



COTSWOLD
DISTRICT COUNCIL



Forest of Dean
DISTRICT COUNCIL



WEST OXFORDSHIRE
DISTRICT COUNCIL

2020 Vision for Joint Working Programme Board

Date: 26th September 2014

Time: 10 – 12

Location: Montpelier Room, Cheltenham Borough Council

Attendees

Councillor Steve Jordan	Councillor Jon Walklett
Councillor Barry Norton	Councillor Lynden Stowe
Councillor Patrick Molyneux (Apologies)	Councillor Chris Hancock
Councillor Mark Booty (Apologies)	Councillor Brian Robinson
Andrew North	David Neudegg
Ralph Young	Peter Hibberd
Jane Griffiths	Jenny Poole
Amanda Attfield	Julie McCarthy
Eric Bohl – Activist group	



2020 Vision for Joint Working Programme Board

Agenda

Cllr SJ advised the group that this was the last meeting for both AA and JG and thanked them for their support and wished them well for the future.

1. Notes from previous meeting

- 1.1 Cllr BN raised his concerns about item 4 and felt that it was not the role of the Programme Board to set up democratically accountable sub groups. This view was endorsed by Cllr LS. Both also expressed concerns about the resource and capacity to support such an advisory group.
- 1.2 Cllr BR explained the purpose of the group and the importance of such a group to FODC to ensure alignment across the parties. He felt it was important to get cross party support, so that despite the elections in May, the council could demonstrate that it was a good and strong partner. It was noted that the proposal mirrored arrangements in place for the JCS which worked well and that at CBC there was a culture of such cross party working groups. Everyone was agreed that each council would have their own scrutiny arrangements.
- 1.3 The comments made by members during a lengthy discussion on the matter were noted and it was agreed that the officers would consider the issues and come back to the next meeting with some revised proposals for consideration.

Action: For officers to present revised proposals for the member advisory group to the next Programme Board for consideration.

2. Reporting back on Activist findings

- 2.1 EB presented his findings from the work Activist had undertaken to date and which will form the basis of his report to be presented to the Programme Board. A copy of the presentation is attached to the minutes.
- 2.2 In setting out the strategic case he advised that he had added Impact as a new driver and Technology to assets and strengths to the drivers, assets and strengths previously shared with members.
- 2.3 He said that preserving council identity had been a key issue which had come through very strongly from both officers and members. He also advised that culture was very powerful in each council.
- 2.4 It was noted that the pensions issue had yet to be resolved and there was a discussion as to whether some members fully understood the financial impact of pensions in the future. EB advised that given the unresolved issues relating to pensions it should not be a key driver for any business case.
- 2.5 EB set out a number of principles and recommendations to address the issues and set out a range of



2020 Vision for Joint Working Programme Board

outcomes which would be delivered. He advised the group that the ethos in the outcomes was very similar to that of the John Lewis Partnership.

- 2.6 When considering the strategic case members stressed the importance of the community leadership role that councils play, which includes the democratic legitimacy of holding other agencies to account. They also felt that the pace of change should be maintained, and that standards should be improved rather than lowest common denominator, so residents would notice a difference.
- 2.7 In response to a question EB advised that the outcomes had been written to counter any risks and issues which may arise from the 2020 Vision.
- 2.8 EB outlined the delivery options and the process used to arrive at a shortlist. He reminded the group that in house transformation will always struggle against a shared service as the transformation can be applied to the shared service which has greater scale.
- 2.9 It was noted that a JV was attractive but the procurement process was complicated, costly and time consuming. There would also be a risk premium added by partners due to the four way share.
- 2.10 He reminded members about the benefits of a joint committee which are often forgotten as an option to deliver shared services, and also reminded the group about the benefits of the Teckal company because it does not require formal procurement, and can grow.
- 2.11 He recognized that some interest had been shown in mutuals but that these were subject to lengthy procurement processes and greater overhead costs.
- 2.12 He had based the preliminary options appraisals on a five year forecast (excluding pensions) with an estimated three year procurement process and that on this basis sharing or LA company were the most appropriate options.
- 2.13 He proposed the councils should start with a joint committee which will oversee the 2020 Vision to share services and act as a management board operating in a commercial manner. Once the pensions issue has been resolved then the councils could move to a company structure.
- 2.14 In response to a question as to whether the councils were creating structures which were “too big to fail” he felt that divisional structures could be created if this was appropriate.
- 2.15 Members expressed their concerns that if the partners await the resolution of pensions at a national level then it was unrealistic that change would progress as quickly as they would wish and that a resolution needs to be found locally.



2020 Vision for Joint Working Programme Board

2.16 JP advised that there were options which could be considered including secondment in order to address the crystallization issue. The s151 officers will need to consider the financial risks and understand the financial options and HR issues.

2.17 Programme Board members provided initial feedback around partner commitment to the Vision and pace of change.

Action: Activist will consider the views and issues raised by the Programme Board for inclusion within the final report to be presented to the next Programme Board along with the pensions options being prepared by GOSS.

2.19 At this stage all officers left the meeting whilst interim management arrangements were discussed.

2.20 EB presented suggested options for interim management arrangements that put in place sufficient capacity and skills to:

- Ensure that 'business as usual' service delivery is maintained.
- Manage an overall programme that ensures a smooth transition.
- Deliver 'early win' projects that are aligned with the programme.

2.21 Three interim senior officer roles were proposed to lead on the development of 2020 Vision:

Leadership Roles	Comments
Interim 'Lead' Head of Paid Service (includes lead commissioning responsibilities).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each authority would retain a head of paid service (which may be shared) who would manage any 'retained' services. • The Lead HoPS would act as co-ordinator for commissioning 2020 Vision, ensuring each authority's interests are being articulated and represented. • Role includes establishing the "small number of expert advisors who commission and monitor services" and managing any shared commissioning functions.
Programme Director (fixed term).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role would be to support the Programme Board and, in due course, the Joint Committee to ensure the effective development and implementation of the programme. • This post does not retain any statutory officer responsibilities.
Interim "Managing Director" of new shared service organisation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role is to establish, shape and lead new shared service organisation, instilling new culture and working methods.



2020 Vision for Joint Working Programme Board

- This post does not retain any statutory officer responsibilities.

2.22 BR indicated that FODDC would expect to see open recruitment for permanent appointments.

2.23 Taking into account the proposed direction of travel, the recommendations were as follows:

1. That interim appointments are made to the three senior officer posts, ring-fenced initially to internal candidates.
2. The three posts would share collective responsibility for delivering the 2020 Vision programme.
3. That the commissioning function be separated from the joint shared service.

Action: The recommendations were endorsed as the basis for further consultation and work on more detailed proposals.

3. Presentation on TCA bid to be submitted on 1st October

3.1 DN advised that the work that Activist had presented will inform the bid and that officers will be working next week to complete the bid so that it can be submitted by 1 October.

3.2 The financial case was also informed by the work that Activist had done and the proposed approach endorsed by the Programme Board today. JP advised that the finance officers had reworked the business case and were happy that savings of £5.2 pa could be delivered. She reminded the board that this was a sizeable programme and that costs to implement the proposal fully were in the region of £8.3m.

3.3 The implementation costs had been informed by lessons learnt from establishing GOSS, shared services across CDC/WODC and from establishing Ubico and the Leisure and Culture Trust. Costs would ensure that business as usual was not impacted and that there was sufficient backfill and capacity. In response to a question she advised that the costs related to the REST programme were not included but ICT costs had been included.

3.4 It was agreed that the full cost of the programme should be included within the bid but that the costs should be broken down across the two strands and into component parts. A request for 50% funding should be made but if DCLG decide to scale back the information will be presented in a menu format that they can choose which elements to fund.

3.5 It was agreed that the signatures of the four leaders would be included in the bid.

Action: Officers to submit bid on basis of strategic approach outlined in discussion in 2 above and



2020 Vision for Joint Working Programme Board

with a financial case set out in 3.4 above.

4. Programme/budget update

4.1 The programme update was noted.

5. Costs request

5.1 The additional costs of £10K for the strategic business case and interim management arrangements work was noted and agreed.

Action: Additional costs to be authorized by s151 officer at CBC

6. Any other business

6.1 It was agreed to review location and chairing of meetings and to use video conferencing where appropriate.

Next Meeting – 31st October 2014