments / capital projects would ensure adequate provision built in.

Communications and Awareness Raising

- Suitable and sufficient signage required.
- Development of a Water Point App and promotion of access to drinking water stations, together with students, including water bottle development and roll out.

Resource implications

6. The estimated investment required across all University properties is £400,000 (capital) over 3 years with revenue costs of approx. £30,000 in Y1 rising to £60,000 in Y3. This amount includes costs related to new installations, improvement of the current facilities, signage and water testing programme. Revenue costs will be bid as part of the Annual Planning round.

Drinking Water Project Budget Costs - 3 Year Investment		
	CAPITAL (incl. fees+VAT)	REVENUE (incl. fees+VAT)
Installations of new DWF(*) (incl. pipe and drainage work)	£ 249,600	
Upgrade existing DWF(*)	£ 46,200	
Cold water services infrastructure improvements(**)	£ 98,200	
Signage	£ 6,000	
Staff Time Internship - Map App		£ 4,000
Water Testing		£ 16,000
Maintenance		£ 120,000
TOT.	£ 400,000	£ 140,000

*DWR=Drinking Water Fountains **Water pressure and temperature issues

Water Investment - 3 Year Compressed Schedule				
	Y1	Y2	Y3	TOT
Total Capital Investment	£ 140,000	£ 130,000	£ 130,000	£ 400,000
Total Revenue Costs	£ 30,000	£ 50,000	£ 60,000	£ 140,000

Risk Management

7. A risk assessment has been carried out looking at the potential risks, likelihood, impact and mitigation strategies including reputation, student satisfaction, health and safety, environment, and financial risks.

- The proposed changes would help to contribute to reputational risk management.

- There is potential for sales of bottled water at University shops and cafes to decrease.
- Improving access to free drinking water will have multiple benefits across the University.

Equality & Diversity

8. E&D considerations are implicitly included in the Drinking Water Policy.

Next Steps

9. Confirm investment, roll out infrastructure improvements and awareness raising.

Consultation

10. Paper prepared by Estates, SRS and the Edinburgh University Students' Association. Reviewed by Director of SRS, Director and Assistant Director of Estates. Staff and students inputted to the project. CMG reviewed the analysis and recommendations in August 2017.

Further information

11. Author

Oliver Glick, Vice President Community, Edinburgh University Students Association;
 Vincenza Verdicchio, Drinking Water Project Coordinator
 Sheila Scott, Building Services Manager
 Joseph Farthing, Communications Manager, SRS
 Michelle Brown, Head of SRS Programmes.
 31 August 2017

Presenter

Grant Ferguson,
 Assistant Director of Estates
 & Head of Estates
 Operations

Freedom of Information:

12. This paper is open



Drinking Water Policy (2017)

Final Draft

1. Purpose

The University's Strategic Plan 2016 states that "as a truly global university, rooted in Scotland's capital city, we make a significant, sustainable and socially responsible contribution to the world". As part of our strategic objectives we have committed to supporting the resources and facilities needed for students' mental and physical well-being. Our strategy also commits us to ensuring sustainability and accessibility are built into our estates.

This policy is a key element of this vision. Drinking water is an issue that concerns students and staff and connects to health and well-being, economics, and environmental sustainability.

This is a proposed update to our current policy: available at <http://www.docs.csg.ed.ac.uk/estatesbuildings/policies/Drinkingwaterpolicy.pdf>

2. Expectations and Commitments

1. Free-standing Bottled Water Coolers should not be located on University premises. Existing units should be removed.
2. Students, staff and visitors should have access to drinking water from drinking water stations distributed across University Campuses.
3. Students, staff and visitors should be discouraged from accessing drinking water from outlets located in workshops, toilets, laboratories and areas under construction in the interest of hygiene and safety.
4. Drinking water stations shall be provided in convenient locations, they should be adequate in number and clearly identified.
5. The design standards for new buildings and major refurbishments must make a suitable and sufficient provision for drinking water stations.
6. Catering servicing University events shall provide drinking water from taps wherever possible.
7. Only in exceptional circumstances should Plumbed-in Water Coolers be installed, which must be subject to written approval by Estates and the installation and running cost are to be paid by the requester.
8. A rolling programme of testing of potability of water from drinking water stations is to be undertaken and managed by Estates.
9. Education/outreach activities will be supported which promotes access to free drinking water, together with seeking to reduce plastic.

3. Responsibility and scope

This policy has been developed by the Estates Department, the Department for Social Responsibility and Sustainability (SRS), the Department for Accommodation, Catering and Events (ACE) and the Students' Association.

4. Implementation and review

This policy will be prominently displayed for visitors at events venues and on our website. Estates and SRS will coordinate a policy review every 3 years to respond to new developments and meet evolving best practice in the sector.

5. Equality and diversity

Due consideration of equalities duties has been included with the policy review.

6. Support

SRS can provide contacts and advice regarding this policy for staff or students. Press or media enquiries should be directed to the Press Office.

7. Approval and review

<i>Consultations held</i>	The policy was originally developed in 2009 and reviewed and updated in 2012. A review was carried out in 2017 with further updates made. Input was gathered through a variety of channels in 2016 and 2017. The final draft went to Central Management Group in August 2017.
<i>Final approval by</i>	Director of Estates / Assistant Director of Estates
<i>Date policy approved</i>	September 2017
<i>Date of commencement of policy</i>	Immediate
<i>Dates for next review of policy</i>	May 2020

8. Contact

For further information, or if this policy is required in an alternative format, please contact Jane Rooney at jane.rooney@ed.ac.uk