



Rialtas na hÉireann
Government of Ireland

Value for Money Unit

Local Government Audit Service

Progress Report No. 8

**Progress on the implementation of the
recommendations contained in VFM Report
No.30:**

Corporate Estate Management and Maintenance in Local Authorities

December 2018

Department of Housing, Planning and Local Government

housing.gov.ie

Local Government Audit Service

The Local Government Audit Service (LGAS), incorporating the Value for Money (VFM) Unit, being an external audit service, provides independent scrutiny of the financial stewardship of local authorities.

The sectoral goals of the LGAS are to:

- carry out the audits of local authorities and other bodies in accordance with the Code of Local Government Audit Practice thereby fostering the highest standards of financial stewardship and public accountability.
- promote the achievement of value for money in local authorities by undertaking Value for Money audits and publishing reports thereon.

It is the responsibility of local authority management to ensure that value for money is achieved by establishing and maintaining sound arrangements including procedures for planning, appraisal, authorisation and control of resources.

This report was prepared on the basis of information, documentation and explanations obtained from the public bodies included in this report. The draft report was sent to all local authorities and relevant Government departments for factual accuracy and where appropriate the comments received were incorporated in the final version of the report. The website of the Department of Housing, Planning and Local Government is the primary means of publishing reports of the Value for Money Unit of the Local Government Audit Service. Should any errors arise they will be corrected and noted in the report published at <http://www.housing.gov.ie/en/publications/localgovernment/auditservice/>

Contents

Introduction	4
Findings	6
Conclusion	29

Introduction

The Value for Money (VFM) Unit of the Local Government Audit Service (LGAS) carries out VFM studies and issues reports on local authority operations, with a view to identifying best practice and recommending ways of improving existing procedures, practices and systems and thereby promoting efficiency and cost effectiveness.

The Unit also prepares and issues progress reports on the implementation, by local authorities, of the recommendations contained in the national reports issued by the Unit. This report is the eighth progress report issued by the VFM Unit of the Local Government Audit Service.

A review of corporate estate management and maintenance in nine local authorities (Dublin and Galway City Councils, Cavan, Cork, Kilkenny, Louth, South Dublin, Tipperary and Wexford County Councils) was undertaken by the VFM Unit of the LGAS and arising from this review VFM Report No. 30 (Corporate Estate Management and Maintenance in Local Authorities) was issued in January 2017. The nine local authorities were chosen following a review of their property portfolios per the State Property Register, taking mergers into consideration and also to ensure a geographical spread of small, medium and large local authorities.

The study was carried out to examine the current position as to how the nine participating authorities managed and maintained their corporate estate portfolio and to recommend ways of improving existing procedures, practices and systems, thereby promoting economy, efficiency and effectiveness. It involved the preparation and issue of a questionnaire. Visits were carried out to the participating authorities and the responses to the questionnaire were validated. A review of international best practice in the area of corporate estate management and maintenance was carried out and opportunities to apply to local authorities identified.

The study related to local authority buildings only, it excluded land. It related to all local authority buildings excluding local authority housing, theatres, leisure facilities and community facilities.

The questionnaire was divided into two sections. Section 1 was to be completed only for corporate office buildings (i.e. main offices and area offices) over 100sqm. This section was designed to give a profile of the participating local authorities' corporate office buildings, how they are being used and what kind of information the local authorities have and monitor in relation to their office building portfolios. It addressed:

- Capacity and utilisation of the corporate estate, and
- Completion of an appendix of detailed information for individual office buildings with office space over 100sqm in size, to give a profile of the local authorities.

Section 2 related to all local authority buildings (excluding local authority housing, theatres, leisure facilities and community facilities) of all sizes. This section was designed to understand the participating local authorities' current practices and forward planning in relation to the management and maintenance of their corporate estates, and the areas it addressed were:

- Corporate estate strategic management.
- Recording the corporate estate.
- Costs associated with the corporate estate.
- Condition and required maintenance of the corporate estate.
- Contract/in house maintenance of the corporate estate.

A follow-up of the implementation of the recommendations contained in VFM Report No. 30 was completed in late 2017 and early 2018. The purpose of this report is to assess the progress made by the 31 city and county councils in implementing the recommendations relevant to them. A draft report was sent to all 31 local authorities for confirmation of factual accuracy and feedback comments and all responded.

The 31 county and city councils were requested to complete a questionnaire and provide relevant backup documentation and all 31 authorities complied with this request. Each of the city and county councils were visited by staff of the LGAS who verified the responses given in the questionnaire. The results of the questionnaire are summarised under findings at 2 below. The responses received in relation to each recommendation are summarised under each recommendation heading. The extent of the implementation of the recommendations contained in VFM Report No. 30 by each city and county council is set out in Exhibits 1-3 on pages 23-28 of this report.

Findings

The progress on the implementation of the recommendations, set out in VFM Report No. 30, is shown below.

It is important to emphasise that the review of the compliance with the recommendations contained in VFM Report No. 30 was carried out in late 2017 and early 2018.

Exhibit 1 shows the recommendations made in VFM Report No. 30 and the number of the 31 local authorities that have implemented each of the recommendations.

Exhibit 2 shows the breakdown by local authority of the recommendations which have been fully or partially implemented and those which were not implemented or not applicable.

Exhibit 3 shows a summary of the overall compliance (as a percentage) by each of the city and county councils with the recommendations contained in VFM Report No. 30.

It should be noted that a County and City Management Association (CCMA) Working Group prepared a business case in February 2018 in relation to the establishment of a Property Interest Register for the Local Government sector. It is thought that if this Property Interest Register goes ahead it will, together with the establishment of Property Management Units in the Local Authorities, address many of the recommendations in Sections 2 and 3 of this report. The business case report is currently being discussed by the CCMA.

Section One: Capacity and Utilisation of the Corporate Estate

Recommendation No. 1

Local authorities should evaluate their space allocation to ensure maximum utilisation of existing space and assess whether or not a move towards more open plan office space would be beneficial and result in cost savings. It should not be presumed that staff of a certain grade or above must have their own cellular/walled office of a minimum size. It is appreciated that protected structures will restrict how the internal layout can be changed. Also, depending on the current design/layout of the building, especially for older buildings, changing the internal layout may be very costly and disruptive; however, if it makes considerable space savings in the long term and reductions in utility and overhead costs then it is worthwhile. The extra space could be used to rehouse staff from other offices, freeing up office buildings which could then be disposed of or rented out, for example.

Progress on implementation of recommendation

Seven (23%) local authorities fully complied with this recommendation, twenty-two (71%) partially complied and two (6%) did not comply with this recommendation.

The main reasons for partial compliance were:

- Some local authorities have ongoing, informal reviews and plans in place.
- Some local authorities have only evaluated some office buildings or their main office building/s.
- Some local authorities have mostly open plan offices already.
- Some local authorities have an office redesign process currently in progress.

The reason for non compliance for one local authority was that no formal evaluation has taken place and they have some open plan office space already. The other local authority is due, in 2018, to assess the need for new offices before they decide what to do with current office layouts.

Recommendation No. 2

Local authorities should review how they store records/paper documents and consider alternatives, such as increased use of offsite storage or a software based paperless approach to see if these options are practical and would result in cost savings.

Progress on implementation of recommendation

Fourteen (45%) local authorities fully complied with this recommendation, fourteen (45%) partially complied and three (10%) did not comply with this recommendation.

The main reasons for partial compliance were:

- Some local authorities already have some offsite storage and carry out ongoing, informal reviews of the situation.
- Some local authorities are currently in the process of reviewing their document storage.

One non complying local authority did plan to start a tender process for the service. A further non complying local authority said that they had not carried out a review due to a lack of staff resources. The other non compliant local authority did not provide a reason.

Recommendation No. 3

Local authorities should consider desk sharing, for example, for work sharing staff. They should consider having hot desks, for example, in the case of staff who spend most of their time outdoors or for staff who frequently spend time in more than one office location.

Progress on implementation of recommendation

Thirteen (42%) local authorities fully complied with this recommendation, thirteen (42%) partially complied and five (16%) did not comply with this recommendation.

The main reasons given for partial compliance were:

- Some local authorities have some hot desks, where suitable.
- Some local authorities have no formal policy, but do have some hot desks/desk sharing.
- Some local authorities had a review exercise in progress.
- Some local authorities had hot desks or desk sharing, but not both.

In two of the cases of non compliance, desk sharing and/or hot desks were not considered suitable by the local authorities due to different work patterns and no surplus space available

for use as hot desks. The other three non complying local authorities are awaiting reviews of office space before they make a decision on desk sharing and/or hot desks.

Recommendation No. 4

For vacant office space, there should be a documented plan in place as to how the space will be used. Office space should remain vacant for as minimum a time as possible.

Progress on implementation of recommendation

Five (16%) local authorities fully complied with this recommendation, eleven (36%) partially complied and fifteen (48%) did not comply with this recommendation.

The main reasons for partial compliance were:

- Some local authorities stated that they are continuously, informally reviewing their space, including any vacant space they have.
- Some local authorities have a documented plan for their main office building only.
- Some local authorities are currently documenting a plan.

In the majority (12) of local authorities who did not comply with the recommendation, the reason cited was that they currently have no or little vacant office space and therefore do not feel that they need a documented plan/procedure in place. The other three local authorities did not provide a reason.

Recommendation No. 5A

Local authorities should have a record of the floor area in sqm (gross and net internal areas) for each of their office buildings held on a property portfolio database.

Progress on implementation of recommendation

Five (16%) local authorities fully complied with this recommendation, nineteen (61%) partially complied and seven (23%) did not comply with this recommendation.

The main reasons for partial compliance were:

- Some local authorities record gross or net internal areas, but not both.
- Some local authorities stated that the information exists but is not recorded in a property database.
- Some local authorities have the information for some of their office buildings or for their main office building/s only.

Of the seven local authorities who did not comply, one said this was due to a lack of resources and the others did not provide a reason.

Recommendation No. 5B

Local authorities should record average sqm/workstation in their office buildings.

Progress on implementation of recommendation

Only two (6%) local authorities fully complied with this recommendation, eleven (36%) partially complied and eighteen (58%) did not comply with this recommendation.

The main reasons for partial compliance were:

- Some local authorities have the information on floor areas, but do not calculate the key performance indicator (KPI).
- Some local authorities stated that although they do not calculate the KPI, they do comply with the minimum workstation size requirements.
- For some local authorities, the KPI is only calculated for some of their office buildings.

Some of the local authorities not complying with this recommendation said it was due to a lack of resources. The others did not provide a reason.

Recommendation No. 5C

Local authorities should use internationally recognised KPIs, as outlined in Appendix 1 of VFM Report No.30, such as sqm per workstation and sqm per full time equivalents (FTE) in order to compare their own office buildings and to other local authorities, so that the reasons for any outlying figures can be investigated and rectified. The figures should be kept up to date.

Progress on implementation of recommendation

Four (13%) local authorities fully complied with this recommendation, eight (26%) partially complied and nineteen (61%) did not comply with this recommendation.

The main reasons for partial compliance were:

- Some local authorities do not calculate the KPIs, but have part of the information to do so.
- Some local authorities calculate some KPIs.

Many of the local authorities cited lack of resources as the reason for non compliance. The others did not provide a reason.

Recommendation No. 5D

Local authorities should calculate and monitor workstations per FTE and have a documented plan in place for excess workstations.

Progress on implementation of recommendation

Only two (7%) local authorities fully complied with this recommendation, ten (32%) partially complied and nineteen (61%) did not comply with this recommendation.

The main reasons for partial compliance were:

- Some local authorities stated that although they do not calculate KPIs, regular space surveys are carried out.
- Some local authorities have no KPIs calculated, but part of the information required is available.

Some of the reasons for non compliance were:

- Some local authorities stated that they have no excess workstations.
- Some local authorities gave lack of resources as the reason for non compliance.
- Others did not provide a reason.

Section Two: Corporate Estate Strategic Management

Recommendation No. 6

All local authorities should have a Property Asset Management Plan (PAMP) in place for their building portfolio. This is a documented strategy for corporate estate management to include, for example, objectives and priorities, a profile and review of current property assets and their suitability, the level of data held on the property portfolio, explanation of maintenance practices, assessments of condition and roles and responsibilities for staff involved in property management.

Progress on implementation of recommendation

None of the local authorities fully complied with recommendation No. 6. Of the remaining authorities six (19%) partially complied, and twenty five (81%) did not comply.

Most local authorities do not have a PAMP in place for their building portfolio, some saying lack of resources is the reason. For the partially compliant local authorities, work on the PAMP is at early work in progress stage.

Recommendation No. 7A

All local authorities should have staff assigned to building asset management at a strategic level, overseeing the local authority's property portfolio as a whole.

Progress on implementation of recommendation

Sixteen (52%) local authorities fully complied with this recommendation, thirteen (42%) partially complied and two (6%) did not comply with this recommendation.

The main reasons for partial compliance were:

- For some local authorities, a small percentage of senior management time is spent on building asset management at a strategic level.
- Some local authorities said they have no central unit, but they do have staff spending some percentage of their time on strategic work.
- Some local authorities have a central unit overseeing many, but not all, of their buildings.

The two non complying local authorities said that management or working groups are currently reviewing the matter.

Recommendation No. 7B

Staff involved in this area should receive appropriate training in property management.

Progress on implementation of recommendation

Five (16%) local authorities fully complied with this recommendation, ten (32%) partially complied and sixteen (52%) did not comply with this recommendation.

The majority of staff had not received training in property management.

The main reasons for partial compliance were:

- Some local authorities stated that they had some related training completed.
- For some local authorities, some of their staff have received training.
- Some local authorities had received some relevant training, but not specifically property management training.

Of the local authorities not complying, some have staff trained in other areas such as procurement but had no formal property management training. In many of the local authorities the staff are newly appointed to the role or the unit has only been recently established and training needs will be met in 2018. Most of the local authorities stated that they intend to find suitable property management training courses for staff to attend in 2018.

Recommendation No. 7C

The survey findings revealed a disjointed approach to property management in most local authorities, with different practices in place depending on the building and the person/people managing it, with no one person or unit having a complete overview of the building portfolio as a whole. Ideally local authorities should have a centralised property function, so that property management staff can manage the entire portfolio rather than individual managers in area offices each following different practices. At the very least there should be a standardised approach across the local authority as to how its individual buildings are managed and maintained.

Progress on implementation of recommendation

Eight (26%) local authorities fully complied with this recommendation, sixteen (52%) partially complied and seven (22%) did not comply with this recommendation.

The main reasons for partial compliance were:

- Some local authorities have no one central property function, but do have some centralisation.
- Some local authorities have a property unit which oversees many, but not all, of its buildings.
- Some local authorities have a property services division and a facilities management unit, with central procurement increasing.
- Some local authorities stated that the establishment of a centralised property function is currently in progress.
- Some local authorities have a centralised property unit, but no central database.

In most of the cases of non compliance, the local authorities had reviews due to start in 2018, or already in progress, to consider having a centralised property function.

Recommendation No. 8

As with vacant office space, there should be a documented plan in place for all types of vacant local authority buildings, outlining how the space/buildings are going to be used or if they will be sold or leased. Buildings should remain vacant for as minimum a time as possible, unless there is a valid reason, for example, renovation work is taking place.

Progress on implementation of recommendation

Only two (6%) local authorities fully complied with this recommendation. Thirteen (42%) local authorities partially complied. Sixteen (52%) local authorities did not comply with this recommendation.

The main reasons for partial compliance were:

- Some local authorities stated that they have an informal plan, knowledge of their vacant buildings.
- Some local authorities had no formal plan, but informal procedures were evident.

Some of the local authorities not complying with the recommendation said that the reason they have no documented plan is that they currently have no vacant buildings.

Recommendation No. 9

There should be regular property reviews and management meetings to discuss property related issues and portfolio rationalisation.

Progress on implementation of recommendation

Seventeen (55%) local authorities fully complied with the recommendation, eleven (35%) partially complied and three (10%) did not comply with this recommendation.

The main reasons for partial compliance were:

- Some local authorities have informal meetings/discussions.
- Some local authorities discuss property matters at some of their general senior management meetings.
- For some local authorities there were informal reviews and an external review in progress.

Of the three local authorities not complying, one has reviews on a needs/individual case basis, another reviews property annually as part of the budget process and the other intends to introduce regular reviews.

Recommendation No. 10

For property purchases, local authorities should have documented procedures in place and these should take account of the State Property Register and DPER Circular 11/15: "Protocols for the Transfer and Sharing of State Property Assets".

Progress on implementation of recommendation

Nine (29%) local authorities fully complied with the recommendation, fourteen (45%) partially complied and eight (26%) did not comply with this recommendation.

The main reasons for partial compliance were:

- Some local authorities do not have documented procedures, but do follow the circular.
- For some local authorities, property purchase procedures are not documented, but rigorous protocols are in place.
- Some local authorities have documented procedures, but they need to be updated.

The non compliant local authorities are aware of the circular. Some stated that they have not had property purchases in recent years so do not have documented procedures. Some intend to document their property purchases procedures in the near future.

Recommendation No. 11

Local authorities should have their own documented procedures in place for property disposals, incorporating the procedures set out in Section 183 of the Local Government Act, 2001.

Progress on implementation of recommendation

The follow-up study shows nineteen (61%) authorities complied in full and the remaining twelve (39%) local authorities partially complied with this recommendation.

All of the partially compliant local authorities stated that they comply with Section 183, but do not have their own disposal procedures formally documented.

Section Three: Recording the Corporate Estate

Recommendation No. 12

All local authorities should prepare and maintain a database of their property portfolio in order to ensure all the buildings they own are monitored as to how they are being used. This could be an extension of, or use the information already held on, their existing fixed asset or property interest registers and should include information for each building such as gross and net internal area (sqm), number of FTE, number of workstations, current building status/use. Much of the information requested in Appendix 1 of the survey for VFM Report No. 30 could be incorporated into this database. This database should be regularly updated.

Progress on implementation of recommendation

Four (13%) local authorities fully complied with this recommendation, twenty two (71%) partially complied and five (16%) did not comply with this recommendation.

All of the partially compliant local authorities stated that they have registers or databases with some of the information on them.

All of the non compliant local authorities stated that work on a property database is planned for the future. Some had working groups or property management staff already looking at the matter. Some pointed out that it could be a lengthy process.

Recommendation No. 13

All local authority buildings should have a unique cost code or identifier, thereby ensuring costs associated with individual buildings, such as maintenance, utility costs, cleaning, security, etc could be monitored on an individual basis. The information could be used in property management decisions, such as whether to retain, renovate or dispose of a building. It would also highlight any unusual variances for a particular building that need to be further investigated.

Progress on implementation of recommendation

Sixteen (52%) local authorities fully complied with this recommendation, eleven (35%) partially complied and four (13%) did not comply with this recommendation.

The main reasons for partial compliance were:

- Some local authorities stated that they have unique cost codes for some of their buildings or for their main buildings only.
- Some local authorities have cost codes by department rather than by individual building.
- Some local authorities stated that costs can be separated out using operation codes.

Of the four local authorities not complying with this recommendation, management is currently reviewing the matter in one, and another plans to add a new module to their financial management system to enable this monitoring. One of the remaining two said non compliance was due to a lack of resources and the other said that it would be a very costly and time consuming task.

Recommendation No. 14A

All local authorities should maintain a register as to the whereabouts of the title deeds for all their buildings.

Progress on implementation of recommendation

Eight (26%) local authorities fully complied with this recommendation, seventeen (55%) partially complied and six (19%) did not comply with this recommendation.

The main reasons for partial compliance were:

- Some local authorities have a register, but it is incomplete.
- Some local authorities stated that although they have no register, all of their title deeds are kept in one section or they know the location/s of all of their deeds.

Of the six local authorities not complying, four were working on the recommendation or intended to incorporate it into new data recording systems. A further one said that they had insufficient staff resources and the remaining local authority did not provide a reason.

Recommendation No. 14B

Title deeds should be kept in a fireproof safe /room and copies scanned.

Progress on implementation of recommendation

Four (13%) local authorities fully complied with this recommendation, twenty one (68%) partially complied and six (19%) did not comply with this recommendation.

The main reasons for partial compliance were:

- Some local authorities have their title deeds kept in a fireproof location, but they do not have them scanned.
- Some local authorities stated that they have most of their title deeds kept in a fireproof location and some of them are scanned.
- Some local authorities stated that they have some of their title deeds kept in a fireproof location, but they do not have them scanned.

Of the local authorities who did not comply, three said that they planned to review the situation in the near future.

Section Four: Costs Associated with the Corporate Estate

Recommendation No. 15

Local authorities should review the leases that they have entered into and the number of buildings they are paying rent on, to keep these to a minimum; there may be reasons why this is not possible, such as lack of capital funding, building location requirements and flexibility for varying accommodation demands.

Progress on implementation of recommendation

Seventeen (55%) local authorities fully complied with this recommendation, six (19%) partially complied and five (16%) did not comply with this recommendation. The recommendation was not applicable for the other three (10%) local authorities as they do not lease any properties from third parties.

The main reasons for partial compliance were:

- Some local authorities have a register/listing which is currently being updated.
- Some local authorities stated that their leases have been evaluated, but they do not have a listing.

One of the non compliant local authorities stated that they only have one lease. A further two said that they only have a small number of leases. Another said that they are working towards a database.

Recommendation No. 16A

Professional advice for new leases should be obtained, ensuring that rent reviews and break clauses are built into contracts.

Progress on implementation of recommendation

A total of twenty six (84%) local authorities fully complied with this recommendation, one (3%) partially complied and one (3%) did not comply with this recommendation. The recommendation was not applicable for the other three (10%) local authorities as they do not lease any properties from third parties.

Recommendation No. 16B

Leases should be reviewed periodically to negotiate rent reductions if the lease structure and market conditions allow.

Progress on implementation of recommendation

Sixteen (51%) local authorities fully complied with this recommendation, eight (26%) partially complied and four (13%) did not comply with this recommendation. The recommendation was not applicable for the other three (10%) local authorities as they do not lease any properties from third parties.

Some of the partially compliant local authorities stated that they carry out a review at the end of the lease term.

The reason cited by two of the non compliant local authorities was that they only have a few leases, all of which are short term with no rent review option on them. A further local authority stated that their leases were not material enough to review or negotiate rent on. The other did not provide a reason.

Recommendation No. 17A

Local authorities should regularly monitor the costs associated with their individual buildings, such as maintenance, cleaning, security, insurance costs, etc.

Progress on implementation of recommendation

The follow-up study shows seventeen (55%) authorities complied in full and the remaining fourteen (45%) local authorities partially complied with this recommendation.

The main reasons for partial compliance were:

- Some local authorities carry out some monitoring.
- For some local authorities costs are monitored for some of their buildings or for their main buildings only.
- For some local authorities costs are monitored by department rather than individual building.

Recommendation No. 17B

They should use collaborative procurement across all buildings to achieve better prices.

Progress on implementation of recommendation

Twelve (39%) local authorities fully complied with this recommendation, thirteen (42%) partially complied and six (19%) did not comply with this recommendation.

The partially compliant local authorities stated that there was some collaborative procurement.

For two of the non compliant local authorities, the buildings are managed on a decentralised approach or have a wide geographical spread. A further one stated that procurement is currently undertaken on a building or section basis. One local authority cited lack of resources as the reason collaborative procurement is not used. Another local authority has a newly formed procurement section that plans to look at the matter. The other non compliant local authority did not provide a reason.

Recommendation No. 17C

Local authorities should also monitor utility costs and usage for electricity, gas, water and oil by individual building to highlight anything unusual.

Progress on implementation of recommendation

Eighteen (58%) local authorities fully complied with this recommendation, twelve (39%) partially complied and one (3%) did not comply with this recommendation.

The main reasons for partial compliance were:

- Some local authorities carry out some monitoring.
- For some local authorities utility costs are monitored for some of their buildings or for their main buildings only.

The reason cited by the non compliant local authority was a lack of staff resources.

Section Five: Condition and Required Maintenance of the Corporate Estate

Recommendation No. 18

Local authorities, after thorough assessment, should have a programme of planned maintenance in place for their entire building portfolio; a move to more planned maintenance will lead to less reactive maintenance, thereby reducing emergency repairs and higher costs. In the longer term this will save the local authority time, inconvenience and money. The programme of planned maintenance should categorise the required maintenance work into urgent, essential (required within 2 years) and desirable works (required between 3 and 5 years).

Progress on recommendation implementation

Only one (3%) local authority fully complied with this recommendation, twenty two (71%) partially complied and eight (26%) did not comply with this recommendation.

The main reasons for partial compliance were:

- Some local authorities have a programme of planned maintenance for some of their buildings or for their main buildings only.
- For some local authorities a programme of planned maintenance is currently being completed.
- Some local authorities have a programme of planned maintenance for the year ahead only.

One of the non compliant local authorities noted that although they have no programme of planned maintenance, they do have several planned maintenance contracts in place. Two others stated that buildings are analysed at budget time or that individual facilities managers look after the maintenance of their own buildings rather than there being one formal programme of planned maintenance for all buildings. Two of the local authorities cited lack of resources as the reason why they do not have a programme of planned maintenance in place and two local authorities did not provide reasons. One local authority said that the issue will be looked at when developing a PAMP.

Recommendation No. 19

Local authorities should ensure that regular building condition surveys are carried out for their property portfolio by suitably qualified staff, such as engineers or architects at regular intervals. These surveys /inspections would highlight areas of required maintenance as well as directing /supporting property managers in longer term decisions, for example, whether individual buildings in poorer condition should be upgraded or disposed of.

Progress on implementation of recommendation

Seven (23%) local authorities fully complied with this recommendation, thirteen (42%) partially complied and eleven (35%) did not comply with this recommendation.

The main reasons for partial compliance were:

- Some local authorities stated that they carry out ongoing, informal building surveys which are not documented.
- Some local authorities carry out building condition surveys for some of their buildings or for their main buildings only.

The main reasons given for non compliance with the recommendation were a lack of resources and that ad hoc, reactive surveys only are carried out. Many of the non compliant local authorities have plans to address the matter going forward.

Recommendation No. 20A

Local authorities should properly log and track maintenance and repair requests.

Progress on implementation of recommendation

Eight (26%) local authorities fully complied with this recommendation, thirteen (42%) partially complied and ten (32%) did not comply with this recommendation.

The main reasons for partial compliance were:

- For some local authorities repair requests are logged and tracked for some of their buildings or for their main buildings only.
- Some local authorities stated that repair requests are emailed and logged, but they are not tracked.
- Some local authorities stated that repair requests are emailed and noted, but that there is no formal log.

Many of the non compliant local authorities use email as a means of communicating repair requests. Some intend to bring in a tracking system, depending on available resources.

Recommendation No. 20B

Local authorities should have a documented protocol in place for response times depending on the nature/ urgency of the request and a system /criteria in place for prioritising maintenance and repairs.

Progress on implementation of recommendation

Only two (6%) local authorities complied in full, thirteen (42%) partially complied and the remaining 16 (52%) local authorities did not comply.

The majority of the partially compliant local authorities stated that they have an informal protocol which is not documented. Some partially compliant local authorities rank the urgency of repair requests for their main buildings only.

The majority of the non compliant local authorities intend developing a protocol for response times.

Recommendation No. 21A

All local authorities should have staff assigned to building asset management at an operational level.

Progress on implementation of recommendation

A total of twenty two (71%) local authorities fully complied with this recommendation, seven (23%) partially complied and two (6%) did not comply with this recommendation.

The main reasons for partial compliance were:

- Some local authorities have staff assigned to building asset management at an operational level for main buildings only.

- Some local authorities do not have just one facilities management unit for all of their buildings. Some buildings are managed separately or locally.

One of the non compliant local authorities said that they would consider the matter as resources became available. The other non compliant local authority said that they do not have staff assigned on an overall asset management level, but they do have staff assigned on a budget holder level.

Recommendation No. 21B

Relevant staff should receive appropriate training in property maintenance and management.

Progress on implementation of recommendation

Five (16%) local authorities fully complied with this recommendation, twelve (39%) partially complied and fourteen (45%) did not comply with this recommendation.

The main reasons for partial compliance were:

- Some relevant training courses have been attended.
- Some local authorities stated that although relevant staff have not attended property maintenance and management training courses, they have relevant qualifications and experience.

The main reasons for non compliance were that staff have property management or maintenance experience, and training in other areas but not specifically formal property management or maintenance training.

Recommendation No. 21C

The local authorities should have a dedicated staff member/unit overseeing the facilities management and maintenance function, so that there is a standardised, co-ordinated approach to the operational running and maintenance of the entire building portfolio, rather than individual facilities management staff in area offices/buildings following different practices.

Progress on implementation of recommendation

Twelve (39%) local authorities fully complied with this recommendation, twelve (39%) partially complied and seven (22%) did not comply with this recommendation.

The main reasons for partial compliance were:

- Some local authorities have a dedicated unit, with a standardised approach for their main buildings or most of their buildings.
- Some local authorities have a dedicated unit, who spend much of their time on this work.
- Some local authorities stated that they have a new role set up/in progress to work towards achieving a standardised approach.

Two of the non compliant local authorities said they were currently reviewing this recommendation and a further one stated that they would review it when resources became

available. Two local authorities considered the recommendation inappropriate for them, one due to the small scale of their building portfolio and the other as various directorates are responsible for different elements of the property portfolio. The other two local authorities did not provide a reason.

Recommendation No. 22A

Local authorities should monitor their maintenance spend by individual building for corporate offices and other buildings.

Progress on implementation of recommendation

Sixteen (52%) local authorities fully complied with this recommendation, thirteen (42%) partially complied and two (6%) did not comply with this recommendation.

The main reasons for partial compliance were:

- Some local authorities monitor maintenance spend as part of the budget process.
- Some local authorities monitor maintenance spend for their main buildings only.
- Some local authorities stated that maintenance spend per Agresso is reviewed periodically.
- Some local authorities stated that some maintenance monitoring is carried out, but not by individual building.

One of the non compliant local authorities is working on linking Agresso with their estate management database for reporting and monitoring purposes, expected to be completed in mid 2018. The other local authority stated that they do not monitor their maintenance spend across buildings due to the dispersed nature, use and type of building owned. Headquarter maintenance costs are monitored against budgets and overruns are examined.

Recommendation No. 22B

The split between planned and reactive maintenance should be tracked and targets set to keep reactive maintenance as low as possible.

Progress on implementation of recommendation

Only one (3%) local authority fully complied with this recommendation, seven (23%) partially complied and twenty three (74%) did not comply with this recommendation.

The main reasons for partial compliance were:

- For some local authorities maintenance is mostly fully planned and for others it is mostly fully reactive.
- Some local authorities extract the information for some of their buildings or for their main buildings only.
- Some local authorities stated that the split is monitored but it is not formally documented.

The main reason for non compliance was that, historically, local authorities have never analysed the split of maintenance costs between planned and reactive. Most of the financial management systems were not originally set up to enable this analysis, however they could be modified to do so. Most of the local authorities stated that they do have many planned annual maintenance contracts in place.

Section Six: Contract / In House Maintenance of the Corporate Estate

Recommendation No. 23

Based on the previous year's spend, local authorities should carry out an exercise to assess whether it is more economical and timely to have in house or outsourced maintenance staff; for example, compare annual spend on plumbing versus annual wage to have a plumber on the local authority payroll.

Progress on implementation of recommendation

Four (13%) local authorities fully complied with this recommendation, seven (23%) partially complied and twenty (64%) did not comply with this recommendation.

The main reasons for partial compliance were:

- Some local authorities stated that their maintenance work is mostly outsourced, and this is considered to be the most efficient maintenance solution.
- Some local authorities stated that they have a review in progress.

Some of the non compliant local authorities stated that it was not practical for them to have in house maintenance staff, due to their small scale and limited staff resources. Some local authorities stated that there would be industrial relations issues with carrying out this type of assessment.

Recommendation No. 24

Local authorities should maintain an up to date panel of contractors, in line with the appropriate procurement procedures, for maintenance work and minor repairs/refurbishments to enable them to negotiate discounted rates and to speed the repairs process up.

Progress on implementation of recommendation

A total of twenty four (77%) local authorities fully complied with this recommendation, three (10%) partially complied and four (13%) did not comply with this recommendation.

Some of the partially compliant local authorities said that they use panels for their main buildings and/or some of their other buildings.

Of the four non compliant local authorities, one stated that their panel needed to be updated and retendered. One said that they have no separate panel for maintenance of corporate buildings. Another stated that they contract work on the basis of priced documents from selected contractors, there is no open call panel. In the last local authority, they did have a list of contractors but did not provide evidence that it was in line with procurement procedures.

Exhibit 1: Number of local authorities who have implemented each recommendation from VFM Report No. 30

	Recommendations made in VFM Report No. 30	Fully Comply	Partially Comply	Non Comply	Not Applicable
1	Local authorities should evaluate their space allocation to ensure maximum utilisation of existing space and assess whether or not a move towards more open plan office space would be beneficial and result in cost savings. It should not be presumed that staff of a certain grade or above must have their own cellular/walled office of a minimum size. It is appreciated that protected structures will restrict how the internal layout can be changed. Also, depending on the current design/layout of the building, especially for older buildings, changing the internal layout may be very costly and disruptive; however, if it makes considerable space savings in the long term and reductions in utility and overhead costs then it is worthwhile. The extra space could be used to rehouse staff from other offices, freeing up office buildings which could then be disposed of or rented out, for example.	7	22	2	
2	Local authorities should review how they store records/paper documents and consider alternatives, such as increased use of offsite storage or a software based paperless approach to see if these options are practical and would result in cost savings.	14	14	3	
3	Local authorities should consider desk sharing, for example, for work sharing staff. They should consider having hot desks, for example, in the case of staff who spend most of their time outdoors or for staff who frequently spend time in more than one office location.	13	13	5	
4	For vacant office space, there should be a documented plan in place as to how the space will be used. Office space should remain vacant for as minimum a time as possible.	5	11	15	
5A	Local authorities should have a record of the floor area in sqm (gross and net internal areas) for each of their office buildings held on a property portfolio database.	5	19	7	
5B	Local authorities should record average sqm/workstation in their office buildings.	2	11	18	
5C	Local authorities should use internationally recognised key performance indicators, as outlined in Appendix 1, such as sqm per workstation and sqm per full time equivalents (FTE) in order to compare their own office buildings and to other local authorities, so that the reasons for any outlying figures can be investigated and rectified. The figures should be kept up to date.	4	8	19	
5D	Local authorities should calculate and monitor workstations per FTE and have a documented plan in place for excess workstations.	2	10	19	

	Recommendations made in VFM Report No. 30	Fully Comply	Partially Comply	Non Comply	Not Applicable
6	All local authorities should have a Property Asset Management Plan in place for their building portfolio. This is a documented strategy for corporate estate management to include, for example, objectives and priorities, a profile and review of current property assets and their suitability, the level of data held on the property portfolio, explanation of maintenance practices, assessments of condition and roles and responsibilities for staff involved in property management.	0	6	25	
7A	All local authorities should have staff assigned to building asset management at a strategic level, overseeing the local authority's property portfolio as a whole.	16	13	2	
7B	Staff involved in this area should receive appropriate training in property management.	5	10	16	
7C	The survey findings revealed a disjointed approach to property management in most local authorities, with different practices in place depending on the building and the person/people managing it, with no one person or unit having a complete overview of the building portfolio as a whole. Ideally local authorities should have a centralised property function, so that property management staff can manage the entire portfolio rather than individual managers in area offices each following different practices. At the very least there should be a standardised approach across the local authority as to how its individual buildings are managed and maintained.	8	16	7	
8	As with vacant office space, there should be a documented plan in place for all types of vacant local authority buildings, outlining how the space/buildings are going to be used or if they will be sold or leased. Buildings should remain vacant for as minimum a time as possible, unless there is a valid reason, for example, renovation work is taking place.	2	13	16	
9	There should be regular property reviews and management meetings to discuss property related issues and portfolio rationalisation.	17	11	3	
10	For property purchases, local authorities should have documented procedures in place and these should take account of the State Property Register and DPER Circular 11/15: "Protocols for the Transfer and Sharing of State Property Assets".	9	14	8	
11	Local authorities should have their own documented procedures in place for property disposals, incorporating the procedures set out in Section 183 of the Local Government Act, 2001.	19	12	0	
12	All local authorities should prepare and maintain a database of their property portfolio in order to ensure all the buildings they own are monitored as to how they are being used. This could be an extension of, or use the information	4	22	5	

	Recommendations made in VFM Report No. 30	Fully Comply	Partially Comply	Non Comply	Not Applicable
	already held on, their existing fixed asset or property interest registers and should include information for each building such as Gross and Net Internal Area (sqm), number of FTE, number of workstations, current building status/use. Much of the information requested in Appendix 1 of the survey for VFM Report No. 30 could be incorporated into this database. This database should be regularly updated.				
13	All local authority buildings should have a unique cost code or identifier, thereby ensuring costs associated with individual buildings, such as maintenance, utility costs, cleaning, security, etc could be monitored on an individual basis. The information could be used in property management decisions, such as whether to retain, renovate or dispose of a building. It would also highlight any unusual variances for a particular building that need to be further investigated.	16	11	4	
14A	All local authorities should maintain a register as to the whereabouts of the title deeds for all their buildings.	8	17	6	
14B	Title deeds should be kept in a fireproof safe /room and copies scanned.	4	21	6	
15	Local authorities should review the leases that they have entered into and the number of buildings they are paying rent on, to keep these to a minimum; there may be reasons why this is not possible, such as lack of capital funding, building location requirements and flexibility for varying accommodation demands.	17	6	5	3
16A	Professional advice for new leases should be obtained, ensuring that rent reviews and break clauses are built into contracts.	26	1	1	3
16B	Leases should be reviewed periodically to negotiate rent reductions if the lease structure and market conditions allow.	16	8	4	3
17A	Local authorities should regularly monitor the costs associated with their individual buildings, such as maintenance, cleaning, security, insurance costs, etc.	17	14	0	
17B	They should use collaborative procurement across all buildings to achieve better prices.	12	13	6	
17C	Local authorities should also monitor utility costs and usage for electricity, gas, water and oil by individual building to highlight anything unusual.	18	12	1	
18	Local authorities, after thorough assessment, should have a programme of planned maintenance in place for their entire building portfolio; a move to more planned maintenance will lead to less reactive maintenance, thereby reducing emergency repairs and higher costs. In the longer term this will save the local authority time, inconvenience and money. The programme of planned maintenance should categorise the required maintenance work into urgent,	1	22	8	

	Recommendations made in VFM Report No. 30	Fully Comply	Partially Comply	Non Comply	Not Applicable
	essential (required within 2 years) and desirable works (required between 3 and 5 years).				
19	Local authorities should ensure that regular building condition surveys are carried out for their property portfolio by suitably qualified staff, such as engineers or architects at regular intervals. These surveys /inspections would highlight areas of required maintenance as well as directing /supporting property managers in longer term decisions, for example, whether individual buildings in poorer condition should be upgraded or disposed of.	7	13	11	
20A	Local authorities should properly log and track maintenance and repair requests.	8	13	10	
20B	Local authorities should have a documented protocol in place for response times depending on the nature/ urgency of the request and a system /criteria in place for prioritising maintenance and repairs.	2	13	16	
21A	All local authorities should have staff assigned to building asset management at an operational level.	22	7	2	
21B	Relevant staff should receive appropriate training in property maintenance and management.	5	12	14	
21C	The local authorities should have a dedicated staff member /unit overseeing the facilities management and maintenance function, so that there is a standardised, co-ordinated approach to the operational running and maintenance of the entire building portfolio, rather than individual facilities management staff in area offices/buildings following different practices.	12	12	7	
22A	Local authorities should monitor their maintenance spend by individual building for corporate offices and other buildings.	16	13	2	
22B	The split between planned and reactive maintenance should be tracked and targets set to keep reactive maintenance as low as possible.	1	7	23	
23	Based on the previous year's spend, local authorities should carry out an exercise to assess whether it is more economical and timely to have in house or outsourced maintenance staff; for example, compare annual spend on plumbing versus annual wage to have a plumber on the local authority payroll.	4	7	20	
24	Local authorities should maintain an up to date panel of contractors, in line with the appropriate procurement procedures, for maintenance work and minor repairs/refurbishments to enable them to negotiate discounted rates and to speed the repairs process up.	24	3	4	
Over all		32%	39%	28%	1%

Exhibit 2: Implementation of recommendations as shown by each local authority

Local Authority	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5A	Q5B	Q5C	Q5D	Q6	Q7A	Q7B	Q7C	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14A	Q14B	Q15	Q16A	Q16B	Q17A	Q17B	Q17C	Q18	Q19	Q20A	Q20B	Q21A	Q21B	Q21C	Q22A	Q22B	Q23	Q24		
Carlow County Council	N	P	Y	N	P	P	N	N	N	P	N	Y	N	P	P	Y	P	Y	P	N	n/a	n/a	n/a	Y	P	Y	N	P	P	P	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	
Cavan County Council	P	P	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	P	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	P	N	Y	Y	n/a	n/a	n/a	P	P	P	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	P	N	N	Y
Clare County Council	P	P	P	P	N	P	N	N	N	P	P	N	P	N	P	Y	N	Y	P	P	P	Y	Y	Y	P	Y	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	Y	P	Y	P	N	Y
Cork City Council	P	P	Y	N	P	P	N	N	N	Y	N	P	P	P	P	Y	P	N	Y	P	P	Y	Y	Y	P	Y	P	P	N	N	N	Y	N	P	N	N	N	P	
Cork County Council	P	Y	N	P	P	N	N	N	N	P	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	P	N	P	N	Y	Y	Y	P	N	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	N	P	N	N	P		
DL Rathdown County Council	P	Y	N	N	P	P	P	P	N	P	N	N	N	P	Y	Y	P	P	P	N	N	Y	P	P	P	Y	P	P	P	P	P	N	N	P	N	N	N	Y	
Donegal County Council	P	Y	Y	P	Y	P	P	P	P	P	P	Y	Y	Y	P	Y	Y	P	Y	P	Y	P	P	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	P	P	Y	Y	Y	Y	P	P	Y	
Dublin City Council	P	Y	P	P	P	P	P	N	P	P	P	P	P	Y	Y	P	P	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	Y		
Fingal County Council	Y	P	Y	P	P	N	N	P	N	P	P	P	N	Y	P	Y	P	P	P	P	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	P	P	P	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	
Galway City Council	P	N	N	N	P	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	P	Y	Y	Y	P	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	P	Y	Y	P	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	
Galway County Council	P	P	P	Y	N	Y	N	N	P	P	P	P	Y	N	Y	P	P	Y	P	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	P	P	P	P	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	P		
Kerry County Council	Y	Y	P	N	P	N	P	P	N	P	P	P	N	Y	P	Y	P	Y	P	P	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	P	P	Y	P	Y	Y	Y	Y	P	N	Y		
Kildare County Council	Y	N	Y	N	P	Y	Y	Y	P	Y	Y	N	P	P	P	P	P	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	P	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	P	Y	
Kilkenny County Council	P	P	P	N	P	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	P	P	P	Y	P	P	P	Y	P	P	P	Y	P	N	P	P	Y	N	Y	P	N	N	Y		
Laois County Council	P	P	P	N	N	N	N	N	N	P	P	P	P	P	N	Y	P	Y	P	N	Y	Y	Y	P	N	Y	P	P	N	N	Y	N	Y	P	P	N	P	Y	
Leitrim County Council	P	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	P	N	P	N	P	N	Y	P	P	N	P	N	Y	Y	P	N	P	N	N	N	N	Y	P	Y	Y	N	N	Y		
Limerick City and County Council	P	Y	P	Y	P	N	N	P	N	P	N	P	Y	Y	Y	P	P	P	N	Y	Y	Y	P	P	P	N	N	P	N	P	N	P	N	P	N	N	Y		
Longford County Council	N	Y	P	Y	P	P	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	P	P	P	Y	N	P	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	P	N	Y	P	Y	N	P	Y	N	N	Y		
Louth County Council	P	P	P	N	P	N	N	N	P	Y	N	Y	N	Y	P	P	P	P	P	P	N	Y	P	Y	Y	Y	P	Y	P	N	Y	N	Y	P	P	Y	Y		
Mayo County Council	P	P	P	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	P	N	P	P	P	N	N	P	P	P	Y	Y	Y	P	P	N	P	N	N	Y	N	N	P	N	N	Y		
Meath County Council	Y	Y	P	P	P	N	N	P	N	Y	N	P	P	P	N	Y	N	Y	P	P	Y	P	P	P	P	Y	P	P	Y	P	Y	P	P	P	N	P	Y		
Monaghan County Council	P	Y	Y	Y	P	N	P	N	P	Y	P	P	Y	Y	Y	P	P	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	P	P	P	Y	P	P	N	P	Y	N	Y	Y	P	N	N	Y	
Offaly County Council	Y	Y	P	N	N	N	P	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	P	P	Y	N	P	N	N	P	Y	P	Y	P	Y	Y	P	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	P	N	
Roscommon County Council	P	Y	Y	N	Y	P	N	N	N	Y	Y	P	N	Y	P	Y	Y	Y	Y	P	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	P	N	P	N	Y	N	N	Y	P	P	Y		
Sligo County Council	P	N	P	P	P	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	P	P	Y	P	P	P	P	P	P	Y	Y	Y	P	P	N	P	P	N	N	P	P	P	N	N	N	N		
South Dublin County Council	Y	P	Y	Y	P	P	P	P	P	Y	Y	P	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	P	n/a	n/a	n/a	Y	Y	Y	P	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	P	N	Y	Y		
Tipperary County Council	P	P	Y	P	P	N	N	N	P	Y	P	P	P	P	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	P	P	P	P	N	N	N	N	N	P	N	P	Y	N	N	N	
Waterford City & County Council	P	P	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	P	P	N	Y	N	P	N	P	P	P	P	Y	Y	P	N	P	N	N	N	N	Y	P	P	P	N	N	N		
Westmeath County Council	Y	Y	Y	P	N	P	N	P	N	N	N	N	Y	N	P	P	P	P	N	P	Y	Y	N	P	P	P	N	P	N	P	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	
Wexford County Council	P	P	Y	P	N	N	N	P	N	Y	N	Y	P	Y	P	P	P	Y	N	P	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	P	P	Y	P	P	Y	P	Y	Y	P	N	Y		
Wicklow County Council	P	Y	Y	Y	P	P	P	N	N	N	N	N	P	P	P	Y	N	P	P	P	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y		
NUMBER OF LOCAL AUTHORITIES:																																							
Fully Comply (Y)	7	14	13	5	5	2	4	2	0	16	5	8	2	17	9	19	4	16	8	4	17	26	16	17	12	18	1	7	8	2	22	5	12	16	1	4	24		
Partially Comply (P)	22	14	13	11	19	11	8	10	6	13	10	16	13	11	14	12	22	11	17	21	6	1	8	14	13	12	22	13	13	13	7	12	12	13	7	7	3		
Non Comply (N)	2	3	5	15	7	18	19	19	25	2	16	7	16	3	8	0	5	4	6	6	5	1	4	0	6	1	8	11	10	16	2	14	7	2	23	20	4		
Not Applicable (n/a)																					3	3	3																
	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31		
PERCENTAGES %:																																							
Fully Comply (Y)	23	45	42	16	16	6	13	7	0	52	16	26	6	55	29	61	13	52	26	13	55	84	51	55	39	58	3	23	26	6	71	16	39	52	3	13	77		
Partially Comply (P)	71	45	42	36	61	36	26	32	19	42	32	52	42	35	45	39	71	35	55	68	19	3	26	45	42	39	71	42	42	42	23	39	39	42	23	23	10		
Non Comply (N)	6	10	16	48	23	58	61	61	81	6	52	22	52	10	26	0	16	13	19	19	16	3	13	0	19	3	26	35	32	52	6	45	22	6	74	64	13		
Not Applicable (n/a)																					10	10	10																
	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	

Exhibit 3: Summary of Compliance by City and County Councils with Recommendations

Name of Local Authority	Full Compliance %	Partial Compliance %	Non Compliance %	Not Applicable %
Carlow County Council	33	32	27	8
Cavan County Council	16	22	54	8
Clare County Council	22	57	21	
Cork City Council	22	43	35	
Cork County Council	16	43	41	
DL Rathdown County Council	16	49	35	
Donegal County Council	54	46	0	
Dublin City Council	35	62	3	
Fingal County Council	38	43	19	
Galway City Council	60	16	24	
Galway County Council	32	46	22	
Kerry County Council	41	43	16	
Kildare County Council	65	27	8	
Kilkenny County Council	24	46	30	
Laois County Council	22	46	32	
Leitrim County Council	24	27	49	
Limerick City and County Council	24	46	30	
Longford County Council	46	27	27	
Louth County Council	33	43	24	
Mayo County Council	19	38	43	
Meath County Council	27	54	19	
Monaghan County Council	41	43	16	
Offaly County Council	35	30	35	
Roscommon County Council	49	24	27	
Sligo County Council	16	54	30	
South Dublin County Council	54	30	8	8
Tipperary County Council	24	41	35	
Waterford City & County Council	16	38	46	
Westmeath County Council	27	32	41	
Wexford County Council	41	40	19	
Wicklow County Council	24	27	49	
Average Rates of Compliance	32	39	28	1

Conclusion

The Value for Money Unit of the Local Government Audit Service published VFM Report No. 30 (Corporate Estate Management and Maintenance in Local Authorities) in January 2017. The purpose of this report is to assess the progress made by the 31 city and county councils in implementing the recommendations contained in the report.

Overall the recommendations have been 32% fully implemented and an additional 39% of the recommendations were partially implemented. Recommendations were not implemented in 28% of cases and were not applicable in 1% of cases. This means that 71% of the recommendations of VFM Report No. 30 were either fully or partially implemented at the date of the review. It is important to emphasise that the review was carried out in late 2017 and early 2018.

There was a high rate of partial compliance for the recommendations to evaluate space allocation, to prepare and maintain a comprehensive database of their full property portfolios, to record floor areas of all their office buildings and to maintain a register as to the whereabouts of their building title deeds. There was also high partial compliance for the recommendation that they should have a programme of planned maintenance in place for their building portfolio. Overall the reasons for partial compliance in these areas was that the local authorities had some of the data recorded and were working towards populating their databases further but that it was still a work in progress and would take time dependent on availability of resources. For evaluations of space allocation and programmes of planned maintenance, these were being carried out informally, not detailed enough and not being fully documented. These areas should be strengthened by local authorities to give relevant central management a full and comprehensive knowledge/record of the entire building portfolio.

There was a high rate of non compliance for the recommendations to calculate property key performance indicators for office buildings, having a documented protocol in place for response times to maintenance and repair requests, tracking the split between planned and reactive maintenance and setting targets to keep reactive maintenance as low as possible. There was also high non compliance with the recommendation to have a Property Asset Management Plan in place for their building portfolio. This is an important documented strategy for corporate estate management and would give local authorities a formal record of their property objectives, priorities and property management and maintenance practices. The property KPIs are used internationally and would enable local authorities to compare against their own office buildings and to other local authorities and to investigate outlying figures. Local authorities need to sufficiently monitor the condition of their buildings and their maintenance spend, having a greater focus on preventative maintenance.

Effective management of their property portfolios require local authorities to take a more informed, coordinated and strategic approach to property management, maintenance and decision making. Following and further implementing the recommendations contained in VFM Report No. 30 will enable them to do this.

housing.gov.ie

