

## **Bristol Arena Contractor Appointment, Value for Money Review and Further Options – APPENDIX A Further essential background / detail on the proposal:**

### **Context**

The purpose of this report is to seek Cabinet approval to enter into a Pre-Construction Services Agreement with Buckingham Group. At the same time the report also seeks approval for the commissioning of a Value for Money review in order to assess the economic case for investment in the project and asks that the Strategic Director Place undertake further indicative work as to the options as to what type, size and shape of arena that could be procured should a new procurement be required. Finally the report seeks approval to bring forward Enabling Works and the pre-ordering of elements of work and to finance work on a proposed car park at 1-9 Bath Road.

### **Recommendations put forward:**

- 1) To approve the award of the Pre Construction Services Agreement (PCSA) to Buckingham Group in order to firm up current costings for the arena as currently proposed;
- 2) To authorise the Strategic Director for Place to undertake all negotiations and sign off the PCSA Contract in consultation with the Mayor as and when it is finalised;
- 3) To ensure that the PCSA process takes full advantage of value engineering options offered under the current arena project;
- 4) To commission an independent value for money review in parallel with the PCSA process in order to inform the economic case for any investment in the arena project;
- 5) To undertake further indicative work as to the options as to what type, size and shape of arena that could be procured should a new procurement be required;
- 6) To request that the Strategic Director for Place return to Cabinet following the conclusion of the PCSA, the Value for Money Study, and the review of options in order to allow Cabinet to take a view on how to proceed with the project in such a way as to seek to minimise additional costs and maximise VFM and the economic case for an Arena;
- 7) To approve Enabling Works and the pre-ordering of elements of work/materials yet to be specified (where there is a clear benefit in doing so) prior to the main building contract being signed;
- 8) To approve the allocation of £500,000 from the existing allocation to the scheme to finance further work on the proposed car park at 1-9 Bath Road; and
- 9) To return to Cabinet with options on the provision of a car park following the work referred to above.

**The proposal:**

1. Bristol is the only core city without an Arena. Developments of this scale do require a significant public subsidy at the outset to enable the facility to be built.
2. It is widely accepted that there are considerable economic and social benefits generated by such facilities in terms of attracting spending to the city and raising its profile. These economic benefits will be realised in Bristol and the sub-region. The lack of an Arena leaves the city without the necessary sized venue that all other major cities possess as part of their cultural infrastructure.
3. The Arena will serve as a catalyst for the development of the Bristol Temple Quarter Enterprise Zone (BTQEZ) in terms of spatial planning, creating jobs and generating economic and business rate growth.
4. The Arena project benefits from a site in the Council's ownership, a technical design (RIBA Plan of Work Stage 4), detailed planning permission and a 25 year operational agreement with an operator in place. Approximately £123m has been secured for the project. At this stage the Council has spent £9m on taking the project forward, and after several previous attempts to deliver an Arena in the city, the project is now more advanced than ever before.
5. On January 11<sup>th</sup> 2017 the Council terminated its Pre Construction Services Agreement with Bouygues UK limited, leaving the project without a Contractor to build the scheme.
6. The approach under the contract (NEC 3 Option C, Engineering and Construction target cost contract with an activity schedule where the out-turn financial risks are shared between the client and the contractor in an agreed proportion) is to work with the Contractor to achieve a Target Cost, expected to be within range of the agreed budget, before returning to Cabinet to seek approval to agree the main building contract with the Contractor. The Target Cost should have been agreed in October 2016 however BCC was unable to agree a cost with the previous contractor. A further cost plan was then commissioned.
7. AMION Consulting was previously appointed by Bristol City Council to prepare an economic appraisal for the proposed Arena scheme in support of an application for funding to the West of England Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP). It is anticipated that this investment will support significant employment benefits in the construction phase, including opportunities for businesses and residents within the West of England sub-region. As the scheme has grown in nature, and aligned with the proposed development of the University of Bristol, it is important

to ensure public investment remains value for money. To inform future decisions on investment an independent VFM review will be commissioned in parallel with the PCSA process.

8. It is possible that the approach to Target Cost setting through the PCSA will not be successful or could indicate a higher than anticipated cost. To alleviate this, further indicative work will be undertaken as to the options as to what type, size and shape of arena that could be procured should a new procurement be required.

## APPOINTING A PREFERRED CONTRACTOR

9. The Council terminated the PCSA agreement with the previous contractor, Bouygues UK (BYUK) on 11<sup>th</sup> January 2017. This left the project without a Contractor to take the project forward. Officers took Queens Counsel (QC) advice on how then to proceed. There is an opportunity under the same procurement process to go to the second placed Contractor Buckingham Group, and appoint them as the Preferred Contractor for the project, rather than begin a new tender process. The preference is to adopt this approach as it is quicker and the estimated costs of delivering the project are less than retendering. The project took QC's advice in relation to termination BYUK's PCSA and the award of a new PCSA to Buckingham Group and this historical advice received from the QC is now included in Appendix G3 (Exempt).
10. As second placed Contractor, Buckingham Group have demonstrated their capability to take the project forward. This followed an extensive tender evaluation period involving the Council's project team including its consultants.
11. The PCSA period can begin when Cabinet approves the appointment of Buckingham Group, the contractual standstill period of 10 days has expired, and the final details of the PCSA contract are agreed between the Council and Buckingham Group. Buckingham Group can then provide Contractor consultancy services, building up a Target Cost with the Council. **If both parties can agree this Target Cost and agree the terms of the main building contract, Cabinet will then be able to decide whether or not to approve the Target Cost to enable start on site.**
12. The details of the Buckingham Group bid are commercially sensitive, but they have maintained the commercial position set out in their tender submission of December 2015 and satisfied all the Council's internal legal and financial checks,

with the decision to proceed with them approved by the Bristol Temple Meads East Phase 1 (BTME P1) officer Project Board.

13. A “reflections” exercise from the previous PCSA has begun, and this will be taken into the next PCSA to maximise the Council’s learning from the process.
14. The PCSA contract has been approved by the Council’s internal Commissioning Procurement Group.
15. Version 3.03 of the latest cost plan produced by AECOM, is appended to this report at **Appendix G1**. This is an indicative plan based on an estimate of the cost of the current design. As such it remains exempt and not for publication for commercial reasons.

## OTHER OPTIONS

16. In mitigation against the possibility of the Target Cost not being at a level of affordability acceptable to the Council, a further set of options will be identified and appraised. This will include looking at the type, size and shape of an arena. It is likely that considerations will include, though not exclusively some or all of the following issues:
  - a. funding and financing routes;
  - b. delivery strategy and partners;
  - c. management and governance structure;
  - d. procurement strategy;
  - e. approach to statutory development control (Planning Consent),
  - f. building design, specification and size;
  - g. form of construction contract;
  - h. insurance and liability strategy, and
  - i. operational and maintenance model.
17. Given the high number of alternative development strategies, for brevity three main alternative options have been summarised below. These options will be compared and evaluated against the existing development. The merits of the alternative options would have to be assessed against the project in its current form.
18. Three alternative options with key considerations are:
  - a. Major redesign of the existing scheme to achieve capital cost reductions

- i. Retain Agreement for Lease and Arena Operator business case, based on the 12,000 capacity multi use Arena;
  - ii. Significant technical simplification, reduction in visual appeal and reduction in the quality of the visitor experience;
  - iii. New application for planning consent;
  - iv. New building contractor procurement exercise;
  - v. Programme and cost consequences;
  - vi. Redesign cost
  - vii. Building regulations compliance
- b. Lower the Arena audience capacity
  - i. Considerations as above and also;
  - ii. Attract the top international shows, artists;
  - iii. Rental value;
  - iv. Event revenue ;
  - v. Under the Agreement for Lease may result in the Arena Operator abandoning current Agreement for Lease
  - vi. Operator Procurement;
- c. Stop the project
  - i. The Council could decide not to proceed with the project. The Arena site would be available for development although the connecting infrastructure and public realm would still have to be funded and delivered.

## **REVIEW OF VALUE FOR MONEY**

- 19.** AMION Consulting was previously appointed by Bristol City Council to prepare an economic appraisal for the proposed Arena scheme in support of an application for funding to the West of England Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP). It is anticipated that the investment will support significant employment benefits in the construction phase, including opportunities for businesses and residents within the West of England sub-region. As the scheme has grown in scope, and aligned with the proposed development of the University of Bristol, it is important to ensure public investment continues to offer value for money. To inform future decisions on investment an independent VFM review will be commissioned in parallel with the PCSA process.
- 20.** The approach previously adopted, and on which the proposed review may be based will be consistent with HM Treasury Green Book guidance. In assessing the costs of the project, consideration will be given to the anticipated capital costs associated with the development of the Arena (and associated infrastructure and

public realm works), alongside the ongoing financial projections relating to the operation of the Arena.

21. The assessment of economic benefits will include an analysis of the expected quantifiable outputs and outcomes in both the construction and the operational phase of the Arena. Alongside this, consideration will be given to the anticipated benefits of the Arena project in promoting the wider redevelopment of the Arena Island site, alongside catalysing wider activity across adjacent sites within the Temple Quarter Enterprise Zone. On this basis, the assessment could examine:
  - a. capital investment;
  - b. temporary construction jobs;
  - c. gross permanent jobs;
  - d. net additional jobs;
  - e. net additional Gross Value Added (GVA)<sup>1</sup>;
  - f. key fiscal impacts associated with the anticipated uplift in business rates.
22. In addition to the above economic benefits, the assessment may also consider the wider, less easily quantifiable benefits that would be expected to be generated by the proposed development such as community and catalytic effects. Based on the analysis of costs and benefits, the value for the money of the Arena scheme will be calculated, focusing on key measures including the benefit cost ratio (BCR) and net present value (NPV).

#### **CAR PARK AT 1-9 BATH ROAD**

23. As part of the Agreement for Lease with the proposed operator of the existing scheme, the Council has to provide 200 parking spaces for the Arena operator packages. A temporary location for these is the Arena site where they are part of the Arena building contract.
24. Now that the Council is in the process of selling the Cattle Market Road site and part of the Arena site to the University of Bristol, a new site for these spaces now needs to be found. A previous options appraisal for the BTQEZ demonstrated that 1-9 Bath Road was the best site for a new car park to be located.
25. The Council's intention to build a car park (of up to 500 spaces) was set out in the March 2016 Cabinet paper, and is shown in the latest update of the Spatial Framework. This project will need to be financed separately from the Arena project and not delivered via the Arena main building contract.

26. Feasibility studies for 1-9 Bath Road are complete and show that a 500 space car park could be delivered on the site with payback expected within 20 years. There could be an opportunity to partner up with stakeholders in terms of capital funding, delivery, or allocation of spaces via permits. The current view is that it would be difficult to make this car park available to the public on Arena event days.
27. The car park needs to be open on Day 1 of Arena opening in 2020. Cabinet is asked to allocate funding from the current project allocation to enable the project to go forward. This request has been accelerated by the need to find a location for the car park spaces planned for the Arena site, which is now being purchased by the University of Bristol. The car park does not have planning permission and formal Cabinet approval will be sought for the project when it is sufficiently developed. To this end £500,000 of funding is required to take forward further feasibility work.
28. Further work is needed on taking forward options, which could include a smaller scale car park of only 200 spaces which would require a lower level of capital funding and risk but also a lower level of income.
29. The delivery of a car park near the city centre is contrary to Council policy on parking, which discourages city centre and BTQEZ car parking. Officers are currently examining the feasibility of a capacity neutral car park space exchange in the central area.
30. An option would be to sell the site to a private developer who would then build and operate the car park. This would reduce the initial capital outlay for the project from the Council, but make it very unlikely that the Council would then operate the car park. It could make it more difficult for the Council to control the build project (which has to be ready when the Arena opens), and the Council would have less influence over how the car park is used. This option has not yet been discounted.

## **ENABLING WORKS**

31. It is proposed that a scope of Enabling Works be undertaken during 2017 to mitigate project cost and programme risks. The cost of these is set out in Appendix G4 (Exempt), which is commercially sensitive as it contains cost estimates for the work, which should not be made public.

- 32.** The scope of the proposed Enabling Works will be developed with the PCSA Contractor following their appointment. The criteria for undertaking enabling works will be that they offer one or both of the following benefits to BCC:
- i. They will provide additional information about the site prior to signing the construction contract. This information will reduce risk and associated costs.
  - ii. They are essential works that can be undertaken prior to the signing of the construction contract which will improve the value of the site and reduce the Arena construction programme duration and associated costs.
- 33.** These Enabling Works will be undertaken by the PCSA Contractor under the terms of the PCSA which allows works to be instructed under the same terms and conditions as the proposed main construction contract. This ensures market competition and full transparency of cost through the open book contract (NEC Option C Target Cost). In undertaking these works, BCC are in no way obliged to proceed into the main construction contract with the PCSA Contractor. BCC's obligations are limited to payment for the contracted and completed Enabling Works.
- 34.** The extent of Enabling Works undertaken will be dependent on the PCSA Programme; however the following list of activities are indicative of the type of works necessary to realise the benefits described above:
- b. Site Investigations and Design Approval
  - c. Specific ground and structural investigations
  - d. Test Piles
  - e. Pile Probing
  - f. Design samples and mock-ups
  - g. Site Setup and Preparatory Works
  - h. Hoardings, fencing, signage and gates
  - i. Site access and security setup
  - j. Site clearing, levelling and grading
  - k. Demolition and removal of concrete structures and obstructions
  - l. Temporary utility connections
  - m. Site preparation and drainage
  - n. Environmental protection measures / remediation
  - o. Construction of haul roads and laydown areas
  - p. Enabling Works to the A4 Bath Road wall and River Avon wall
  - q. Improvement works to the A4 slip road
  - r. Attendance to the St Phillips Footbridge Project on Arena Island



35. The extent of the works will be confirmed by the BCC Project Management Team in conjunction with the PCSA Contractor and the BCC Cost Consultant.
36. **Consultation and scrutiny input:**
37. **Internal consultation:**
38. This paper has been reviewed by the Senior Leadership Team (28<sup>th</sup> February and 14<sup>th</sup> March). The Mayor and Cabinet Member have been briefed on the status of the project and were last briefed on 13<sup>th</sup> March and 16<sup>th</sup> March 2017.
39. **External consultation:**
40. No external consultation has taken place.

### Risk management / assessment:

**FIGURE 1**

**The risks associated with the implementation of the PCSA decision :**

No.	RISK  Threat to achievement of the key objectives of the report	INHERENT RISK (Before controls)		RISK CONTROL MEASURES  Mitigation (i.e. controls) and Evaluation (i.e. effectiveness of mitigation).	CURRENT RISK (After controls)		RISK OWNER
		Impact	Probability		Impact	Probability	
1	Entering into PCSA - Risk of procurement challenge.(pre QC advice)	High	High	Advice received from Queens Counsel provided some confidence that the risk of challenge being successful was low.	Med	Low	BTME P1 Project Board.
2	Potential cost increases emerging . Council unable to sign building contract and thus construction cannot begin.	High	High	Review any cost increases with Contractor input and also seek alternative funding sources so that the project can proceed through target setting and return to Cabinet for a final decision prior to start on site.	Med	Med	BTME P1 Project Board.
3	Target Cost / Actual costs of the project exceed estimates.	Med	Med	Robust target setting process with Contractor. Involve Contractor in Value Engineering / Scope reduction work to reduce costs; Pain/Gain share in place to incentivise Contractor. VFM Exercise undertaken. Options considered	Med	Med	BTME P1 Project Board.

**FIGURE 2****The risks associated with not implementing the PCSA decision:**

No.	RISK  Threat to achievement of the key objectives of the report	INHERENT RISK		RISK CONTROL MEASURES  Mitigation (ie controls) and Evaluation (ie effectiveness of	CURRENT RISK		RISK OWNER
		(Before controls)			(After controls)		
		Impact	Probability		Impact	Probability	
1	Do not enter into PCSA - no Contractor appointed under existing procurement.	Med	Med	Begin alternative procurement of revised scheme / procurement strategy - this option is being twin tracked with the PCSA.	Med	Med	BTME P1 Project Board.
2	Cost increases not addressed - Project either ends or is revised significantly. Delay in project delivery and loss of value of work completed to date.	High	High	Amended project with new procurement process. Revisit business case and stakeholder commercial relationships to reset requirement and brief.	Med	Med	BTME P1 Project Board.

**Public sector equality duties:**

An Equalities Impact Assessment has been carried out previously on the project.

**Eco impact assessment**

An Eco Impact Assessment has been carried out previously on the project.

**Resource and legal implications:****Finance****a. Financial (capital) implications:**

The report seeks approval to commence PCSA dialogue with the Buckingham Group, following termination in January of the process with the original preferred bidder. The PCSA process, the cost of which is referred to in the exempt report (Appendix G2 Exempt), will facilitate greater cost certainty of the project. Approval to undertake the PCSA process does not mean agreement of the construction project. On conclusion of the dialogue, a report will be brought back to the Mayor in Cabinet, outlining the outcome of the dialogue process and the project target cost. The Mayor will consider progress of the development in accordance with the Council's duty of best value.

At the same time a value engineering exercise will be progressed to assess areas of possible cost reduction whilst maintaining within the parameters of the existing procurement process.

Cabinet agreed to progress the Arena venue scheme on the former Diesel Depot site in Temple Meads in January 2014, and £91m was incorporated into the capital programme, as agreed by Full Council in February 2014. The estimate was based on building cost

assumptions undertaken with the Council's cost consultants as part of the business plan for the development. In December 2014, a further provision of £9m was agreed as optimum bias on the build cost. The gearing between public and private investment at the time was 58/42%. It should be noted that this was for the Arena only.

Cabinet subsequently agreed an additional £28m for the wider Arena Island project in March 2016. That report made reference to the need for parking facilities but did not seek provision within the capital programme.

Provision for the Arena Island development, as agreed in the capital programme, is £123.5m, for the period 2016-22. In addition £8m of the £9m optimum bias reserve has been transferred to the capital investment reserve and earmarked for alternative purposes. £1m has been held in reserve as provision for liabilities that are not deemed to be wholly capital.

Funding of the currently agreed Arena programme is complex and subject to financial risks. It is based on some assumed capital receipts, planning contributions and operator contributions to the capital development. These cash contributions offset the need to borrow to fund the capital development costs. The report identifies some risk with assumed receipts from the disposal of the Cattle Market Road site. If this risk materialises there would be a bottom line long term revenue funding implication for the Council. Previous assumptions regarding income from the temporary use of the site have now been discounted in light of the recent decision to dispose. Community Infrastructure Levy of £8m, agreed as part of the financial support by Cabinet in March 2016 is deemed by officers realisable within project timescales, but as yet not wholly secured, and could be adversely impacted by any sudden downturn in the development market should prevailing economic conditions change.

The primary elements of the overall financing package, namely City Deal Funding through the Economic Development Fund (£53m) and Operator Income (£39m), are the capitalised value of revenue income streams over 25 years post completion of the scheme. The Council must fund the upfront development costs through borrowing. Availability of the Economic Development Fund is dependent on business rate growth across the sub-region's Enterprise Zones and Areas. If business rate growth is not as high as anticipated, then some of the £53m could be at risk.

With the potential for cost pressures and the funding risks outlined above, it is timely that the Council undertake a value for money review of the scheme in parallel with progression of the PCSA process. Major projects should be subject to periodic gateway reviews, including prior to investment approval. The independent review will reassess all financial costs, risks, and benefits. It will involve re-assessing all elements of this scheme including the proposed target costs, operator contract, wider economic benefits, other dependent

contracts and risks. It will review these with regard to their contribution to overarching strategy and desired outcomes, and will assess alternative procurement options, taking account of recommendation 5 of this report. It is intended to provide assurance for the Council, that a decision to progress the scheme is taken in line with its duty of best value. The details will inform the economic case and can be included in the supporting evidence for the investment decision.

Provision for up to £100,000 will be made from within the capital investment reserve to fund the review. The cost is estimated to be significantly below EU thresholds for procurement of these services.

Approval is also sought for the contractor to commence enabling works at the site. The estimated cost of these works is specified on the exempt agenda. Funding for these initial works will be from the agreed capital provision for Arena Island. There is a risk that such expenditure could become abortive if the project does not progress – in which case it would fall to be a charge to revenue.

Finally the report seeks approval for expenditure of up to £500,000, from within the existing Arena Island capital estimate, to assess options for development of a car park close to the Arena. A requirement of the operator agreement is for a minimum 200 spaces. Whilst officers preferred option is to develop the adjacent Bath Rd site there are a number of issues, including planning policy constraints that need consideration. The outcome of the options appraisal will be brought back to Cabinet for consideration, along with their capital financing implications and impact on the wider capital programme. Funding for the development of the car park is likely to be dependent on Council borrowing. It is then assumed that income from parking will be sufficient to offset both the operating costs and capital financing costs (interest on borrowing and minimum revenue provision.) The long term business case supporting this assumption will require further due diligence, and appraisal of operating options. There will be varying degrees of financial risk and reward associated with those options. Again any abortive fees would fall as a charge to the revenue account.

**Advice given by**    **Chris Holme, Interim Head of Corporate Finance**  
**Date**                    **27.03.17**

b. Financial (revenue) implications:

As stated above, the financing arrangements for the Arena are complex and subject to a number of financial risks. The intention of the scheme from the outset was that the scheme would be revenue cost neutral for the Council. However previous reports have advised Cabinet that in the early years there would need to be a net subsidy as income from the Economic Development Fund and Operator Income would not meet financing costs. During

the projects lifecycle, as capital financing costs would generally remain fixed but operator income is index linked, income should over time exceed annual costs to the Council.

What this does mean that from 2021/22 onwards additional provision will need to be made within the medium term financial plan for the net revenue contribution. Previous reports have indicated a figure of up to £1.15m. Current financial modelling would suggest between £600-800k per annum for the period 2022 to 2025, based on the cost estimates above, then reducing to breakeven between 2028 and 2030 – based on annual uplift of the operator income in line with current inflation assumptions. However this will need to be reviewed in line with the amended operator lease agreement on sharing of business rate cost increases, and other liabilities, such as insurances which will fall as a charge to the Council. This medium term growth may need to be offset by future budget reductions.

Pending further options appraisal, revenue assumptions regarding the car park remain cost neutral.

**Advice given by**     **Chris Holme, Interim Head of Corporate Finance**  
**Date**                     **27.03.17**

**Comments from the Corporate Capital Programme Board:**

None.

**c. Legal implications:**

Legal advice supports the approach taken namely of appointing the second placed Contractor (Buckingham Group) as the Preferred Contractor and entering into a PCSA with them.

The PCSA does not commit the Council to enter into a building contract but to engage with Buckingham Group to seek to agree a target price for a building contract, the outcome will be reported to Cabinet for a final decision to proceed (or not).

Under the terms of the PCSA the Council may instruct Buckingham Group to carry out enabling works, including site preparatory works and ordering materials. By ordering enabling works through the PCSA the Council is not committed to proceeding into the main building contract. The enabling works are dealt with as a discrete package of works carried out under the PCSA.

**Advice given by**     **Nancy Rollason, Senior Solicitor**  
**Date**                     **27.03.17**

**d. Land / property implications:**

This report mainly addresses construction costs and contract matters. Construction will need to be completed to the agreed standard to enable completion of the operator lease, and thus secure that element of the funding. Part of the funding is dependent on achieving an optimum land value from the residue of Arena Island and Cattle Market Road sites. The net benefit ring fenced for the Arena Funding is at the top of the range of potential values indicated by the earlier external valuers' report. The costs assessed and used for that are based on desk top assessments so will be reviewed as detailed site investigations are carried out. The proposed transaction with University of Bristol (UoB), now approved by Cabinet, increases the prospect of achieving the full net value, but it has been made clear in the separate report to Cabinet of 7 March 2017 that there is a potential range which was reported as £11m - £16m.

The agreement with University of Bristol, which was approved by Cabinet and is expected to legally contract in April 2017, would commit the Council to legal transfer of the residue of Arena Island and Cattle Market Road sites. The residue of Arena Island, also known as the Phase 2 site, would cease to be owned by the Council probably in mid 2018. Thereafter, it would not be available to be used as the main contractor site compound. This does produce a pressure for the construction delivery and thus is a new potential cost pressure. The University, Contractor and Council will need to work together on construction coordination, including requirements for compounds and logistics, but also around the overall interface between adjoin sites and construction programmes. This report also confirm the need linked to the agreement with University of Bristol for commitment to a project to deliver a car park off the Arena Island site as the previous intention was for some parking requirements to be met on a temporary basis by constructing a car park on the Phase 2 land.

**Advice given by     Robert Orrett, Service Director Property Services**

**Date                     27.03.17**

**e. Human resources implications:**

There is a Project Development Budget which covers staffing for the life of the project. Although most of the team is already in place further specialist staff will be required for a project of this scale including positions such as Construction Director, Design Manager and Commercial Manager.

**Advice given by     Mark Williams, Place HR Business Partner**

**Date                     27.03.17**

