

SPECIAL ORDINANCES UNDER STATUTE A THE
CHANCELLOR AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE
UNIVERSITY *Approved by Grace 2 of 3 July 2013*

*AUDIT COMMITTEE OF THE COUNCIL (SPECIAL ORDINANCE
UNDER STATUTE A IV 10) [P69]*

1. There shall be a standing committee of the Council, called the Audit Committee, which shall consist of:
 - (a) a member of the Council in class (e) (as referred to in Statute A IV 2(e)) appointed by the Council to serve as Chair of the Committee,
 - (b) two members of the Council appointed by the Council from among its members who are members of the Regent House, provided that neither the Vice-Chancellor, a Pro-Vice-Chancellor, nor the Chair of a Council of a School shall be eligible to serve,
 - (c) four persons, not being members of the Regent House or employees of the University, appointed by the Council with regard to their professional expertise and experience in comparable roles in corporate life, including at least two members with experience of finance, accounting, or auditing,
 - (d) not more than three persons co-opted by the Committee, of whom
 - (i) the first person co-opted shall be a member of the Regent House, such person not being a member of the Council;
 - (ii) not more than two co-opted persons shall be members of the Regent House, such persons not being members of the Council;
 - (iii) not more than two co-opted persons shall be external members, one but not more than one of whom may be a member of the Council in class (e) (as referred to in Statute A IV 2(e)), provided that it shall not be obligatory for the Committee to co-opt any person or persons.

For the purpose of these regulations, external members are defined as the following members of the Audit Committee:

- (a) persons who are members of the Council in class (e) (as referred to in Statute A IV 2(e));
 - (b) persons who are not employees of the University or any of its companies or of a College, and who do not hold College Fellowships which qualify them for membership of the Regent House.
2. Members in classes (a), (b), and (c) shall be appointed in the Michaelmas Term to serve for three years from 1 January next following their appointment. No member in class (a), (b), and (c) may serve for more than eight consecutive years. Co-opted members shall serve until 31 December of the year in which they are co-opted or of the following year, as the Committee shall decide at the time of their co-optation.

3. No person may be a member of the Audit Committee who is a member of the Finance Committee. If a member of the Audit Committee becomes a member of the Finance Committee, her or his place shall thereupon become vacant.
4. No decision of the Audit Committee shall have any binding effect unless there are at least five members, three at least of these being external members, present at a meeting of the Audit Committee. If a decision is the subject of a vote and there is an equality of votes cast, the Chair, or Acting Chair, as the case may be, shall be entitled to give a second or casting vote.
5. In the absence of the Chair of the Committee, the Audit Committee shall elect an acting Chair from the external members present.

ORDINANCES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
CHAPTER XIII FINANCE AND PROPERTY
AUDIT COMMITTEE [P1038]

Amended by Grace 1 of 27 November 2013

1. The Audit Committee shall meet at least twice in each financial year. It shall be the duty of the Committee:
 - (a) to keep under review the effectiveness of the University's internal systems of financial and other control;
 - (b) to advise the Council on matters relating to the external and internal auditors, including their appointment, the provision by the auditors of any additional services outside the scope of their regular responsibilities, the remuneration of the auditors, and any questions relating to the resignation or dismissal of auditors;
 - (c) to ensure that sufficient resources are made available for internal audit;
 - (d) to approve proposals for internal audit put forward by the internal auditors;
 - (e) to review annually with the external auditors the nature and scope of the external audit;
 - (f) to consider any reports submitted by the auditors, both external and internal;
 - (g) to monitor the implementation of any recommendations made by the internal auditors;
 - (h) to satisfy themselves that satisfactory arrangements are adopted throughout the University for promoting economy, efficiency, effectiveness, and risk management;
 - (i) to establish appropriate performance measures and to monitor annually the performance and effectiveness of the external and internal auditors;
 - (j) to consider, in consultation with the external auditors, (i) any financial statements annexed to the abstract of accounts, including the auditors' report, and (ii) any statement provided by the Council on the governance of the University;

- (k) to ensure that all significant losses are properly investigated and that the internal and external auditors, and where appropriate the Higher Education Funding Council for England, are informed;
- (l) to oversee the University's policy on fraud and irregularity, and to ensure that they are informed of any action taken under that policy;
- (m) to make an annual report to the Council, the Vice-Chancellor, and the Higher Education Funding Council for England;
- (n) to receive reports from the National Audit Office and the Higher Education Funding Council for England, and to advise the Council thereon;
- (o) to forward minutes of their meetings to the Council.

Taken from the Statutes and Ordinances of the University of Cambridge: <http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/univ/so/>.

Deloitte LLP - fees for internal audit work 2014 - 15

Appendix C

	<u>Number of Days</u>	<u>Cost (excluding VAT)</u>	<u>Cost (including VAT)</u>
Completion of 2013 - 14	90	£64,439	£77,327
Audit Work in 2014 - 15	<u>379</u>	<u>£334,247</u>	<u>£401,096</u>
Total	<u><u>469</u></u>	<u><u>£398,686</u></u>	<u><u>£478,423</u></u>

Deloitte LLP - fees for other work relating to 2014 - 15

	Fees (excluding) VAT	Fees (including) VAT
Other Work		
None	£NIL	£NIL
Total	<u><u>£NIL</u></u>	<u><u>£NIL</u></u>

External audit**(i) PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP and overseas network firms – fees for audit work in relation to 2014 – 15**

<i>Entity and service</i>	<i>Fees (incl. UK VAT – where applicable)</i>
External audit work for the University, Cambridge Assessment, Cambridge University Press, Associated Trusts, subsidiaries and the standalone CUEF financial statements	£853,052
Cambridge University Press – review of paper setting out impact of transition to FRS 102	£7,800

(ii) PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP and overseas network firms – fees for non-audit work for services billed after 30 October 2014 and reported in our November 2014 summary

<i>Entity and service</i>	<i>Fees (incl. UK VAT – where applicable)</i>
<i>Company Secretarial</i>	
Cambridge Assessment – members voluntary liquidation of Sandonian Properties Limited	£24,331

(iii) PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP and overseas network firms – fees for non audit services 2014 - 15 billed since our November 2014 summary

<i>Entity and service</i>	<i>Fees (incl. UK VAT – where applicable)</i>
<i>Other assurance services</i>	
Little U – National College for Teaching and Leadership (NCTL) return	£4,256
Cambridge Investment Management Ltd – FCA client asset work	£5,225
Cambridge Assessment – Agreed upon procedures in respect of the Queen's Award	£6,000
<i>Tax compliance and advisory</i>	
Cambridge Enterprise Ltd – Corporation tax compliance	£5,820
Cambridge University Technical Services Ltd – Corporation tax compliance	£3,444
Cambridge University Press – discussion re permanent establishment risks and transfer pricing	£15,600

Advisory

Little U – North West Cambridge review	£225,432
Cambridge University Press – pensions advice	£12,000
Cambridge University Press – investigation into allegations in India	£307,200

(iv) PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP – fees in respect of participation in external projects/events administered by departments

<i>Entity and service</i>	<i>Fees (incl. UK VAT – where applicable)</i>
Work in respect of ClimateWise, which is administered by the Programme for Sustainability Leadership	£32,100

Assurance on the Colleges' use of public funding

The Audit Committee has approved a protocol for reporting satisfaction, or otherwise, with the use of funds transferred by the University to the Colleges for educational purposes.

Assurance is retrospective. The exercise compares the College Fee Transfer (being the College share of tuition income) from the University with the Education income and costs, as disclosed in each College's audited accounts.

Attached: a schedule based on the Colleges' 2014 accounts showing:

- College's share of tuition income (regulated Undergraduate fee deemed to be public funds)
- Other education income (other UG and PG fees charged directly by Colleges)
- Expenditure on Education.

A College's endowment income might be restricted for educational purposes and exceed the gap between a College's expenditure on undergraduate education and the amount it receives as College Fee Transfer. Therefore *total* expenditure made from restricted funds is also noted.

The exercise shows the "headroom" for each College, and invites further investigation if headroom is limited.

The information provides assurance that the Colleges' share of tuition income is properly applied for educational purposes.

	Colleges' share of tuition income £000 A	Other Education Income £000 B	Total Education Income £000 C	Total Education Costs £000 D = B + C	Direct (Deficit) on Education £000 E	Total Restricted Fund income £000 F = D + E	Net £000 Further investigation	2013 Net £000	Alternative view £000 A + E + C
CHRIST'S	1,569	923	2,492	(2,571)	(79)	879	800 Note 1	84	(123)
CHURCHILL	1,624	1,279	2,903	(4,105)	(1,202)	(9)	(1,211)	(1,263)	(2,490)
CLARE	1,879	940	2,819	(3,794)	(975)	1,054	79 Note 2	(268)	(861)
CLARE HALL	0	535	535	(559)	(24)	382	358 Note 3	(198)	(177)
CORPUS CHRISTI	1,027	672	1,699	(3,009)	(1,310)	1,235	(75)	(903)	(747)
DARWIN	18	1,192	1,210	(1,280)	(70)	175	105 Note 3	(9)	(1,087)
DOWNING	1,569	1,144	2,713	(3,990)	(1,277)	519	(758)	(966)	(1,902)
EMMANUEL	1,894	618	2,512	(3,943)	(1,431)	1,154	(277)	(931)	(895)
FITZWILLIAM	1,486	1,133	2,619	(3,257)	(638)	505	(133)	(270)	(1,266)
GIRTON	1,838	1,370	3,208	(3,832)	(624)	849	225 Note 8	(141)	(1,145)
GONVILLE & CAIUS	2,073	1,065	3,138	(5,302)	(2,164)	1,448	(716)	(824)	(1,781)
HOMERTON	2,820	1,309	4,129	(4,061)	68	0	68 Note 4	208	(1,241)
HUGHES HALL	304	1,316	1,620	(1,667)	(47)	96	49 Note 3	(157)	(1,267)
JESUS	1,993	820	2,813	(4,879)	(2,066)	756	(1,310)	(1,632)	(2,130)
KING'S	1,492	1,098	2,590	(4,463)	(1,873)	1,578	(295)	(1,000)	(1,393)
LUCY CAVENDISH	550	608	1,158	(1,435)	(277)	134	(143)	(140)	(751)
MAGDALENE	1,175	1,277	2,452	(2,809)	(357)	549	192 Note 7	(579)	(1,085)
MURRAY EDWARDS	1,389	808	2,197	(3,020)	(823)	119	(704)	(844)	(1,512)
NEWHAM	1,370	1,179	2,549	(4,425)	(1,876)	994	(882)	(1,638)	(2,061)
PEMBROKE	1,589	1,038	2,627	(4,316)	(1,689)	577	(1,112)	(1,167)	(2,150)
PETERHOUSE	891	558	1,449	(2,889)	(1,440)	548	(892)	(1,418)	(1,450)
QUEENS'	1,928	1,270	3,198	(4,873)	(1,675)	280	(1,395)	(1,549)	(2,665)
ROBINSON	1,464	885	2,349	(3,456)	(1,107)	62	(1,045)	(1,186)	(1,930)
ST. CATHARINE'S	1,740	1,053	2,793	(4,222)	(1,429)	637	(792)	(959)	(1,845)
ST. EDMUND'S	414	1,021	1,435	(1,430)	5	1,679	1,684 Note 5	345	663
ST. JOHN'S	2,074	1,457	3,531	(8,693)	(5,162)	2,133	(3,029)	(4,270)	(4,486)
SELWYN	1,443	601	2,044	(2,853)	(809)	403	(406)	(524)	(1,007)
SIDNEY SUSSEX	1,343	870	2,213	(3,963)	(1,750)	222	(1,528)	(1,913)	(2,398)
TRINITY	2,278	1,410	3,688	(15,692)	(12,004)	1,653	(10,351) Note 6:	(11,338)	(11,761)
TRINITY HALL	1,453	780	2,233	(4,345)	(2,112)	1,188	(924)	(1,056)	(1,704)
WOLFSON	571	1,638	2,209	(2,241)	(32)	111	79 Note 3	(143)	(1,559)
Total	43,258	31,867	75,125	(121,374)	(46,249)	21,910	(24,339)	(36,649)	(56,206)

From Colleges' accounts

Total restricted fund income - "worst case" is that it is all specific to Education

Direct deficit - excess of Education costs over total Fees received

"Headroom"- net(deficit) on Education assuming all restricted funds are specific to Education.

"Headroom 2"- Colleges share of fees plus ALL restricted fund income, less the cost of Education.

- Note 1 394 Home/EU UG out of student population of 583 (68%)
 - Note 2 453 Home/EU UG out of student population of 680 (67%)
 - Note 3 Predominantly graduate Colleges: public funds for UG nil/not significant.
 - Note 4 521 Home/EU UG out of student population of 1,016 (51%)
 - Note 5 Restricted fund income is for Research institutes in the College. Not applicable to Education.
 - Note 6 2013 comparative restated
 - Note 7 Magdalene includes Fees includes research income 443 and 65 Cambridge Bursary Scheme. Home/EU UG 63% of student population.
 - Note 8 462 Home/EU UG out of student population of 676 (71%)
- = satisfactory explanation where calculated headroom is marginal.**

University of Cambridge Audit Committee

Assurance on Colleges' use of funds

Note of a meeting on Thursday 12 March 2015 in the Registry's office.

Present: Chair of the Audit Committee, Mr Mark Lewisohn
 Chair of the Colleges' Committee, Professor David Yates
 Chair of the Bursars' Committee, Ms Deborah Lowther
 Registry and Secretary of the Audit Committee, Dr Jonathan Nicholls

In attendance: Assistant Secretary of the Audit Committee, Dr Clara East

1. The meeting was part of an established mechanism to provide assurance that the autonomous Colleges applied public funding received via the Colleges' share of tuition fee income for appropriate educational purposes and that due attention was paid to efficiency and value-for-money considerations.
2. The mechanism included an annual exercise by the University's Director of Finance to compare Colleges' total fee income and restricted funds income with expenditure on education. The assessment of the Colleges' 2013-14 audited accounts had been completed and, at the next meeting of the Audit Committee on 7 May 2015, the Director of Finance would report satisfaction with the application of funds transferred. The table compiled by the Director of Finance from the Colleges' accounts had been circulated to the attendees for information. Additional assurance in this regard was provided via this annual meeting, which provided a forum to explore matters and exchange information, particularly in the area of value for money.
3. With regard to the table of accounts the Registry explained that the analysis was based on a formula originally developed by the Audit Committee following the 2008 Funding Council visit in which HEFCE sought greater assurance than was provided by the previous method of self-certification. The Audit Committee had later requested that account was also taken of restricted funds in the analysis, since some may be attributable to supporting education. The analysis was intended to demonstrate that Colleges were spending more on education than the share of tuition fee they received.

Running through the table of figures, Column D showed the difference between Education income (including Tuition Fee) and Education costs; a negative entry indicated that Colleges were spending at least their tuition fee share and gave the basis for the assurance. Column F took into account spend out of all 'Restricted Funds' as reported in the accounts. The restricted funds were not necessarily for educational purposes (although such could be determined by detailed investigation on a College by College basis). In the case of Christ's and St Edmund's Colleges there was an apparent surplus, however assurance was given that this arose from bringing into the analysis restricted funds not specifically for Education, and the surplus did not arise from lack of spending of the tuition fee share.

It was questioned whether the monies transferred by the University were strictly speaking 'HEFCE' funds; however, the Registry explained that the HEFCE and HMG considered that tuition fees paid by individual students, which were principally supported by favourable loan terms from HMG, were equivalent to public monies and HEFCE would continue to expect the

University to receive assurance regarding the use of the monies. In an uncertain regulatory environment it was important that the Audit Committee of the University was able to take assurance from this annual exercise.

It was acknowledged that the figures were not static as Colleges would continue to fundraise to maximise their education income. The presentation of the figures would be amended to give clearer column headings and to add notes of explanation. It would also be reconsidered whether Restricted Funds should be included in the Net column since these included bursary money and hardship awards, some of which were provided for maintenance rather than tuition. It was agreed that a note should be added about Trinity College which had spent significantly less on education compared to 2013.

4. Ms Lowther took attendees through the value for money report, which she explained was an interim report prepared by the Colleges Value for Money sub-committee (formerly the Purchasing Committee). A full annual report would be prepared in future. Whilst the report did not cover all areas looked at previously, it addressed current interest and activity in the VfM area. Attention was drawn to the following points:

- renegotiation of the purchasing contract had been very successful;
- significant savings were estimated on energy procurement and management under the Colleges' flexible purchasing contract;
- commitments to carbon reduction were being organised collectively through the OIS and were working well;
- much work had been done on insurance with a shift away from full provision by RSA and re-tendering for the insurance contract was imminent; self-insurance had been considered but had not been taken forward as an option as it was unlikely to yield greater value than received through the current contract.

Ms Lowther concluded that VfM was an evolving area and that there was much willingness in Colleges to collaborate and use their combined purchasing power. One new example being considered was the collection of professional advice on the value of buildings; this was required for accounting purposes but was very time consuming when done on an individual College basis. Smaller groups of Colleges with similar objectives were working together on areas such as IT, childcare, catering and student accommodation arrangements. These collaborations tended to be market-driven and were not easy to push, however the more that was done, the more this could encourage others to follow.

More generally it was noted that efficiency and value for money were big issues for the Sector. The Diamond 2 report aimed to demonstrate to Government that HEIs were taking active and effective steps to secure value for money and savings. This was critical in the context of the next Comprehensive Spending Review, which was widely assumed to bring forward a very difficult settlement for the sector. Ms Lowther affirmed that the Colleges also took these issues seriously and that the VfM sub-committee met regularly and had the opportunity to report to every Bursars' Committee meeting at which there was a high level awareness of the issues. It was also noted that Colleges would think about the issues individually to an extent dependent on their size and structure. University and College Joint Committee meetings would further look at ways of combining forces, such as had been very

successfully achieved in the area of health and safety. The University and the Colleges should continue to consider other services that they could.

5. The University's Audit Committee would receive a copy of this meeting note and the Colleges' Value for Money interim report at its meeting in May. Appendix A would be shared with the College Bursars' Committee.

Registrary's Office

April 2015

Report by the General Purchasing sub-Committee to the Bursars Committee

Value for Money (VfM) for the financial year 2013-14

(including updates on initiatives in 2014-15)

Introduction

The Colleges of Cambridge are independent self-governing institutions working in close partnership with the University to deliver their charitable objectives. Collectively this partnership is referred to as 'Collegiate Cambridge'. The Bursars' Committee represents the Bursars of all the Colleges acting in collaboration where it is appropriate to do so.

The Bursars' Committee seeks to enable the Colleges to take maximum possible advantage of opportunities for efficiency through information sharing and through collective purchasing initiatives. It also recognises the imperative to demonstrate value for money achievements across the collegiate University and is committed to supporting the University in meeting its obligations to external funding bodies in this regard.

The remit of the Bursars' General Purchasing sub Committee (GPSC) is to provide leadership and oversight of VfM and collaborative initiatives across the Colleges, working in close association with the University. The definition of 'Value for Money' covers the key areas of 'Economy, Efficiency and Effectiveness'¹.

Within this context the sub Committee has been specifically requested by the Bursars' Committee:

1. To prepare on behalf of the Colleges an annual VfM report for the Bursars' Committee.
2. To formulate and disseminate best practice in purchasing among the Colleges.
3. To identify areas of purchasing that could benefit from joint initiatives and initiate co-operative purchasing ventures where feasible.
4. To oversee those collaborative purchasing activities which are not separately reported to the Bursars' Committee.
5. To provide a forum in which the Colleges can, in conjunction with the University Purchasing Office, maximise opportunities for co-operation on VfM between the Colleges and the University.

Total expenditure across the Colleges in 2013/14 was £350m (an increase of 6.7% on the previous year). Of this £269m, has been identified as 'controllable spending' defined as total expenditure less depreciation, interest and investment costs.

This definition excludes interest costs; however in 2013-14 two rounds of funding were issued totalling £149m under a new long term collective bond, representing some 32% of the total borrowings of Colleges at the financial year end.

¹ Economy – careful use of resources to save expense, time or effort

Efficiency – delivering the same level of service for less cost, time or effort

Effectiveness – delivering a better service or getting a better return for the same amount of expense, time or effort.

Benchmarking

The Bursars Committee undertakes regular benchmarking studies on behalf of the Colleges in order to provide useful information. In particular comparative information is produced from College accounts as well as additional key performance indicators comparing key staff and non-staff expenditure items across all of the main operating departments within the Colleges. This information is made available to the participants to inform management strategies within the Colleges.

52% of 'controllable' spending relates to staff costs – wages, salaries and stipends. A further 14% of costs falls into the category of 'Other academic' costs.

Annual surveys are undertaken across each of these areas to provide benchmarking information to inform decisions taken by the Colleges independently:

- i. The Assistant Staff salary survey covers the Assistant staff
- ii. The Stipends survey provides information about academic stipends, for full time and part time posts.
- iii. The annual Cost of Education return completed by each College provides further information on academic staff and non-staff costs

Inter-College purchasing agreements

Discretionary spending categories make up the remainder of 'controllable spending'. This totalled approximately £91m in 2013-14.

26% of this discretionary spending² was through collective purchasing arrangements, representing 73% of the total College spending in the expenditure categories covered by these agreements. These are:

- Catering supplies
- Energy and CRC tax
- Insurance
- Business Rates

In addition some 11% of conference income was placed through Conference Cambridge, a joint venture marketing organisation. This understates the true contribution of Conference Cambridge as much repeat business originally placed through this organisation is transacted directly with the Colleges.

2014-15 Developments

Catering:

Over the ten months to April 2015 the benefit of the purchasing arrangement has varied between 10% and 20% of market prices.

² Discretionary spending is defined as 'Controllable spending' less Salaries, Stipends, and 'Other academic'

The Frozen contract was successfully tendered and brought within the scope of the purchasing agreement to ensure rigorous controls for this category of this product, which had previously been managed separately. This enabled the purchasing agreement to be extended for a further period from April 2015 without any increase in fee rates.

33% of Colleges are now using e-procurement to some extent. The estimated benefit of the plan to employ electronic procurement and product level invoice reconciliation is between 2% and 3% of expenditure.

Insurance:

The Insurance group has undertaken a preliminary investigation into the merits of self-insurance, but concluded that the current state of the insurance market meant that there was no compelling case for such a move at the present time.

Energy:

In Spring 2014, the Energy Management Committee (EMC) went out to tender for energy procurement advisers and following the tender process appointed new procurement agent, six months before the first renewal date for gas purchasing which was August 2014. The EMC also proposed, following the appointment of the new procurement advisers to move to flexible purchasing on gas and half-hourly electricity.

The initial tenders (in June 2014 for the gas contract, commencing August 2014 and in July 2014 for the half hourly electricity starting in October 2014) resulted in 85% of the non-commodity charges being fixed price for the three year duration of the contracts. The non-half hourly electricity meters were tendered on a fully fixed price basis and the price fixed for three years.

CRC tax spend was £818,209 for the 12 months to March 2015. The price of a ton of CO² went up by 30% between the first and second phase of the scheme (second phase started in 2014-15).

Other Intercollegiate Initiatives

Development

Joint training events (5 or 6 per year) for college development staff (sometimes also in conjunction with CUDAR) are held, so saving costs compared with separately organised training

Colleges have co-operated in procuring services from common telethon consultants;

Some Colleges are jointly organising and hosting of overseas events for alumni e.g. in Hong Kong and Singapore;

Colleges share a joint membership of CASE.

IT

CASC (Colleges' Administrative Software Consortium) develops and maintains software specifically for Cambridge Colleges. CASC allows Colleges to develop software suited to their particular needs and to have support immediately available. This is often cheaper and more reliable than commercially available alternatives. It has developed a number of programs. Currently 20 of the Colleges are members of the consortium and use at least one of the programs. The programs range from accounting for supervision payments to applications for Research Fellowships. The most recent development is the provision of software for room bookings in Colleges.

A number of groups of Colleges are seeking to develop joint initiatives to deliver more effective management of IT services in the face of rising costs and technical complexity. These range from sharing of personnel to more widespread collaboration initiatives. These are already delivering benefits in terms of improved resiliency.

Collaboration between the University and the Colleges

All Colleges are able to access University purchasing contracts via Unibuy. Colleges also have access to the training in procurement services offered by University Procurement.

21 Colleges are using the University Occupational Health and Safety Service (OHSS) for training, support, advice and an annual Health and Safety External Audit. This has resulted in significant cost savings for Colleges with the added advantage of consistency of standards being applied across the Colleges.

Almost all Colleges jointly utilise Cambridge in America as a tax efficient giving organisation for the US.

The University Catering Service participates in the Colleges' joint purchasing arrangement for catering supplies.

Discussions took place during the year with the University Estates Department about the potential for joint energy purchasing across the University and the Colleges. After consultation with the respective purchasing agents it was unanimously concluded that there was little potential value in further aggregation.

IT infrastructure and services

The University and Colleges already co-operate over IT services in various ways and thereby reduce costs. The most significant of these, from a College perspective, are CAMCORS (where a new version is being completed to allow supervisions to be accounted for coherently) and the Cambridge University Data Network (where Colleges and the University operate a dedicated fibre network across Cambridge).

The University Information Services (UIS) has begun working with Departments and Colleges to share computing expertise and to share services where possible. This is still at an early stage and will require several years to reach a conclusion. Nonetheless, co-operation is developing. This is particularly apparent in access to University library and IT resources, connection to JANET, networking, shared security concerns, and purchasing of software and hardware. The first of these are well-established but more is possible with the latter items.

The Bursars' IT Committee is discussing with UIS reforming the committee to provide a better forum for sharing ideas. UIS is negotiating University-wide agreements with software and hardware suppliers.

Office of Intercollegiate services (OIS) and the Legal Affairs and Employment sub-Committee

OIS provides a range of value added services to the Colleges collectively, saving expense and improving efficiency especially enabling the Colleges to make and implement collective arrangements with the University. Among the services provided by OIS are:

- Collection and payment of contributions by the Colleges to various functions which are jointly financed by the University and the Colleges. These include:
 - Central Admissions Office
 - CAMSIS (student information system)
 - University Counselling Service
 - Cambridge in America
 - University Communications Office
 - Sports syndicate
 - CamCORS
- Redistribution of fee income and bursary support between the Colleges in line with respective collective agreements
- Provision of legal advice
- Administrative support for collective management arrangements, including the provision of corporate structures to facilitate such arrangements.
- Administrative support to key committees and sub-Committees and management of the Bursars Committee website as a major resource for all Colleges.

The total of subscriptions and levies collected by OIS in 2014 was £2.435m. The annual cost of OIS plus the operation of Bursars Committee and Senior Tutor's Committee is approximately £285k.

The Legal and Employment sub-Committee of the Bursars' Committee contains representatives not only from the Colleges but also from the Senior Tutors' Committee and the University. This membership allows legal problems to be addressed, where possible and practicable, in a coherent way across the various bodies that make up the University. The pooling of resources in this way avoids colleges and university institutions paying individually for legal advice (although this option remains open if the institution feels this is the best approach).

Future agenda

Last Mile delivery: The Cambridge Business Improvement District has commissioned consultants to provide recommendations on the introduction of a 'last mile delivery' service to businesses and Colleges in the central BID zone. The proposed service would operate from an out of city hub with electric vehicles delivering a range of items including ambient, chilled and frozen foods to the city centre. The primary benefits of this project would include a reduction in the number of delivery vehicles that congest the city.

Waste Management: A proposal for the collective purchasing of Waste Management Services is under active consideration. The total spend across the Colleges is estimated at £700k per annum.

Maintenance: Representatives of the sub Committee will be attending the next meeting of the existing group of maintenance managers / clerk of works on 29th October to identify existing collective purchasing initiatives and to review the opportunities to extend best practise.

Nursery provision: Discussions have been initiated regarding a potential participation in a joint Nursery project with the University (being led by University Procurement) – to deal with the long term need for more nursery places.

Other commodities for consideration

Professional services

Agency staff

Janitorial services

- Laundry
- Domestic supplies

Stationery

Furniture

General Purchasing sub-Committee

8th October 2015