

## Board of Management Audit & Assurance Committee

<b>Date of Meeting</b>	<b>Tuesday 23 May 2023</b>
<b>Paper No.</b>	<b>AAC4-E</b>
<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>5.2.3</b>
<b>Subject of Paper</b>	<b>Internal Audit Report – Planned Maintenance</b>
<b>FOISA Status</b>	<b>Disclosable</b>
<b>Primary Contact</b>	<b>Henderson Loggie</b>
<b>Date of production</b>	<b>28 April 2023</b>
<b>Action</b>	<b>For Discussion and Decision</b>

### 1. Recommendations

The Committee is asked to consider and discuss the report and the management responses to the internal audit recommendations.

## 2. Purpose of report

The purpose of this review is to provide management and the Audit and Assurance Committee with assurance on key controls relating to the curriculum and financial plans in place for City of Glasgow College and their alignment with the regional plan for Glasgow and the college student number targets.

## 3. Key Insights

This internal audit of Planned Maintenance provides an outline of the objectives, scope, findings and graded recommendations as appropriate, together with management responses. This constitutes an action plan for improvement.

The Report includes a number of audit findings which are assessed and graded to denote the overall level of assurance that can be taken from the Report. The gradings are defined as follows:

Good	System meets control objectives.
Satisfactory	System meets control objectives with some weaknesses present.
Requires improvement	System has weaknesses that could prevent it achieving control objectives.
Unacceptable	System cannot meet control objectives.

## 4. Impact and implications

Refer to internal audit report.

LEVEL OF ASSURANCE

Good

# City of Glasgow College

## Planned Maintenance

Internal Audit report No: 2023/03

Draft issued: 18 April 2023

Final issued: 28 April 2023



# Contents

		<b>Page</b>
<b>Section 1</b>	<b>Management Summary</b>	
	• Overall Level of Assurance	1
	• Risk Assessment	1
	• Background	1 - 2
	• Scope, Objectives and Overall Findings	2
	• Audit Approach	2
	• Summary of Main Findings	3
	• Acknowledgements	3
<b>Section 2</b>	<b>Main Findings and Action Plan</b>	<b>4 - 9</b>
<b>Appendix I</b>	<b>Internal Audit Report 2017/09 – Planned Maintenance, Areas For Improvement Relating to GLQ Areas of Responsibility</b>	<b>10 - 13</b>

## Level of Assurance

In addition to the grading of individual recommendations in the action plan, audit findings are assessed and graded on an overall basis to denote the level of assurance that can be taken from the report. Risk and materiality levels are considered in the assessment and grading process as well as the general quality of the procedures in place.

Gradings are defined as follows:

<b>Good</b>	System meets control objectives.
<b>Satisfactory</b>	System meets control objectives with some weaknesses present.
<b>Requires improvement</b>	System has weaknesses that could prevent it achieving control objectives.
<b>Unacceptable</b>	System cannot meet control objectives.

## Action Grades

<b>Priority 1</b>	Issue subjecting the organisation to material risk and which requires to be brought to the attention of management and the Audit and Assurance Committee.
<b>Priority 2</b>	Issue subjecting the organisation to significant risk and which should be addressed by management.
<b>Priority 3</b>	Matters subjecting the organisation to minor risk or which, if addressed, will enhance efficiency and effectiveness.



# Management Summary

## Overall Level of Assurance

<b>Good</b>	System meets control objectives.
-------------	----------------------------------

## Risk Assessment

This review focused on the controls in place to mitigate the following risks on the City of Glasgow College ('the College') Strategic Risk Register as at March 2023:

- Failure to achieve improved performance (net risk score: 10);
- Negative impact of statutory compliance failure (net risk score: 10); and
- Failure of Business Continuity (net risk score: 12).

## Background

As part of the Internal Audit programme at the College for 2022/23 we carried out a review of the planned preventative maintenance (PPM) framework in place over the College's assets. The Audit Needs Assessment, agreed with management and the Audit and Assurance Committee in March 2022, identified this as an area where risk can arise and where Internal Audit can assist in providing assurances to the Board of Management and the Principal that the related control environment is operating effectively, ensuring risk is maintained at an acceptable level.

The College's new campuses were funded through a Non-Profit Distributing (NPD) arrangement, whereby a private consortium, Glasgow Learning Quarter (GLQ), designed, built and will maintain the campuses over a 25-year period. The College will make unitary charge payments to the consortium over this period. Under the contract GLQ is responsible for Hard Facilities Management (FM) services such as building and fabric maintenance (both planned and reactive). Responsibility for Soft FM, such as cleaning and grounds maintenance, is split between the College and GLQ.

Ensuring there is an appropriate level of PPM is important to ensure that whole lifecycle costs of the College's estate are minimised, as well as ensuring that statutory maintenance requirements are met.

There is a Project Agreement between the College and GLQ, which sets out the responsibilities of both the College and GLQ regarding PPM. The Project Agreement includes a number of Performance Standards, some of which are relevant to PPM. As part of the Project Agreement there is also a schedule of all items that need to be maintained and the frequency of their maintenance.



## Planned Maintenance

### Background (continued)

GLQ has sub-contracted some aspects of its contract with the College to a single main contractor, FES FM. FES FM utilises an asset management system, Maximo, to record the required PPM, and PPM jobs are assigned to engineers for completion each month. The College's Estates team is involved in monitoring completion of PPM jobs by FES FM (or other external contractors).

### Scope, Objectives and Overall Findings

This audit reviewed the arrangements in place to monitor the performance of GLQ against the terms of the contract in relation to PPM.

The table below notes the objective for this review and records the results:

Objective	Findings			
	1	2	3	
<b>The objective of the audit was to determine whether:</b>				
	<b>No. of Agreed Actions</b>			
1 Appropriate controls have been put in place to ensure that GLQ is carrying out the agreed planned maintenance programme.	<b>Good</b>	-	-	2
<b>Overall Level of Assurance</b>	<b>Good</b>	-	-	<b>2</b>
		System meets control objectives		

### Audit Approach

Building on the internal audit work performed in this area in 2016/17 (internal audit report 2017/09, finalised 30 August 2017) we reviewed the terms of the contract with GLQ to identify contractual responsibilities in relation to PPM. Through discussion with the Building Contract Compliance Manager and Head of Estates, and review of documentation, we then established what systems and controls have been put in place to ensure that these responsibilities are met. Within this report, we have reported on areas where expected controls were found to be absent or where controls could be further strengthened.

Compliance testing was carried out where necessary to ensure that the controls in place are operating effectively.



### Summary of Main Findings

#### **Strengths**

- The responsibilities of GLQ regarding PPM are clearly set out in the Project Agreement, including through Performance Standards and in a schedule of assets requiring PPM and the frequency for their maintenance;
- Five-Year and Annual Schedules of Programmed Maintenance are in place, which set out what is required to be maintained and graphically show which week(s) in the year PPM is to be undertaken on these assets. As part of our audit testing, we selected a sample of 15 PPM jobs from the Annual PPM Planner and confirmed that the work had been carried out in line with the Planner;
- FES FM has a series of PPM Instruction Sets, which we understand to be derived from the SFG20 maintenance standards and detail the work to be carried out for most types of assets on the PPM Planner or cross-refer to manufacturer's instructions;
- The Maximo system is used to record the frequency when assets require PPM to be undertaken, and this is used to produce Job Sheets each month for PPM tasks. The Job Sheets are sent directly to handheld Personal Digital Assistants (PDAs) used by FES FM engineers who are based on the College campus or are printed out in hard copy for external contractors;
- A FES FM Training Matrix is in place showing, for each engineer in the team servicing the College, expiry dates for relevant certificates covering various relevant areas;
- The Estates team strives to select at least 20% of the PPM jobs each month (from a list appended to the Monthly Service Report) for checking against paperwork in the Maximo system. In the sample, priority is given to the higher risk PPM activities; and
- Once the review is complete, the random sampling spreadsheet is then emailed to FES FM and GLQ to address any comments. If required, a meeting between the College Estates team and FES FM is held to clarify any queries or discuss any concerns. A representative from GLQ is also invited to attend. FES FM then returns the spreadsheet addressing comments.

#### **Weaknesses**

In internal audit report 2017/09 – Planned Maintenance we identified a number of weaknesses relating to operational areas where GLQ / FES FM was responsible for processes and controls. From our current audit testing and discussion with the Building Contract Compliance Manager and Head of Estates we identified that some of these issues had not been addressed and for the following it was agreed that there would be benefit in actioning:

- The Building Engineering Services Association (BESA) SFG20 maintenance standards are applied by FES FM however reference is not made on the PPM Planners to the specific SFG20 maintenance standard, or other applicable standard, for each asset; and
- It was not clear from the PPM Planners which tasks related to statutory maintenance, although our sample testing did provide evidence that PPM was being undertaken on assets requiring statutory maintenance.

### Acknowledgments

We would like to take this opportunity to thank the staff at the College who helped us during the course of our audit visit.



# Main Findings and Action Plan

**Objective 1 - Appropriate controls have been put in place to ensure that GLQ is carrying out the agreed planned maintenance programme.**

### **Background and Project Agreement**

GLQ has sub-contracted some aspects of its contract with the College to one main external contractor FES FM. This external contractor uses an asset management system, Maximo, to detail all the required planned maintenance.

There is a Project Agreement between the College and GLQ which sets out the responsibilities of both the College and GLQ regarding planned preventative maintenance (PPM). The Project Agreement includes a number of Performance Standards, for which some are relevant to PPM. As part of the Project Agreement there is also a schedule of all items that need to be maintained and the frequency of their maintenance. The College has had external consultants prepare a 'Contract Handbook' which summarises the key aspects of the Project Agreement for College staff to refer to. GLQ has created an 'Operations and Maintenance Manual' setting out for assets in the College a range of information, such as technical information and maintenance requirements (manufacturer's maintenance frequency and maintenance standards to be applied), although it was established during our audit that the manual is not routinely referred to by College Estates staff and the Building Engineering Services Association (BESA) SFG20 maintenance standards (refer below) are considered by management to be more relevant.

Under the Project Agreement Performance Standards there is required to be a Five-Year and Annual Schedule of Programmed Maintenance. GLQ has prepared these PPL Planners in spreadsheets which set out what is required to be maintained and graphically show which week(s) in the year PPM is to be undertaken on these assets.

### **Planning and Conducting PPM Work**

FES FM supervisor staff assign the PPM tasks to either a) appropriate FES FM engineers in the Maximo system; or b) if the work is to be carried out by a contractor, then FES FM will contact the contractor and arrange a time for the contractor to come in and perform the work.

If the work is to be carried out by FES FM engineers, then the Maximo system automatically sends the job to the FES FM engineer's handheld Personal Digital Assistant (PDA) when this is assigned to them. The FES FM engineer has until the end of the month to complete the job and it is up to them as to when they schedule this. When the engineer starts the job, they will look for an appropriate maintenance standard to use on their PDA, with PDAs having a list of SFG20 maintenance standards, which is the industry standard for building maintenance specification. FES FM has a series of PPM Instruction Sets, which we understand to be derived from the SFG20 maintenance standards and detail the work to be carried out for most types of assets on the PPM Planner or cross-refer to manufacturer's instructions. For some assets, maintenance is carried out by an external contractor in line with another applicable standard.

Once the job is finished the FES FM engineer closes this off on their PDA and then this updates Maximo on a real-time basis. The Job Sheet on Maximo includes: job description (asset reference on PPM Planner and FES PPM Instruction Set used); brief description of work done; recommendations or further work required; date and time work started and finished; and the names of the engineers carrying out the work.





## Planned Maintenance

### **Objective 1 - Appropriate controls have been put in place to ensure that GLQ is carrying out the agreed planned maintenance programme (continued).**

#### **Planning and Conducting PPM Work (continued)**

If work is carried out by external contractors, then when the contractor comes on site they must sign in, have any Permits to Work completed, and provide evidence of appropriate training or qualifications (for higher risk work) before being allowed to work. After the work has been completed the relevant paperwork is provided to the FES FM administration staff for input into Maximo and closure of the job.

As part of our audit testing, we selected a sample of 15 PPM jobs from the Annual PPM Planner and confirmed that the:

- work had been carried out in line with the Planner by checking the dates on Maximo and that details agreed to the FES FM Job Sheets or other paperwork attached on Maximo;
- FES FM Job Sheets referred to an appropriate PPM Instruction Set, and that work carried out by external contractors referred to a relevant standard or appeared appropriate; and
- FES FM engineer who carried out the work is included on the FES FM Training Matrix and considered whether an appropriate external contractor had been used. Three FES FM engineers were not noted on the Training Matrix however we established that two of the three had left FES FM during the year and had therefore been removed from the Training Matrix. The other engineer was a FES FM Commercial Catering specialist who is brought in to carry out that type of work. In our sample, four external contractors had been used to carry out the PPM work, one of whom was the manufacturer of the Riverside Workshop crane. From review of the external contractor websites all companies appeared to have the appropriate credentials to undertake the work.



## Planned Maintenance

### Objective 1 - Appropriate controls have been put in place to ensure that GLQ is carrying out the agreed planned maintenance programme (continued).

#### Planning and Conducting PPM Work (continued)

In internal audit report 2017/09 – Planned Maintenance, finalised 30 August 2017, we identified a number of weaknesses relating to operational areas where GLQ / FES FM was responsible for processes and controls. A letter was provided to the Vice Principal Infrastructure setting out these issues and we recommended that these be raised with GLQ.

We have listed these operational issues at Appendix I of this report and have provided a progress update. From our audit testing and discussion with the Building Contract Compliance Manager and Head of Estates we identified that some of these issues have been fully addressed, some were considered but College management felt that there would be no benefit in taking forward and some remained outstanding, but it was agreed that there would be benefit in actioning and these are summarised below.

Observation	Risk	Recommendation	Management Response		
Reference is now made to SFG20 on the PPM Planners but not the specific maintenance standard for each asset. The Head of Estates noted that specific details are provided on the engineer's PDA although during our previous audit we found that the PDA gave no link to the actual SFG20 standard. Engineers had to go to the SFG20 standards (which were on their PDAs) and try and work out which one was best to be used.	PPM work may not be carried out in line with the appropriate maintenance standard.	<p><b>R1</b> A column should be added to the Annual PPM Planner to make it clear which specific SFG20 maintenance standard, or other applicable standard, should be applied for each asset.</p> <p>This standard can then be checked against the paperwork for completed PPM tasks uploaded to Maximo.</p>	<p>We will ensure the applicable SFG20 maintenance standard is applied to the Annual PPM Planner.</p> <p>The reference made on the service report can be checked back against the planner, but we cannot enforce FES FM to upload the appropriate SFG standard sheet to Maximo.</p> <p><b>To be actioned by:</b> Head of Estates</p> <p><b>No later than:</b> 30 June 2024</p>		
			<table border="1"> <tr> <td><b>Grade</b></td> <td><b>3</b></td> </tr> </table>	<b>Grade</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Grade</b>	<b>3</b>				



## Planned Maintenance

### Objective 1 - Appropriate controls have been put in place to ensure that GLQ is carrying out the agreed planned maintenance programme (continued).

Observation	Risk	Recommendation	Management Response	
<p>It was still not clear from the PPM Planners which tasks related to statutory maintenance, although our sample testing did provide evidence that PPM was being undertaken on assets requiring statutory maintenance.</p> <p>Information relating to the SFG20 standards on the SFG20 website noted that task lists are colour-coded so that users can easily differentiate between statutory, mandatory, function-critical and discretionary tasks.</p>	<p>Appropriate PPM work may not be carried out to meet statutory requirements.</p>	<p><b>R2</b> Linked to <b>R1</b> about identifying the specific SFG20 maintenance standard on the Annual PPM Planner, consider colour coding to differentiate between statutory, mandatory, function-critical and discretionary tasks, or show statutory tasks in a separate column, so it is clear what the purpose is and that relevant requirements are met.</p>	<p>We will ensure that statutory PPM activities are differentiated.</p> <p><b>To be actioned by:</b> Head of Estates</p> <p><b>No later than:</b> 30 June 2024</p>	
			<p><b>Grade</b></p>	<p><b>3</b></p>



## Planned Maintenance

### **Objective 1 - Appropriate controls have been put in place to ensure that GLQ is carrying out the agreed planned maintenance programme (continued).**

#### **Monthly Reports and Sample Checks**

The Monthly Service Report received from FES FM provides a summary of the PPM tasks carried out in the month as per the Schedule of Programmed Maintenance. This sets out the number of tasks carried out in-house or by subcontractors, and if there are any scheduled tasks that are outstanding.

Following a recommendation made in internal audit report 2017/09 – Planned Maintenance, the College now has a detailed written PPM Monitoring Procedure. The Estates team strives to select at least 20% of the PPM jobs each month (from a list appended to the Monthly Service Report) and check on Maximo:

- the target start and finish dates compared to the actual start and finish dates;
- the information entered by the engineer on the service sheet(s); and
- that any missed PPM activities from the previous month have been completed;

During random sampling, priority is given to the higher risk PPM activities e.g. life safety systems and statutory requirement items. Priority is also given to less frequent PPM tasks such as those carried out annually, every two years, every 11 months etc.

The jobs sampled are recorded on a random sampling spreadsheet together with any contractor and College comments and queries, such as if insufficient information has been provided or to ask if remedial work has been carried out. Once the review is complete, the random sampling spreadsheet is then emailed to FES FM and GLQ to address any comments. If required, a meeting between the College Estates team and FES FM is held to clarify any queries or discuss any concerns. A representative from GLQ is also invited to attend. FES FM then returns the spreadsheet addressing comments. Any outstanding items are rolled over in to the next month until completed to the College's satisfaction.

We reviewed the College's random sampling spreadsheets covering the period September 2022 to January 2023 and confirmed that 20% of PPM jobs had been sampled each month and that the process had been followed as described above.

A list of any tasks identified as not being complete in accordance with the PPM programme is provided for incorporation into the Payment Mechanism (PayMech) return detailing financial penalties applicable for discussion at the PayMech review meeting.

Random checks may also be carried out by Estates staff for higher risk items by visiting the engineers at the time of the maintenance and querying them about what maintenance they are doing, asking them to explain how they are doing this, and show which maintenance standard they are applying. Logbooks held in the FES FM office may also be accessed to verify work undertaken. The FES PPM Instruction Sets can also be referred to if further information is required on what a PPM task includes.



## Planned Maintenance

### **Objective 1 - Appropriate controls have been put in place to ensure that GLQ is carrying out the agreed planned maintenance programme (continued).**

#### **Reconciliation**

A PPM monthly comparison spreadsheet is maintained by Estates between the total number of tasks listed on the Annual PPM Planner and the total number of completed jobs listed in the FES FM monthly report. Although there are monthly variations, the overall total tasks for April 2022 to March 2023 were 2,883 against 2,891 respectively, a difference of only 0.28%.

In internal audit report 2017/09 – Planned Maintenance, we recommended that a comprehensive reconciliation of PPM work should be undertaken using spreadsheet comparison tools to compare the PPM jobs for each month (from the Annual PPM Planner spreadsheet) to PPM jobs scheduled and completed for that month (from Maximo). Although the current reconciliation performed is not as detailed as suggested in the recommendation it, together with other monthly checks in place such as verifying that any missed PPM activities from the previous month have been completed, provides reasonable assurance that all the planned work is being undertaken annually.



## Appendix I – Internal Audit Report 2017/09 – Planned Maintenance Areas for Improvement Relating to GLQ Areas of Responsibility

Operational issue raised in August 2017 report	Progress at April 2023
<p>The Annual and Five Yearly Planned Maintenance Schedules did not set out the maintenance standard to be used and the location of the maintenance requirements from the Operations and Maintenance Manual. As a result, the GLQ operative or external contractor undertaking the maintenance may select and apply the incorrect maintenance standard.</p>	<p>This is still the case.</p> <p>We suggested following our 2017 audit that the Annual PPM Planner would benefit from a column being added to show which maintenance standard should be applied for each asset and that the Operations and Maintenance Manual reference could be included. Also, engineers should be advised of which maintenance standard to apply on their PDA.</p> <p>There is still no reference to the Operations and Maintenance Manual on the PPM Planners however the Head of Estates noted that the SFG20 standards are more relevant than the Manual.</p> <p>Reference is now made to SFG20 on the PPM Planners but not the specific maintenance standard for each asset. The Head of Estates noted that specific details are provided on the engineer’s PDA although during our previous audit we found that the PDA gave no link to the actual SFG20 standard. Engineers had to go to the SFG20 standards (which were on their PDAs) and try and work out which one was best to be used.</p> <p>Refer recommendation <b>R1</b> on page 6 of this report.</p>
<p>GLQ were required to undertake a quarterly review and update of the Annual Planned Maintenance Schedule but this had not been completed. When there are changes to the Annual Planned Maintenance Schedule there would be benefit in a change log being used to record all changes to the previous iteration.</p>	<p>There is still only an annual review of the PPM Planner however the Head of Estates is content with that. The plan is fixed for the year unless a new asset is purchased that has a maintenance requirement that needs to be added.</p>



## Planned Maintenance

Operational issue raised in August 2017 report	Progress at April 2023
<p>The Operations and Maintenance Manual was not complete, with some assets on the Annual Planned Maintenance Schedule not able to be identified in the Operations and Maintenance Manual. We identified one instance where although the asset was found in the Operations and Maintenance Manual the maintenance requirements reference logged related to a document that could not be located.</p>	<p>As above, the Head of Estates noted that the SFG20 standards are more relevant than the Manual.</p>
<p>Where there are multiple numbers of the same asset robust procedures were not in place to identify all of these assets and provide operatives undertaking planned maintenance with aids to ensure that all such assets were maintained.</p>	<p>A significant number of assets on the PPM Planners note quantity as 'multiple'. The Head of Estates advised that, where relevant, the FES FM engineers work through the buildings in a methodical manner to ensure that all items are covered. We were also advised that FES FM maintain lists of certain assets, but that it would not be practical to maintain lists of everything covered by the PPM Planner.</p>
<p>There was not always evidence that checks had been undertaken to ensure that GLQ staff and contractors assigned to jobs had the required experience, skills and qualifications to undertake the maintenance tasks they were assigned to. The training matrices which were required to be completed for GLQ operatives setting out the skills and experience of their staff had not been completed at the time of audit fieldwork.</p>	<p>A current FES FM Training Matrix was provided showing, for each engineer in the team servicing the College, expiry dates for relevant certificates covering various areas, such as elevating work platforms, mobile access towers, gas, electric, hot works, confined spaces, health and safety etc.</p> <p>As part of our audit testing of a sample of PPM jobs, we checked that the FES FM engineer who carried out the work is included on the FES FM Training Matrix. Three FES FM engineers were not noted on the Training Matrix however we established that two of the three had left FES FM during the year and had therefore been removed from the Training Matrix. The other engineer was a FES FM Commercial Catering specialist who is brought in to carry out that type of work.</p> <p>Reliance is placed on the checks undertaken by FES FM when external contractors are used however as part of our testing we considered whether an appropriate external contractor had been used. In our sample, four external contractors had been used to carry out the PPM work, one of whom was the manufacturer of the Riverside Workshop crane. From review of the external contractor websites all companies appeared to have the appropriate credentials to undertake the work.</p>



## Planned Maintenance

Operational issue raised in August 2017 report	Progress at April 2023
<p>The level of detail of the narrative held on Maximo regarding maintenance work completed by GLQ operatives and on contractors' paperwork was inconsistent, but often did not set out which maintenance standard or maintenance instructions had been applied, and this in turn made it difficult to determine whether adequate planned maintenance had been undertaken.</p>	<p>For the sample of PPM tasks sample tested we found that the FES FM Job Sheet on Maximo included: job description (asset reference on PPM Planner and FES PPM Instruction Set used); brief description of work done; date and time work started and finished; and the names of the engineers carrying out the work.</p> <p>Of the four external contractors in our sample, from review of paperwork, one referred to a British Standard, one to a relevant Code of Practice and the other two gave a description of the work performed, in one case by the manufacturer of the asset.</p> <p>Overall, the level of detail provided on Maximo was considered to be adequate and consistent.</p> <p>The level of detail on Maximo is reviewed as part of the College's monthly random sampling and if insufficient information has been provided then this would be raised as a query for FES FM.</p>
<p>Not all hard copy paperwork to support work completed, such as contractors' paperwork, was scanned and attached to the planned maintenance jobs on Maximo.</p>	<p>For the sample of PPM items tested, hard copy paperwork to support the work completed, such as the FES Job Sheet or external contractors' paperwork, was found to be attached to the PPM job on Maximo in all cases.</p>





## Planned Maintenance

Operational issue raised in August 2017 report	Progress at April 2023
<p>We found that although there were some planned maintenance activities related to assets requiring statutory maintenance, it was not clear whether the planned maintenance work being undertaken was adequate to cover all of the statutory requirements.</p>	<p>We suggested following our 2017 audit that there would be benefit in GLQ compiling a table of the statutory PPM requirements and matching each of these statutory requirements against the items in the PPM Planner which ensure that these statutory requirements are met.</p> <p>Such a table has not been compiled and it was still not clear from the PPM Planners which tasks related to statutory maintenance, although our sample testing did provide evidence that PPM was being undertaken on assets requiring statutory maintenance.</p> <p>Information relating to the SFG20 standards on the SFG20 website noted that task lists are colour-coded so that users can easily differentiate between statutory, mandatory, function-critical and discretionary tasks. Linked to <b>R1</b> about identifying the specific SFG20 maintenance standard on the Annual PPM Planner, tasks could be colour coded to identify which category they fall into, or statutory tasks could be shown in a separate column.</p> <p>Refer recommendation <b>R2</b> on page 7 of this report.</p>
<p>GLQ were not undertaking internal quality checks over planned maintenance apart from periodic supervisor visits to operatives or contractors whilst planned maintenance work was being carried out, although it was identified that these checks by the supervisor were not formally recorded.</p>	<p>The Head of Estates advised that GLQ now undertakes quality checks and the College has increased checking to 20% of monthly PPM tasks performed, which has led to an improved service being provided to the College.</p>



---

**Aberdeen** 45 Queen's Road AB15 4ZN

**Dundee** The Vision Building, 20 Greenmarket DD1 4QB

**Edinburgh** Ground Floor, 11-15 Thistle Street EH2 1DF

**Glasgow** 100 West George Street, G2 1PP

**T:** 01224 322 100

**T:** 01382 200 055

**T:** 0131 226 0200

**T:** 0141 471 9870

**F:** 01224 327 911

**F:** 01382 221 240

**F:** 0131 220 3269

Henderson Loggie LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in Scotland with registered number SO301630 and is a member of PrimeGlobal, a global association of independent accounting firms, the members of which are separate and independent legal entities. Registered office is: The Vision Building, 20 Greenmarket, Dundee, DD1 4QB. All correspondence signed by an individual is signed for and on behalf of Henderson Loggie LLP. Reference to a 'partner' is to a member of Henderson Loggie LLP. A list of members' names is available for inspection at each of these addresses.

