

LGR Implementation Board
Friday 29 July 2022
2.00 pm John Meikle Room- Deane
House at Somerset West and Taunton
District Council



To: The Members of the LGR Implementation Board

Cllr V Keitch (Chair), Cllr B Revans, Cllr L Leyshon, Cllr D Fothergill, Cllr F Purbrick, Cllr F Smith-Roberts, Cllr R Wyke, Cllr D McGinty and Cllr J Clark

All Somerset County Council Members are invited to attend meetings of the Cabinet and Scrutiny Committees.

Issued By Scott Wooldridge, Monitoring Officer and Strategic Manager - Governance and Democratic Services – 21st July 2022

For further information about the meeting, please contact Andrew Melhuish on andrew.melhuish@somerset.gov.uk or Laura Woon on laura.woon@somerset.gov.uk

Guidance about procedures at the meeting follows the printed agenda.

This meeting will be open to the public and press, subject to the passing of any resolution under Regulation 4 of the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012.

This agenda and the attached reports and background papers are available www.somerset.gov.uk/agendasandpapers



RNID typetalk

AGENDA

Item LGR Implementation Board - 2.00 pm Friday 29 July 2022

Public Guidance notes contained in agenda annex

1 **Appointment of the Local Government Reorganisation Implementation Board Vice-Chair**

The Chair of the Local Government Reorganisation Implementation Board will invite nominations from the Board Members and preside over the election.

2 **Apologies for Absence**

To receive Board Member's apologies.

3 **Declarations of Interest**

Details of all Members' interests in District, Town and Parish Councils can be viewed on the Council Website at County Councillors membership of Town, City, Parish or District Councils and this will be displayed in the meeting room (Where relevant). The Statutory Register of Member's Interests can be inspected via request to the Democratic Service Team.

4 **Public Question Time**

The Chair will allow members of the public to present a petition on any matter within the Board's remit. Questions or statements about any matter on the agenda for this meeting may be taken at the time when each matter is considered (see guidance notes).

5 **Summary terms of reference & role of Implementation Board** (Pages 9 - 16)

To consider the report.

6 **Programme Update** (Pages 17 - 54)

- Programme Scorecard
- Programme risk register
- PwC monthly review for June, and half year review
- Implementation Board draft forward plan

To receive a presentation and report on the programme update.

7 **Review of Programme Strategic Objectives** (Pages 55 - 64)

To receive a presentation.

Item LGR Implementation Board - 2.00 pm Friday 29 July 2022

8 **Local Community Networks: update and items for Board review** (Pages 65 - 78)

To receive a presentation.

9 **LGR Advisory Board - proposal to reinstate** (Pages 79 - 82)

To consider the report.

10 **Consequential Parliamentary Order** (Pages 83 - 92)

To consider the report.

11 **LGR Implementation Board - Meeting Dates & Membership** (Pages 93 - 100)

To consider the report.

12 **Any Other Urgent Items of Business**

The Chair may raise any items of urgent business.

This page is intentionally left blank

Guidance notes for the meeting

1. **Council Public Meetings**

The former regulations that enabled virtual committee meetings ended on 7 May 2021. Since then, all committee meetings need to return to face-to-face meetings. The requirement is for members of the committee and key supporting officers to attend in person, along with some provision for any public speakers. However due to the current COVID restrictions and social distancing measures only a small number of people can attend as meeting room capacities are limited. Provision will be made wherever possible for those who do not need to attend in person including the public and press who wish to view the meeting to be able to do so virtually.

2. **Inspection of Papers**

Any person wishing to inspect minutes, reports, or the background papers for any item on the agenda should contact Democratic Services at democraticserviceteam@somerset.gov.uk or telephone 01823 357628.

They can also be accessed via the council's website on www.somerset.gov.uk/agendasandpapers.

Printed agendas can also be viewed in reception at the Council offices at County Hall, Taunton TA1 4DY.

3. **Members' Code of Conduct requirements**

When considering the declaration of interests and their actions as a councillor, Members are reminded of the requirements of the Members' Code of Conduct and the underpinning Principles of Public Life: Honesty; Integrity; Selflessness; Objectivity; Accountability; Openness; Leadership. The Code of Conduct can be viewed at: [Code of Conduct](#)

4. **Minutes of the Meeting**

Details of the issues discussed, and recommendations made at the meeting will be set out in the minutes, which the Committee will be asked to approve as a correct record at its next meeting.

5. **Public Question Time**

If you wish to speak, please contact Democratic Services by 5pm 3 clear working days before the meeting. Email democraticserviceteam@somerset.gov.uk or telephone 01823 357628.

Members of public wishing to speak or ask a question will need to attend in

person or if unable can submit their question or statement in writing for an officer to read out.

In order to keep everyone safe, we respectfully request that all visitors to the building follow all aspects of the Covid-Secure guidance. Failure to do so may result in you being asked to leave the building for safety reasons.

After entering the Council building you may be taken to a waiting room before being taken to the meeting for the relevant agenda item to ask your question. After the agenda item has finished you will be asked to leave the meeting for other members of the public to attend to speak on other items.

A slot for Public Question Time is set aside near the beginning of the meeting, after the minutes of the previous meeting have been agreed. However, questions or statements about any matter on the agenda for this meeting may be taken at the time when each matter is considered.

At the Chair's invitation you may ask questions and/or make statements or comments about any matter on the Committee's agenda – providing you have given the required notice. You may also present a petition on any matter within the Committee's remit. The length of public question time will be no more than 30 minutes in total (20 minutes for meetings other than County Council meetings).

You must direct your questions and comments through the Chair. You may not take a direct part in the debate. The Chair will decide when public participation is to finish.

If an item on the agenda is contentious, with many people wishing to attend the meeting, a representative should be nominated to present the views of a group.

An issue will not be deferred just because you cannot be present for the meeting. Remember that the amount of time you speak will be restricted, to three minutes only.

In line with the council's procedural rules, if any member of the public interrupts a meeting the Chair will warn them accordingly.

If that person continues to interrupt or disrupt proceedings the Chair can ask the Democratic Services Officer to remove them as a participant from the meeting.

Provision will be made for anybody who wishes to listen in on the meeting only to follow the meeting online.

6. **Meeting Etiquette for participants**

- Only speak when invited to do so by the Chair.
- Mute your microphone when you are not talking.
- Switch off video if you are not speaking.
- Speak clearly (if you are not using video then please state your name)
- If you're referring to a specific page, mention the page number.
- Switch off your video and microphone after you have spoken.
- There is a facility in Microsoft Teams under the ellipsis button called turn on live captions which provides subtitles on the screen.

7. **Exclusion of Press & Public**

If when considering an item on the agenda, the Committee may consider it appropriate to pass a resolution under Section 100A (4) Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 that the press and public be excluded from the meeting on the basis that if they were present during the business to be transacted there would be a likelihood of disclosure of exempt information, as defined under the terms of the Act.

If there are members of the public and press listening to the open part of the meeting, then the Democratic Services Officer will, at the appropriate time, ask Participants to leave the meeting when any exempt or confidential information is about to be discussed.

8. **Recording of meetings**

The Council supports the principles of openness and transparency. It allows filming, recording and taking photographs at its meetings that are open to the public - providing this is done in a non-disruptive manner. Members of the public may use Facebook and Twitter or other forms of social media to report on proceedings. No filming or recording may take place when the press and public are excluded for that part of the meeting. As a matter of courtesy to the public, anyone wishing to film or record proceedings is asked to provide reasonable notice to the Committee Administrator so that the relevant Chair can inform those present at the start of the meeting.

We would ask that, as far as possible, members of the public aren't filmed unless they are playing an active role such as speaking within a meeting and there may be occasions when speaking members of the public request not to be filmed.

A copy of the Council's Recording of Meetings Protocol is available from the Committee Administrator for the meeting.

Please contact the Committee Administrator or Democratic Services on 01823 357628 or email democraticserviceteam@somerset.gov.uk if you have any questions or concerns.

Somerset County Council
LGR Implementation Board
– 29 July 2022

LGR Implementation Board – Terms of Reference

Lead Officer: Scott Wooldridge – Monitoring Office & Strategic Manager – Governance & Democratic Services

Author: Andrew Melhuish – Democratic Services – Service Manager

Contact Details: Andrew.melhuish@somerset.gov.uk

1. Summary

- 1.1.** The LGR Implementation Board was formed following a report to Executive on 15 June 2022.
- 1.2.** The Terms of Reference for the LGR Implementation Board are submitted for note.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1. To note the Terms of Reference for the LGR Implementation Board.**

3. Background

- 3.1.** On 15 June 2022 the Executive agreed to establish an LGR Implementation Board to monitor the LGR programme and provide advice and recommendations on its implementation to the Executive of Somerset County Council.
- 3.2.** The LGR Implementation Board will exist until 31 March 2023 and consist of 9 members, 3 from Somerset County Council (nominated by the Leader of that Council), 2 members of Somerset County Council (nominated by the Leader of that council's largest Opposition political group), 1 member of each of the 4 districts (nominated by the Leader of their respective council).
- 3.3.** The Terms of Reference the Board will monitor the programme and provide advice and recommendations on its implementation to the Executive of Somerset County Council.
- 3.4.** The Terms of Reference for the LGR Implementation Board are set out in Appendix A.

4. Consultations undertaken

- 4.1.** None required to support this report.

5. Implications

- 5.1.** No specific financial or risk implications have been identified in respect of the

recommendations in this report.

6. Background papers

6.1. Executive Report – 15 June 2022.

Note For sight of individual background papers please contact the report author

Local Government Reorganisation Implementation Board

Terms of Reference

Purpose

1. On 17 March 2022 the Secretary of State made the Somerset (Structural Changes) Order 2022 (the SCO). The SCO sets out the mechanism for the reorganisation of local government and the establishment of a single unitary council in Somerset on 1 April 2023. The SCO further provides that during the period from 10 May 2022 until 31 March 2023 the Executive of Somerset County Council will be responsible for:
 - preparing for and facilitating the economic, effective, efficient and timely transfer of the district councils' functions, property, rights and liabilities (the Main Transitional Function); and
 - any other executive function specified by the Secretary of State in orders made under sections 7 or 20 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 or in regulations made under section 14 of that act (the Article 7 Functions).
2. The LGR Implementation Board (the Implementation Board) will monitor the reorganisation programme in Somerset and provide advice and recommendations on its implementation to the Executive of Somerset County Council. The Implementation Board will have the responsibilities set out in paragraph 17.
3. The Implementation Board will make recommendations in accordance with the principles of good decision-making namely:

- giving consideration to all options available;
- having regard to due consultation;
- giving consideration to professional advice from officers;
- having clarity of aims and desired outcomes;
- that the action proposed must be proportionate to the desired outcome;
- having respect and regard for human rights and for the councils' Public Sector Equality Duties;
- a presumption in favour of openness, transparency and accountability;
- only relevant matters being taken into account;
- due weight being given to all material considerations (including opportunities and risks);
- proper procedures being followed.

Term

4. The Implementation Board will exist until 31 March 2023.

Membership and voting

5. The Implementation Board will be made up of 9 members drawn from the Legacy Councils as follows:
 - 3 members of Somerset County Council nominated by the Leader of that Council;

- 2 members of Somerset County Council nominated by the leader of that council's largest Opposition political group;
 - 1 member of each of the 4 district councils nominated by the leader of their respective council.
6. Each member will have one vote.
 7. In the event of a member of the Implementation Board ceasing to be a member of their appointing council, the person responsible for their nomination to the Implementation Board shall nominate another member in their place.
 8. Each person nominating a member of the Implementation Board may designate another member to act as substitutes for the member(s) appointed under paragraph 5 above if the appointed member(s) is unable to attend a meeting of the Implementation Board. Substitutions may only be made on a meeting-by-meeting basis. Any substitutions must be notified to the Monitoring Officer of Somerset County Council by 9.00am on the day of the relevant meeting.
 9. For the avoidance of doubt, it is a matter for the respective leaders to appoint their members/substitutes.
 10. The Chairperson will be the County Council's Lead Member for Local Government Reorganisation & Prosperity. The Vice Chairperson of the Implementation Board will be elected by the Implementation Board at its inaugural meeting. If neither the Chairperson nor the Vice Chairperson are present, the Implementation Board will elect a Chairperson for the meeting from the members present.

11. The quorum for the Implementation Board will be 5 members, including at least 1 member from a district council. Unless the law provides otherwise, all matters shall be decided by a majority of the votes of the members present and voting; if there are equal numbers of votes for and against, the Chairperson of the meeting shall exercise a second, casting vote.

Meeting arrangements

12. Somerset County Council will act as administering authority to the Implementation Board and provide all necessary governance support.
13. The Implementation Board will meet at least monthly and otherwise as may be determined by the Chairperson. Where either a majority of members or at least three district council members submit a signed request for an extraordinary meeting in writing to the Chairperson (or the Vice-Chairperson in the absence or incapacity of the Chairperson), the Chairperson (or Vice-Chairperson as the case may be) must make arrangements to call an extraordinary meeting within 10 calendar days of receiving the request.
14. The administering authority will give notice of time, date and venue for the meetings in accordance with the provisions of the access to information requirements of the Local Government Act 2000 as amended and ensure compliance with The Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012.
15. At the inaugural and subsequent meetings of the Implementation Board the standing orders of the Implementation Board will be those of Somerset County Council. The Implementation Board may at any time approve its own set of standing orders which will take effect thereafter or at such other time as the Implementation Board may determine.

16. Meetings of the Implementation Board could take place in a number of locations around the county of Somerset. The Implementation Board will determine a programme of meeting locations for the period of its constitution at its inaugural and/or subsequent meetings.

Functions

17. The Implementation Board will:

- Monitor and make recommendations to Somerset County Council's Executive on the delivery of the Implementation Plan for the unitary council;
- Review and make recommendations to Somerset County Council's Executive on the allocation of revenue and capital expenditure to be made for delivery of the Implementation Plan by the Executive of Somerset County Council.
- Review and make recommendations to Somerset County Council's Executive on submissions to DLUHC in relation to the preparation orders and directions consequential to the SCO including those dealing with civic and ceremonial matters. This includes all matters relating to the transition of mayors, sheriffs, chartered trustees and insignia.
- Review and make recommendations to Somerset County Council's Executive on the development of the Constitution and the Schemes of Delegation for the unitary council to be established in Somerset;
- Review and make recommendations to Somerset County Council's Executive on plans to align existing change activities across the councils;

- Review and make recommendations to Somerset County Council's Executive on the development of the unitary council's annual budget 2023/24 and the associated medium term financial plan;
- Review and make recommendations to Somerset County Council's Executive on the development of policies for the unitary council and protocols across the five councils for use during the transition period to support the implementation of the unitary council and delivery of its annual budget 2023/24.
- Consult on (with the expectation that any comments arising from that consultation will be taken into consideration by the councils' executives in respect of the recommendations that they make to their full council):
 - the budgets to be set by each of the councils for the financial years 2022/23 and any medium-term financial plan to be set by the councils (or any of them); and
 - any policies or plans to be implemented by any of the councils and which will have a material impact on the delivery of the Implementation Plan or the rights and/or obligations of the new unitary council in Somerset on its establishment.
- Make recommendations on all of the above to the Executive of Somerset County Council.

Links between the Implementation Board and other bodies of the Somerset Local Authorities

18. The councils will separately constitute a joint scrutiny committee or panel, the purpose of which will be to scrutinise the work of the Executive of Somerset

County Council in relation to the implementation of the unitary council in Somerset.

19. The Executive of Somerset County Council will receive advice from the Implementation Board but for the avoidance of doubt will not be bound by its recommendations.

This page is intentionally left blank

Together we are delivering your

New Somerset Council

Programme update

Alyn Jones, Alastair Higton, Angela Farmer

Programme Scorecard for month of June

Alyn Jones

Key points for discussion:

1. Overall programme status: Amber
2. The programme is part of the overall approach to MTFP
3. 17 of 712 products are at risk or off track
4. Resourcing remains a challenge particularly in the Service Alignment workstream, however work is under way to understand where these pressures are greatest and agree a solution.

Ask of Implementation Board:

- To review and note the scorecard
- To review and note the programme budget

	Overall RAG		Resources		Schedule	
	Last Period	This Period	Last Period	This Period	Last Period	This Period
Overall Prog. RAG	G	A	A	A	G	G
Assets Optimisation: Property	G	A	A	A	G	A
Assets Optimisation: Technical	A	A	G	G	G	G
Communities, Customers & Partnerships	G	G	A	A	G	G
Finance	G	A	G	A	G	A
Governance	G	G	A	A	G	G
People	G	G	A	A	G	G
Service Alignment	A	A	R	R	A	A

Escalations & Awareness

Awareness

Programme

•In regard to overall programme delivery, gaps remain in some delivery plans and all workstreams are working to ensure all milestones for these deliverables are known and added to the master data before the end of July

Governance

•Work is ongoing between PMO/Governance to provide Legal Services with the overview of all deliverables requiring a decision so that Legal Services can do an initial assessment of which deliverables require Legal advice/support. Critical that all Ws heed this assessment and seek legal guidance where required.

Finance

•Capital Programme – Interim resource appointed and in post to complete baseline assessment of capital programmes/bids across the 5 councils by end July. Sub WS is confident that Capital Strategy and investments for Yield Strategy will still be delivered within required timeframes.

•LGR Savings – The LGR programme is being used as part of the vehicle to deliver the MTFP to ensure that the alignment, design and development of services across the programme is progressed within the available budget envelopes. The Financial Strategy Report was approved by the Executive the July and the MTFP process will be launched with key stakeholders/managers 21st July.

Resource

Resources by Sub-Workstream	Last Period	This Period
Total Sub-Workstream Scorecards:	101	99
Sub-Workstreams Sufficiently Resourced	68	71
Sub-Workstreams with Borderline Resources	27	22
Sub-Workstreams Inadequately Resourced	6	6
No. of Products within Inadequately Resourced Sub-WSs	39	122
No. of Tranche 1 Products within Inad. Resourced Sub-WSs	13	4

Time

Time used and remaining until Vesting Day (April 2023):	Last Period <small>(As of)</small> 31/05/2022	This Period <small>(As of)</small> 30/06/2022
Time Used <i>(Since Oct 2021)</i>	242 Days (44%)	272 Days (50%)
Time Remaining	305 Days (56%)	275 Days (50%)

Product Delivery (Tranche 1 and 2)

Page 22

All Workstreams	All T1 & T2 Products	Tranche 1	Tranche 2
Total Number of Products	245	179	66
Delivered	39	38	1
On Track	187	135	52
At Risk	0	0	0
Off Track	2	2	0
On Hold/Not yet Started	17	4	13

Milestone Delivery (Tranche 1 and 2)

All Workstreams	All T1 & T2 Products	Tranche 1	Tranche 2
Total Number of Products	712	504	208
Delivered	151	129	22
On Track	481	305	176
At Risk	9	8	1
Off Track	8	8	0
On Hold/Not yet Started	9	0	9

Programme Risk Update

Friday 29th July 2022

Angela Farmer

Ask of the Implementation Board:

- To note the 17 current risks on the register
- To determine if there are any other risks that should be considered
- To determine frequency of updates of programme level risks to the Board

Key points for discussion:

1. General update on risks and the development of the programme level risks
2. Overview of the current programme level risks
3. Overview of how they are monitored

Risks

For this specific programme the definition of risk is:

The effect of uncertainty on objectives

Or in other words....

A potential for something to occur that can have an impact on what you are trying to deliver

Introduction to the approach taken in presenting Programme Level Risks

Reports to Programme Steering Group and Programme Board include

1. Dashboard – in effect a high level overview of
 1. The number of programme level risks and which workstream carries the risk
 2. An overview of the residual scores and identification of the highest level of residual risks
 3. An overview of workstream risks
2. An overview of all programme level risks
 1. A more detailed overview of each of risks including controls and actions that are in place

LGR Risks - July 2022

Programme Level Risks:

Overview of total number of risks:

Workstream	Total N
Finance	4
People	3
SAI	3
CCP	2
PSG/PMO	5

Residual likelihood Score of Programme level Risks

Remote	Unlikely	Possible	Probable	Certain
0	4	10	2	1

Likelihood score	Programme-level risk
Probable	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of staff Unforeseen emergency
Certain	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Budget gap

Workstream Risks:

Overview of total number of risks:

Workstream	Total number of risks
People	26
CCP	14
SAI	31
Finance	20
Assets	25
Governance	14
Total:	149

Category	Workstream	Risk Title	Cause	Effect	Risk Owner (Group)	Controls (Mitigating Actions)	Further action required	Risk Before Mitigation	Residual Risk	Risk ID
Benefits - Cash	Strategic Risk	There is a risk of a significant budget gap for new Somerset Council in 2023/24 when Districts and County budgets combined, significantly impacting the financial sustainability of the new unitary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Councils use once-off sources of funding to balance their 2022/23 budgets which creates a budget 'gap' for 2023/24 for Somerset Council - National changes in how councils are funded due April 2023 - Costs of demand & inflationary pressures increase above previous forecasts - Short term approach to borrowing for longer terms needs in rising interest rate environment 	Reductions in service budget and levels	Finance Workstream	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development of 2022/23 baseline budget for new Council by end of May 2022 to provide basis for the development of MTFP for new Somerset Council and the 2023/24 budget 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Finance & Assets Protocol in place across the 5 councils - S24 notice from DLUHC which takes effect from May 2022 - Budget Monitoring processes in the 5 councils 	Very High	Very High	10
Cost	Strategic Risk	Loss of staff from County and District Councils deemed essential to the programme delivery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Staff leave due to uncertainty - Loss of key staff with specific skills and knowledge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Delays in the delivery of the Programme implementation plan - Additional cost of resourcing eg temporary labour - Knock-in impacts to BAU service delivery - Insufficient level of experience and expertise to deliver the new council operations 	People Workstream	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Analysis of staff on fixed term contracts to 31/3/23 2. Explore mutual aid 3. Appointment of Chief Executive for SCC and new Council agreed by Full Council end of July 2022 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use of interim staff - Redeployment - Recruitment Protocol - Staff engagement to support development of culture (building on existing culture) throughout the lifetime of the programme 	Very High	High	12
Benefits - Cash	Strategic Risk	Failure of workstreams/projects to achieve their expected financial benefits as described in business case (£18.5m p.a. after 2 years)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Significant Workstream failure. - Loss or non-delivery of Essential products. - Unrealistic expectations of benefits assigned to workstreams or products 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of achievement of promised overall programme benefits. - Programme does not meet stakeholder expectations 	Finance Workstream	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Robust benefits realisation plan in place - Early modelling / forecasting of cash-benefits - Monitoring through programme reporting framework including escalation and intervention - Dedicated LGR Programme Manager (now in post) 	<p>Tranche 1 products agreed</p> <p>Work on Tranche 2 products started</p>	High	High	15
Quality	Strategic Risk	Loss of opportunity to align public and VCSE services to new operating model and outcomes defined in the Business Case	Ineffective partnership working / poor relationships between the five Somerset councils; partnership working between SCC and Police, Fire, CCG, Acute Hospital Trusts, ICS, and VCSE.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduced financial and non-financial benefits. - Poor relationships between partners and new authority. - Transformational opportunity lost, delayed or reduced - Negative impact on cross cutting outcomes for communities - Reputational damage for new Council 	Communities, Customers and Partnership Workstream	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Ensure LGR Advisory Board remains inclusive, transparent and accessible (CCP) 2.Stakeholder management plan(s) for critical products and across workplans (CCP) 3.External communications on purpose and benefits of the LGR programme (Comms) 4. Senior officer engagement with VCSE and partners (CCP) 5. VCSE and public voice represented (CCP) 6. Use of the Customer Panel to hear the voice of the public and users (CCP) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Complete partner and stakeholder mapping exercise (CCP) 2.Targeted engagement with all strategic partners (CCP) 3.Effective ongoing communications with all stakeholders about LGR programme and its objectives (Comms) 4.Effective LCN's 5.Services thinking about the relationship with the public and VCSE in design and delivery (SA) 	High	High	14
Quality	Strategic Risk	Design / products to create the new unitary council will not have the community as a central focus in the design of the new operating model	Focus is disproportionately on 'safe and legal' service delivery /Legacy ways of working are carried forward to implementation of the new authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Organisational culture is not community focussed -Inefficient partnership working. - Poor outcomes for communities. - Failure to deliver planned business case benefits 	Communities, Customers and Partnership Workstream	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Engagement with all workstreams to secure agreement / recognition that communities focus goes beyond 'safe and legal' (CCP) 2. Ensure interdependencies are identified and managed, through iterative discussion and collaboration (CCP) 3.Specifically, engage with People workstream to support an ethos and culture of communities and customers first (CCP/People) 4.Involve customers and communities in the design of products and services (CCP) 5.Learn from customer experience and feedback (CCP) 6.Develop sound business cases to underpin sufficient resourcing to deliver communities focused objectives (CCP/Finance) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Programme and workstream checkpoint review criteria 2. Ensure LGR Advisory Board remains effective, inclusive, transparent and accessible (PSG) 3. Embdoy community focus as a critical requirement of operating model development through workshops, research and engagement (CCP) 4. Ensure TOM development reflects emerging customer strategy and principles (CCP) 	High	High	19
Scope (Programme Deliverables)	Strategic Risk	Unforeseen emergency or business continuity interruption or rising tide situation that requires staff to be directed from the day job into incident response.	Civil Contingency / external event requiring standing up of councils resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inadequate resources in project delivery - Lack of management capacity - Reallocation of programme or existing council resources to support response and recovery 	Service Alignment Workstream	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create and maintain a Business Continuity Plan (BCP) for the LGR Programme (signed off by Programme Board) including: Engagement with Workstreams to develop the BCP, Engagement with Somerset Local Authorities Civil Contingencies Unit to ensure alignment with wider BCP arrangements across the programme and 5 councils, internal comms to ensure awareness and buy-in for BCP, and desktop test of BCP. (Resource constraints have delayed completion of this piece of work however more staff have been approved for PMO) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Programme Board overview of programme and escalation as appropriate from Steering Group and PMO. 2.Existing business continuity arrangements in each authority 	High	High	13

Category	Workstream	Risk Title	Cause	Effect	Risk Owner (Group)	Controls (Mitigating Actions)	Further action required	Risk Before Mitigation	Residual Risk	Risk ID
Scope (Programme Deliverables)	Strategic Risk	The risk that the back-office ERP (Enterprise Resource Planning) system not sufficiently implemented to support the new authority	- Failure to ensure new Microsoft Dynamics finance system in place for 1 April 2023	- Inability to pay invoices, raise invoices and monitor spending during the year	Finance Workstream	Continued close management of implementation partner against published programme, clear governance and oversight including third party, independent governance role all reporting in to formal Steering Group	Implementation plan that delivers in excess of the minimum viable product	High	High	26
Quality	Strategic Risk	Lack of a decision around contracts that are reaching the end of their life between now and April 2024	No strategic decision has been taken about what to do with contracts that need renewing before April 2024 and in some cases, have already been extended once.	Reduction in service levels	Service Alignment Workstream		Engage with finance and procurement sub workstreams to ensure that decisions are made that allow sufficient time to put contracts/arrangements in place and to mobilise.	Very High	Medium	228
Scope (Programme Deliverables) Page 28	Strategic Risk	The risk that there are insufficient people resources to implement LGR Programme and deliver the approved business case	- the programme not seen as BAU and the no 1 priority by council members and chief officers (all 5 councils) - Staff not released from normal operational duties - Insufficient capacity within legacy councils - Lack of resilience across assigned workforce	- programme not delivered to quality, time and cost - non-cash and cash benefits not delivered - Delays in the delivery of the Business Case objectives or compromised quality delivered - Additional cost of temporary staffing to fill resource gaps - Unmanageable workloads on staff	People Workstream	1.Programme checkpoint review to identify resource requirements by work stream and function. This will inform the following:- Recruitment Protocol and its application across the five councils 2. Resource Management Plan 3. Strong programme management and reporting to allow identification and resolution of potential staffing issues 4. Work across all 5 councils to pause or cease activity, or rescope within LGR programme to deliver greater benefit 5. Resource constraints to be reviewed and escalated weekly to CEOs and the programme board. To be reported to members at each Joint Committee 6. Removal of duplication across the programme	1. early definition of resource requirements (capability and capacity) as part of gateway 2. Validation of 1 with PwC as QA partner incorporating lessons learned from previous LGR programmes 3. Resource shortfalls to be raised to five CEOs to address 4. Interim labour arrangements to be defined as a fall back plan. 5. - Dedicated LGR Programme Manager (in post from Jan '22) 6. PwC as quality assurance partner in place from Dec '21. 7. 17 February 2022 agreement to fund additional PMO, project specific and subject matter expertise to the programme.	Very High	Medium	11
Benefits - Non-cash	Strategic Risk	The risk that the LGR programme negatively impacts service provision and improvement activities of Children's Services and Adult Social Care.	- Organisational and resource focus on these services is reduced or insufficient. - Services not drawn sufficiently into the programme. - Development of culture of the new authority fails to embrace these services	- Performance of service for vulnerable adults negatively impacted. - Poor external perceptions of quality of services. - Potential Government intervention	Programme Management Office Workstream	1.Modelling of interdependencies between programmes, reflected in respective plans 2.Active consideration within the emerging Target Operating Model	1. Strong communication within the programme 2. Adherence to project guidelines around Change Control, Benefits realisation and risk. 3. Horizon scanning 4. Cross-cutting involvement of senior managers across workstreams in particular Service Alignment and Improvement 5. Quarterly reporting to Programme Board 6. PMO engagement and participation with Integrated Care System Governance	High	Medium	21
Benefits - Non-cash	Strategic Risk	Inter-Dependencies between workstreams not managed effectively	Collaboration between different workstreams has been limited and further partnership working is required to define interdependencies between workstreams and clarify what input from SMEs is required.	Inability to deliver cross-cutting products successfully and therefore benefits not realised	Programme Management Office Workstream	Tranche 1 product dependencies to be assessed after Tranche 1 product list is signed off on 8th March 2022. Quality assurance of products list.	- Programme tranches developed to aid management of the overall programme - A process/approach for management of dependencies to ensure impacts of change (time/cost/quality) are easily understood at both workstream and programme level. Programme level - consider as part of Benefits realisation, PMO providing assurance against delivery of programme capabilities	High	Medium	139
Reputation / Political	Strategic Risk	The risk that BAU activity within the Councils is impacted by stretched staff resources balancing LGR and BAU work	- Poorly managed deployment of staff. - Pull on already insufficient capacity in existing councils. - Leadership teams unable to stand down activities deemed vital for local government delivery. - Failure to prioritise, pause, stop or rescope existing BAU and development work in the 5 councils - Government changes requiring action/implementation during transition	- Reduced capacity to deliver non-LGR activity to required quality. - Reputational harm to existing and new councils - Loss of staff owing to workload / disruption to services - Staff wellbeing	Steering Group	1. Recruitment protocol 2. Staff engagement at local level 3. BAU processes at local level to ensure any additional work is scrutinised before agreeing to continue 4. Monitoring key performance indicators for any drop off in service provision		High	Medium	25

Category	Workstream	Risk Title	Cause	Effect	Risk Owner (Group)	Controls (Mitigating Actions)	Further action required	Risk Before Mitigation	Residual Risk	Risk ID
Scope (Programme Deliverables)	Strategic Risk	The risk that non-delivery or late delivery of key LGR products that other workstreams are dependent on	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Complexity of the programme not fully understood (no critical path). - Time pressure not allowing full analysis of interdependencies across products, projects and workstreams. - Lack of understanding of key dependencies within the project workstreams. - Lack of detail in product lists. - Assumptions that work is being delivered elsewhere 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Missed opportunities. - Siloed working. - Failure to deliver key products. - Delays to workstreams and ultimately the programme. - Re-engineering of solutions / rework required 	Programme Management Office Workstream	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Robust programme and project planning - Modelling of interdependencies incorporated into work plans and must have - Adequate resourcing of programme staff with appropriate capabilities and capacity to deliver workplans - Utilise Lessons learned from other programmes. - Dedicated LGR Programme Manager (now in post) 	Reliable critical path is available, with regular opportunities to monitor and course-correct when necessary. Regular opportunities for project managers to review with workstream and sub-workstream leads. Review of workstream and programme scorecards	High	Medium	23
Scope (Programme Deliverables) Page 29	Strategic Risk	Uncontrolled change to the scope of the LGR programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Changes to programme or workstream scope made outside of agreed tolerances for escalation or decision-making - Inadequate impact assessment of any proposed change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Failure to deliver the new council to agreed time, cost and quality. - Failure to deliver agree financial and non-financial benefits. - Missed transformation opportunities for the new authority - Impact on capacity of teams to manage and deliver the programme: rework, wasted effort and reduction in shared understanding of programme priorities and required activity 	Steering Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change Control framework (February '22) for the programme including shared ownership by all programme staff. - Strong communication within the programme promoting adherence to guidelines around Change Control, Benefits realisation and risk. - Quality assurance of workstream reporting 	Programme Implementation Manual outlining decision-making tolerances and purpose of change controlCurrent Programme governance arrangements: PMO, Programme Steering Group and Programme Board to identify and (Change control process to be in place from early February '22)	High	Medium	27
Scope (Programme Deliverables)	Strategic Risk	The risk that there is insufficient capacity to manage the people side of change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Capacity at management level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Where programme outcomes and benefits results are dependent on collective, proficient, sustained adoption of new ways of working 	People workstream	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Change management approach, quality framework and tools established and in use 2. Supplementary offer to strengthen change capabilities started and will continue to evolve, e.g. targeted interventions and coaching, high risk, high need products in T1 3. Validation of approach and priorities with PwC and our Unitary partners 4. Working closely with comms and People workstream 5. Plans in place to identify and collaborate with wider change assets across all organisations 6. Mobilisation of tactical change management resource to work alongside and support existing network of change management across all organisations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2. Evidence based approach to defining extent and impact of T1 products to define level of need and target resource where needed most 3. Application of data and insight from across WS to build programme change plan and EIA support 4. Embedding change management within current assurance processes practice and reporting 5. Nominated Lead for People Change 	High	High	309
Scope (Programme Deliverables)	Strategic Risk	The risk that delivery of ICS implementation is not effectively joined-up with LGR implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interdependency between ICS and LGR is not sufficiently understood or acted upon 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Failure to deliver programme to agreed time, cost and quality. - Failure to deliver expected benefits. - Missed transformation opportunities 	Service Alignment Workstream		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Understanding of interdependencies incorporated into LGR work plans and must have - Adequate staff resource across both programmes with appropriate capabilities and capacity to address the work 	Medium	Medium	22
Cash	Risk	There is a risk that legacy		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Threat to opening financial position of the council 	Workstream					

Monitoring and review

Programme level risks are monitored and reviewed as follows:

1. Monthly reports to Programme Steering Group
 1. Discussions about the current risks on the register which can include reviews of current risks
 2. Identification of any new risks that the Group wish to further consider from which work will be undertaken to determine the risk and the actions being taken to reduce or mitigate the risk
2. Monthly reports to Programme Board
 1. Identification of any specific they wish to further consider or investigate
3. Weekly discussions with Programme Management Office
 1. Identification of any further mitigation or controls that need to be added
 2. Identification of any new risks for consideration
4. Discussions with workstreams as needed based
 1. Support to the workstreams on risks in general
 2. Identification of risks that need to be escalated to programme level
5. Working with PwC to align issues through their assurance work with Programme Level risks

Recommendations and decisions

1. To note the 17 risks currently on the programme risk register
2. Identification of any further risks that the board wish the programme to consider
3. Identification of frequency of future reports to the Board

PwC Monthly Report for June, and half-year review

Author:
PwC

This is the seventh monthly report and half yearly report which is intended to:

- Set out emerging themes, insights and reflections as part of the 'critical friend' role the core team have been commissioned to provide, informed by outputs from workshops, 1:1 meetings and smaller working sessions; and attendance at the Programme Steering Group and Programme Board meetings;
- Provide an overview of some of the key activities that have taken place over the past month;
- Propose solutions to issues identified and suggested next steps.

This monthly report (June 2022) contains reflections from a particular point in time and recognises the progress that has been made against issues or risks highlighted in previous reports.

Ask of Programme Board:

- To review the contents of the report

Key insights: half year view

Over the course of our review of the LGR programme over the past six months, the programme has made significant progress in moving from planning and setting the foundations of the programme, to delivering over 400 products across six workstreams in earnest. There is a clearer prioritisation of activities and deliverables with a strong focus on achieving the Tranche 1 elements that are critical for vesting day. However, as to be expected with a programme of this scope and complexity, a number of issues remain that need to be addressed to (1) establish a safe and legal functioning authority on 1st April 2023, (2) deliver on the benefits of LGR based on the commitments made in the business case and to set a firm foundation for future transformation and financial sustainability for the council.

Key achievements include:

- **The Programme has a clear view of the ‘minimum viable product’ that needs to be delivered on vesting day in Somerset,,** and the transformational activity that will occur subsequently. This is demonstrated in the restructuring of the programme into three tranches, and prioritisation of over 170 products (including top approx. 49 products and subproducts) that must be in place by 1st April 2023.
- **The shift from ‘planning’ to ‘delivering’ the programme is mostly complete.** The programme management and reporting infrastructure (including processes and tools) has been effectively embedded, risks have been identified and managed, and all workstreams are now delivering tranche 1 and 2 products. 22 (5%) of products have already been delivered.
- **The Programme Board has developed a more focused approach in leading the programme,** making a number of key strategic decisions over recent months to guide the Programme Steering Group and six workstreams, for example around the activity analysis, target operating model, and MTFP.

Page 33

There are five areas of improvement that the programme should focus on going forward:

- Whilst the programme is focused on delivering tranche 1 products to establish a safe and legal authority, **it is also essential that the foundations continue to be laid down for the transformation and financial sustainability in the new council.** This includes continuing to develop the target operating model and develop plans to transform and improve services across tranches 2 and 3. This will be required to realise the benefits that underpinned the original decision to proceed with LGR, and to address the emerging MTFP savings gap.
- **There should be a continued theme of developing a stronger central steer and and top down approach to driving the programme.** This should be centred around the rapid definition of the operating model for the new council and re-shaping the programme to align with it, so that there is clear accountability and ownership on delivering the operating model across the workstreams. This will also help to reinforce a focus around the savings and benefits that will be achieved as the operating model is in place.
- **Operational grip at the workstream level needs to be improved to allay concerns around whether reporting accurately reflects the status of the programme.** Based on programme reporting, the majority of workstreams are reporting as ‘green’ and on track, apart from issues relating to resourcing. The devolved model of delivery, with subworkstream leads responsible for delivering products (two degrees of separation away from workstream leads and the PMO) means visibility at the level of operational detail required to hold sub workstream leads to account is difficult. Incomplete work plans, missing milestones, and lack of clarity in the scope of products, means that reporting does not necessarily provide an accurate picture of the progress made. It is important that workstream leads and workstream PMO have oversight and manage progress across each subworkstream more closely.
- **There remain continued difficulties in identifying cashable and non-cashable benefits (e.g. a lack of service consolidation savings identified) and the proposed directive approach to identifying savings through costed service options should be pursued at pace.** There is agreement and clarity around the LGR benefits being incorporated within the MTFP, and a clear approach and plan around strengthening the assumptions around benefits for tranche 1 and tranche 2 products in June. However, workstreams have expressed difficulty in identifying and quantifying benefits, in part impeded by the complexity of the approach. This has created challenges around the development of the MTFP, and this has also been impacted by delays in the Finance workstream in developing the financial baseline. Plans are being developed for a more centrally-driven approach and ownership to the identification and tracking of LGR savings which needs to be a focus.
- **Resource gaps need to be managed on a ongoing basis, in order to not impede project delivery.** Resource constraints drive most instances where products are not on track. While initial efforts were made to collate resource bids and recruit staff to fill critical gaps, there must be ongoing management and monitoring of resource gaps, reflecting BAU issues, such as attrition. This must be owned by each workstream. In addition, there needs to be a more granular assessment of the impact of LGR activities weighed against BAU for each subworkstream (taking into account statutory and customer facing services), which will occur in June.

Overview: June 2022

Summary for June 2022

Key headlines:

- The Programme is at a stage where it must balance the delivery of a safe and legal functioning authority with the requirement to identify LGR savings in the context of a widening MTFP savings gap, and define and set the foundations for the improvements and transformation that will occur post-vesting day. This requires a clear vision of the new council, which the operating model design will deliver. The Programme should bring together the operating model design, identification of savings, and tranche 2 and 3 planning as a combined piece of work. This should include key enablers, such as technology and its key related products (e.g. the applications roadmap and architecture) to inform opportunities to drive savings through self-service and automation.
- Programme leadership oversight and strategic steer have strengthened over the past few months, focusing on delivering tranche 1 products, facilitated by the new eight week forward view. LGR PMO provides check and challenge to each workstream on a monthly basis, and centrally coordinates key products, including the LGR savings, the operating model, activity analysis, dependency mapping, and change management.
- However, due to the fact that the Programme is devolved across two layers (workstream, and sub workstream - with the latter being responsible for delivering products), operational oversight at the workstream level remains inconsistent. Workstream PMO must oversee up-to-date work plans, with accurate milestones, and manage sub workstreams more closely, without relying on verbal updates. This will address issues where milestones are missing, not up to date, or where they are re-cast without central oversight. This will strengthen and improve workstream leads' ability to provide assurance of sub-workstream delivery. These themes were reinforced by the findings from the service standards deep dive.

Area of progress include:

- **Closer scrutiny of progress tracking:** The Programme scorecard shows that only four (out of 233) products are off track, with 32 (14%) delivered. The addition of an 8 week rolling plan shared with PSG enables focus on and scrutiny of imminent milestones and products due. LGR PMO has also proactively identified potential bottlenecks, where a significant number of products are due in October, November and January.
- **Clear approach to LGR savings:** there is a clear, centrally driven approach to the realisation and identification of savings. Savings will be split by service level, and Finance will provide workstreams with their savings targets, together with supporting guidance in July. Finance will retain central oversight and monitoring of the savings, while responsibility for the identification of savings will reside with the service leads. In the context of the widening MTFP gap, this requirement is broader than the LGR savings. It is important that transformation and alternative service delivery are explored as a key lever for realising savings, as many service standards are already operating at or near to the statutory minimum, which means that a reduction in service levels will not realise the savings required. The development of costed service structures and the activity analysis may also help to inform this work.
- **Identification and management of dependencies:** dependency mapping across products and workstreams, as well as at the programme level, has been complete, while outstanding data gaps need to be addressed to ensure all dependencies are comprehensively captured. Work is ongoing to embed the dependency management tool across all workstreams and subworkstreams.

Areas for consideration:

- **Continue to strengthen operational oversight at the workstream level:** Work plans (inc. milestones) and tranche 2 planning need to be updated and completed, otherwise they impede workstream PMO visibility of sub workstream progress, as well as impacting the accuracy of the scorecard reporting. It makes workstream PMO reliant on verbal updates from the sub workstreams, as opposed to a data-driven process, based on up to date project documentation, and milestones may be re-cast without central visibility. A programme of this scale and complexity, with sub workstreams leading product delivery, requires that workstream PMO has a comprehensive and accurate view of the status, risks, issues, and upcoming milestones of all sub workstreams.
- **Bringing together the activity analysis, operating model design, and MTFP to inform tranche 2 and 3 planning:** A range of core products that will inform the wider transformation of the new council post vesting day should tie in closely with the identification of LGR savings. The activity analysis will identify areas for investigation to realise further savings. In addition, operating model choices will be evaluated against indicative costs, so it is important that these parameters are set and consistent with the savings allocated to each service. Finally, technology as a key enabler in driving service improvements and efficiencies should be reflected in the technology strategy and applications roadmap.
- **Targeted approach to addressing resource constraints:** the ambiguity and lack of clarity around the extent and impact of the resourcing issue continues, with the majority of workstreams rating resources as amber, while maintaining that the majority, if not all products and milestones remain on track. It is not realistic to prioritise LGR above BAU activities across the board, and prioritisation should be done on a case by case basis for each sub workstream which is at risk of not delivering critical tranche 1 products without additional resource.

Overview and progress made against next steps from May

Now that the MVP is in delivery, there needs to be a focus on defining and the completion of planning of tranche 2 and 3, and ensuring alignment between these and the design and phased implementation of the operating model and MTFP to enable the benefits of LGR and ensure the fiscal sustainability of the new council.

Overview of issue	Suggested next steps from May	Progress made in June and suggested next steps
Programme leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The May report identified a number of areas of the Programme that would benefit from central steer, leadership, and coordination. These 'central products' include the operating model, activity analysis, benefits and savings identification, and change management. These key areas would form the locus of strategic leadership that would drive the vision and direction of the overall Programme, and provide a balance to the devolved model of delivery, with leads at the sub workstream level delivering products. In addition, the issue around how Adult, Children's Services, and Public Health are involved in LGR was raised as an ongoing issue, both with respect to the delivery of products (e.g. commissioning) and LGR savings. Finally, there are a number of strategic design decisions that are occurring at the workstream level and are being reviewed and approved by the workstream boards, and it is important that there is clarity around what should go to PSG / PB and what remains signed off at a workstream level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a more balanced model of delivery, which enables workstreams to be responsible for the delivery of products, while reinforcing Programme Board and PSG's role in steering and coordination key cross-cutting and strategic 'central' products. Initial planning has already begun to bring together the milestones for the operating model, MTFP, and activity analysis into a single timeline, which also includes key dependencies on products such as the corporate plan, and service standards. Building on this, more detailed planning needs to occur to bring together each of the 'central products' identified as a coherent whole and to ensure that they are jointly delivered, working towards the shared timeframes of Executive approval in October and approval by Full Council in November. Together with the commitments in the business case, as the operating model is defined, this should help to set out a clear vision of what the future council will look like beyond 'safe and legal', and when the broader benefits of LGR will be felt by residents, staff and communities. The issue relating to the involvement of Adult Services, Children's Services, and Public Health remains, and will also need to be addressed as part of the operating model design.
Progress against delivery: tranche 1,2,3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The May report emphasised the importance of balancing the 'safe and legal' MVP for vesting day with scoping and defining the broader improvements that need to be achieved across tranche 2 and 3, in ensuring that the benefits underpinning the approval of the business case remain front of mind. In addition, the length of time taken to scope and plan tranche 2 products was identified as an issue, as a range of key milestones will need to be achieved over the next six months in order to deliver tranche 2 products after vesting day, and a number of tranche 2 products are key enablers of tranche 1 products. For some critical products (e.g. service standards), it is important to ensure clarity around what will be achieved, and what is and is not in scope. E.g the SAI workstream has reinforced that the service standards product will "ensure a level playing field, and not set out future service delivery". 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> While the focus on the MVP has helped with prioritisation, there remains room for interpretation around what constitutes the MVP and what will be delivered by vesting day. While a change control process has been established, sub workstreams have shifted some milestones to later dates (e.g. CCP and SAI), and these were deemed below the threshold, and not raised to PSG or PB. It is important to assess the cumulative impact of these changes, and if they alter the 'MVP' for vesting day. Around 20 products were reprofiled between May and June. In the examples above, the workstream PMO does not have sight of these shifting dates. Tranche 2 planning is in progress and not complete across the workstreams. For example only three workstreams have defined tranche 2 products for CCP, and planning for tranche 2 products is ongoing for the People workstream. PSG now has sight of an eight week view of forthcoming products and milestones. It is important that all work plans and milestones are kept up to date by each sub workstream (and workstream), and that any changes are captured through the established change control process. This will enable PSG to strengthen its focus on developing solutions to the issues identified.

Overview and progress made against next steps from May

Operational grip at the workstream level, in terms of their oversight and management of sub workstreams, remains an issue and needs to be strengthened to ensure that the Programme has an accurate and up to date view of the progress it is making. LGR savings need to be considered in the broader financial context of the emerging MTFP savings gap.

Overview of issue	Suggested next steps from May	Progress made in June and suggested next steps
<p>Programme and project management ways of working</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work was ongoing to complete the dependency mapping across products and workstreams. The dependency mapping, together with the SAI deep dive for the service standards product, and the monthly assurance reports identified a range of issues relating to the quality and completeness of work plans, which directly impacts the visibility of the progress workstreams are making in delivering their products (e.g. missing or inaccurate milestones, and a clustering of milestones at specific dates (e.g. 1st January). • It was suggested that, as part of the reporting process, workstream leads should provide more robust check and challenge with each sub workstream on the quality and completeness of their work plans, including activities and milestones. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The dependency mapping is completed, and the focus is now on ensuring the dependency mapping tool is used and embedded within each of the workstreams and sub workstreams. Outstanding data gaps around milestones and products need to be addressed to ensure all dependencies are comprehensively captured. • Across the dependency mapping, SAI deep dive into the service standards, and the monthly assurance meetings, there remains an issue around work plans and milestones being incomplete and not being kept up to date. This means that workstream PMO may not have an accurate view of the progress each sub workstream is making, and it impacts oversight from LGR PMO, due to inaccurate reporting. Several workstream leads and workstream PMOs said that they are unable to keep work plans and milestones up to date due to resource and time constraints. In terms of ways of working, workstream PMOs obtain verbal updates from sub workstreams and rely on sub workstreams to raise any issues or concerns. • There remains a requirement for more robust, documented, check and challenge between workstream PMO and sub workstreams, to ensure that they are delivering products on time and to a high standard, and proactively managing risks and dependencies, and that the delivery of related products across sub workstreams is coordinated and joined up.
<p>Benefits and LGR savings</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the May report, there was clarity that the LGR savings process will be incorporated as part of the overall MTFP process, and savings have been split at the service-level. In addition, work was ongoing to combine the MTFP timetable with the activity analysis, operating model, and other key milestones. • There was a suggestion that It may be helpful to establish a Finance-led group and governance arrangement (involving the People workstream and Benefits Lead) to drive and be held centrally accountable for the realisation of LGR savings, while recognising that workstreams have the understanding of their service required to identify savings opportunities. • There was a recognition that a driver of the delays in relation to the identification of benefits was around Finance amalgamating budgets and providing a financial baseline and the People workstream having a clear view of the establishment (inc. vacancies). • Finally, it was suggested that Finance should be involved and have sight of design decisions for key products that may impact MTFP (e.g. the IT applications roadmap). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In June, the Programme has taken a more central and directive approach in identifying the LGR savings, as part of MTFP. The Finance workstream will provide the workstreams with details of the financial baseline and service-level savings targets, together with supporting guidance in July, while maintaining central oversight. Workstreams will also require an accurate view of the current establishment, and they will receive the outputs of the activity analysis in July to help to identify areas for investigation. Service leads within workstreams will be responsible for identifying savings beyond those specific to LGR, which is important because LGR savings should not be delivered in isolation of the broader financial context of the new council. • This work needs to be conducted jointly and in parallel with the development of the target operating model and the scoping of the service improvements and transformation post-vesting day, as part of tranche 2 and 3 planning. • Finance will commission external support to develop costed service envelopes, informed by benchmarking with other unitary councils. A significant portion of savings are stemming from SAI, which will need to be disaggregated and managed at the right level (e.g. clarifying ownership for identifying these savings at the sub workstream level).

Overview and progress made against next steps from May

Reflecting technology's role as a key enabler, once the applications architecture and roadmap is completed, it needs to tie in to a range of key strategic products, including the operating model, and the MTFP. Workstreams have reported amber on resources for several months, but prioritisation of LGR against BAU needs to occur on a case by case basis, and this requires a more granular understanding of the resource gaps.

Overview of issue	Suggested next steps <u>from May</u>	Progress made in June and suggested next steps
Technology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The May report reinforced the strategic importance of the applications roadmap and architecture product, which was behind schedule due to delays in identifying a lead. Until the roadmap is completed, there will not be full visibility or clarity around the system and technology related activities required over the next 12 to 18 months (e.g which systems need to get migrated when). This is broadly being mitigated by not integrating any systems for vesting day (with knock on impacts to the SAI workstream), and focusing on core systems (e.g. ERP) and priority integrations. CCP is conducting a digital maturity assessment and the outputs of this assessment should directly inform the Applications Roadmap. It was unclear how the TDA reports to PSB / PB as a single voice around technology. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An update on the IT architecture and status of technology products was provided to the workstream leads as part of the fortnightly workshop and a proposed migration approach was presented to PSG. Reflecting the strategic importance of the applications roadmap, it needs to tie in to both the Finance workstream (due to its impact on MTFP), the operating model (so that it is aligned with the phased implementation of the operating model, as a key enabler), and SAI (as it will directly impact the types of service improvements that will be facilitated by technology). The 'single voice' around technology could be strengthened from both a governance, and a strategic and operational perspective. The applications roadmap and architecture, together with associated products including the technology strategy, and technology change and adoption plan, should be owned and driven by a single strategic lead who is able to readily navigate across TDA and PSG, with oversight around how in flight and forthcoming technology products are (a) contributing to the technology strategy, (b) enabling the operating model, and (c) delivering against the three tranches of the LGR Programme.
Change management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The May report identified instances where change management and communications activity was happening at a programme and workstream level, without central visibility and coordination. It reinforced the importance of having a central change management plan and capability that drives activity at the Programme level, supported by a strategic lead. The change management plan was in development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a more joined up approach around the change management, based on collaboration between the People workstream and LGR PMO. An assessment of people change across tranche 1 products has been completed to target support where change management is critical for the delivery of key products. Combined with technology change and adoption, this should inform the development of a programme-level change management plan, which is aligned to comms planning and activity. While each workstream now has a comms lead, there needs to be more consideration to how comms is delivered as one of a number of strands of change management, which also includes training and organisational development, ways of working and a culture, and tying this closely to benefits realisation.
Resource constraints	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The two key findings from the May report related to ensuring that the management of the resource bids was conducted on an ongoing basis, and that there needed to be a more granular understanding of the resource requirement across each workstream. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ambiguity and lack of clarity around the extent and impact of the resourcing issue continues, with the majority of workstreams are rating resources as amber, while maintaining that the vast majority, if not all products and milestones remain on track. It is not realistic to prioritise LGR above BAU activities across the board, and prioritisation should be done on a case by case basis for each sub workstream which is at risk of not delivering critical tranche 1 products without additional resource.

QA meetings: workstream specific insights (1/2)

The insights below reflect the key headlines from the monthly assurance meetings and workstream scorecards.

Overview of issue	Insights and suggested next steps
Asset Optimisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Out of 11 sub workstreams and 31 products, the “Applications Roadmap and Contracts Review, Integration Strategy and Systems Architecture, Integrated Lines of Business” subworkstream and its associated product is behind schedule, due to delays in onboarding a sub workstream lead. While delivery has now begun, only one milestone has been articulated: “Revised Detailed Work plan to be in place”, which is on track. Given its strategic importance, this product should have a number of meaningfully articulated milestones that are closely monitored both by the workstream PMO and lead, as well as PSG. This is because this product will set out the ambition for what can be achieved by vesting day, and the broader three year roadmap from a technology perspective. ● It is important that this product is not developed in isolation, and is developed in parallel with a range of related products, including (1) the technology strategy, (2) the digital strategy, (3) consolidated management of in flight projects, (4) tech adoption and change plan. Combining the applications roadmap (and programme of work that will emerge from it) with the consolidated view of in flight projects will provide an overview of the cumulative workload and resource requirement. The change freeze on tranche 1 products will help prioritisation. ● The concept of technology as a key enabler in the operating model of the new council, service improvements in the SAI workstream and beyond, and in identifying efficiencies as part of MTFP needs to be more strongly embedded across the programme. The applications roadmap and programme of work to migrate/merge/consolidate 285 applications over the next three years needs to align to the phasing of the operating model, and tranche 2 and 3 planning.
Service Alignment and Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The SAI workstream has reinforced that its RAG rating as Amber for Schedule, Red for Resourcing, and Amber overall, reflects the chronic issue of sub workstream leads managing BAU against LGR Programme delivery, and has requested (a) a blanket commitment from Programme Leadership that LGR takes priority, and (2) that Member and political commitments are de-prioritised ahead of LGR delivery. ● Currently, four subworkstreams are behind schedule, however 0 products are at risk of not being delivered, and 0 product milestones are at risk of not being reached, providing an inconsistent view of the workstream status. The overall summary from the workstream leads is that delivery is progressing, even if milestones are re-cast. When milestones are re-cast, this needs to be made clear in the reporting, which should include any knock-on impact on dependent products. ● It is important that the SAI PMO has closer oversight of how each workstream is delivering to its work plan, and that these are not verbal confirmations, but robust checks and challenges against up to date work plans. These issues were reflected in the findings on the service standards deep dive, set out later in this report. ● The de-scoping of what will be delivered for vesting day needs further scrutiny. An example of this is the business support sub workstream, which has just been formed. Little consideration has gone into understanding how digital and tech-enabled self-service can define what the business support capability could look like.
Customer, Communities, and Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There are concerns around whether the scorecard accurately reflects the progress made in this workstream, and whether the workstream lead and workstream PMO have sufficiently close oversight of how each subworkstream is progressing. There are a range of milestones, including those which are overdue, that are not up to date. 20 products do not have milestones assigned, at least two milestones have passed but which are still showing on track; any many imminent milestones will need to be updated or pushed back. Some products are not placed in a tranche. When asked about the status of each subworkstream, and whether the reporting is accurate, the workstream PMO said that they are reliant on what the subworkstreams are reporting back. ● Only three workstreams have defined tranche 2 products, and there remains some work to do to complete planning for these products.

QA meetings: workstream specific insights (2/2)

The insights below reflect the key headlines from the monthly assurance meetings and workstream scorecards.

Page 40

Overview of issue	Insights and suggested next steps
Finance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Finance workstream has shifted from green to amber, due to delays in budget planning and monitoring relating to the amalgamation of the base budgets and the LGR savings. The current MTFP budget gap is approximately £45m, and issues around budget and savings are “clouding the rest of the workstream”, which is now Amber across the board. The workstream is confident that they will not deliver LGR savings, which are rated red in the scorecard. • There is a recognition that, for a core set of savings to be realised, work needs to commence imminently (e.g. the £0.5m saving for asset rationalisation requires engagement with Members imminently as decisions need to be made in the coming months). To expedite and drive the LGR savings forward, Finance will provide workstream leads with service-level savings targets informed by benchmarked costed service structures, together with supporting guidance in July. • Similar to other workstreams, the workstream PMO does not have an accurate and up to date view of how each subworkstream is tracking against their work plan, and expressed that it would be difficult to have an eight week forward plan, due to resource and time constraints. • While the majority of products will fall in tranche 1 for this workstream, tranche 2 planning has not been complete, and only one tranche 2 product has been planned. • It is unclear how much progress has been made month-on-month relating to the ERP system based on the workstream scorecard, and it would be helpful to have a more granular understanding of the activities and progress made for that specific subworkstream.
People	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The workstream scorecard depicts a positive view of workstream progress, with no issues identified across the entire workstream (two issues are “in development”), all sub workstreams are on track apart from Health and Safety (which mobilised later), and all products (out of 55) and milestones (out of 126) are on schedule. However, the inaccurate recording of milestones (e.g. the T&Cs product is due for 1st July, the organisation design principles show they were completed in April, but they haven’t commenced, and three tranche 1 products do not have a due date) needs to be addressed to strengthen the validity of the reporting. While acknowledging that the organisation design and tier 1 - 3 structures will be iterated based on a set of key dependencies around the CEX appointment and operating model design, it is important that an initial set of milestones can be defined, and adjusted when required. This is particularly important in the context of the assurances sought by Programme Board that tiers 1-3 are appointed before vesting day, with the workstream responding that this depends on whether there is external recruitment for these posts. • As with all other workstreams, planning for tranche 2 products is ongoing.
Governance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There has been little change with respect to the Governance workstream’s scorecard since last month. There is a continued focus on establishing the Transition and Implementation governance, all products are on track, and all workstreams are on schedule. While there is an acknowledgement that the amber status for resourcing reflects a three month forward view, and a set of longstanding issues relating to securing legal services skills and capability, as with the other workstreams, it is not clear at which point milestones will be eventually impacted by these resource constraints. • There are a number of subworkstreams that could benefit from the addition of more than a single milestone date to facilitate progress tracking (e.g. the Corporate Planning subworkstream has a single (and final) milestone relating to approval by Full Council in November). In addition, there is an insufficient level of detail around the EMS system, reflecting the six month lead in time and the fact that it needs to be in place ahead o the 2023 election in May. • As per other workstreams, tranche 2 planning has not been completed, and only two products have been identified for tranche 2.

LGR Implementation Board Draft Forward Plan

**Author:
Alastair Higton**

A draft forward plan for the Board has been generated from milestones and decision points of critical Tranche 1 products.

Dates will be confirmed with Workstreams however they have been validated by the PMO and Monitoring Officer.

Ask of Programme Board:

- To review and note the contents of the forward plan and propose any other topics that could come to the Board

Implementation Board draft forward plan (dates tbc)

- Council Constitution
- Target Operating Model
- Proposed structure for the new Council
- Unitary Council Budget
- Service Standards for the new authority
- People Strategy and Plans
- Branding for the new Council
- Capita Contract plans
- Customer Strategy and plans
- Asset Management Plan and Policy Framework
- Asset and Service Devolution
- ICT Strategy and plans
- Digital Strategy and plans
- Partnership Strategy and plans
- Data Protection and Information Governance compliance
- Local Community Networks matters
- Emergency Planning and Business Continuity approach

Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) Implementation Board LGR Programme Level Risks - update

29th July 2022

Lead Officer: Alyn Jones, LGR Programme Director

Author: Angela Farmer, Risk Manager for LGR Programme

Contact Details: angela.farmer@sedgemoor.gov.uk

1. Summary

- 1.1.** There are many definitions of risk. In most cases it is the potential for something to occur that can have an impact on what you are trying to deliver.

Therefore, to have risk management in place is about good governance and by having good governance in place, the programme can look to achieve the objectives it has set itself.

The programme level risks identified are those that the programme need to be aware and actively mitigate in order to ensure that all products are delivered.

Without effective risk management, the LGR programme will fail to deliver the desired outcomes either in terms of time, cost, quality, or a blend of all three.

2. Issues for consideration / recommendations

- 2.1.** Members of the Implementation Board are asked to note the current LGR programme risks.
- 2.2.** Members of the Implementation Board to note the arrangements for review and development.

3. Background

- 3.1.** As part of the development of the LGR programme, a risk management framework for the programme was developed. This has allowed consistency in approach to risk assessment, scoring and mitigation. It also develops the process by which risks are escalated to Programme Steering Group and Programme Board.

3.2. As of June 2022, there were 17 programme level risks. These risks evolve and changes the programme changes and develops as well.

Workstream	Programme Level risks
People	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Loss of staff from County and District Councils deemed essential to programme delivery 2. The risk that there are insufficient people resources to implement LGR programme and deliver the approved business case 3. There is a risk that there are stretched resources to deliver BAU activity, programme and projects outside of LGR
Customers, Communities and Partnerships	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Loss of opportunity to align public and VCSE services to new operating model and outcomes as defined in the Business Case 2. Design/products to create new unitary council will not have the community as the central focus in the design of the new operating model
Service Alignment and Improvement	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lack of decision around contracts that are reaching the end of their life between now and 2024 2. Unforeseen or increase in the level of civil contingencies incidents requiring mobilisation of Business Continuity/Civil Contingencies activity 3. The risk that delivery of ICS implementation is not effectively joined-up with LGR implementation
Finance	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is a risk of a significant budget gap for new Somerset Council in 2023/24 when districts and County budgets combined, significantly impacting financial sustainability of the new authority 2. There is a risk that legacy councils make spend commitments that adversely affect implementation and benefits delivery 3. The risk that the back-office ERP (Enterprise Resource Planning) system is not sufficiently implemented to support the new authority 4. Failure of workstreams/projects to achieve their expected financial benefits as described in business case (£18.5m p.a. after 2 years)
Programme Steering Group / Programme Management Office	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Uncontrolled change to the scope of the LGR programme 2. Next Council Elections lead to loss of momentum in the programme 3. Inter-dependencies between the workstreams not managed effectively 4. The risk that non-delivery or late delivery of key

	<p>LGR products that other workstreams are dependent on</p> <p>5. The risk that the LGR programme negatively impacts service provision and improvement activities of Children’s Services and Adult Social Care.</p>
--	---

A full breakdown of the risks can be found at Appendix One, which will show in more detail the risk scores and mitigation.

3.3. Monitoring and review

Programme-level risks are reviewed and developed in a number of ways:

1. Monthly through Programme Steering Group and the Programme Board on the current programme level risks
2. Through reports to Programme Steering Group where risks can be identified and thus developed.
3. Through direct work with the workstreams and their respective project and change managers to ensure that the delivery of mitigation is being undertaken
4. Reviewing workstream risks for risks that are being recommended for escalation to the programme risk register
5. New risks as the workstream develop their products for delivery, and the risks that are associated with the delivery

4. Background papers

4.1. Appendix One – breakdown of risks

Note: For sight of individual background papers please contact the report author

This page is intentionally left blank

Programme Risk Update

Friday 29th July 2022

Angela Farmer

Ask of the Implementation Board:

- To note the 17 current risks on the register
- To determine if there are any other risks that should be considered
- To determine frequency of updates of programme level risks to the Board

Key points for discussion:

1. General update on risks and the development of the programme level risks
2. Overview of the current programme level risks
3. Overview of how they are monitored

Risks

For this specific programme the definition of risk is:

The effect of uncertainty on objectives

Or in other words....

A potential for something to occur that can have an impact on what you are trying to deliver

Introduction to the approach taken in presenting Programme Level Risks

Reports to Programme Steering Group and Programme Board include

1. Dashboard – in effect a high level overview of
 1. The number of programme level risks and which workstream carries the risk
 2. An overview of the residual scores and identification of the highest level of residual risks
 3. An overview of workstream risks
2. An overview of all programme level risks
 1. A more detailed overview of each of risks including controls and actions that are in place

LGR Risks - July 2022

Programme Level Risks:

Overview of total number of risks:

Workstream	Total N
Finance	4
People	3
SAI	3
CCP	2
PSG/PMO	5

Residual likelihood Score of Programme level Risks

Remote	Unlikely	Possible	Probable	Certain
0	4	10	2	1

Likelihood score	Programme level risk
Probable	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of staff Unforeseen emergency
Certain	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Budget gap

Workstream Risks:

Overview of total number of risks:

Workstream	Total number of risks
People	26
CCP	14
SAI	31
Finance	20
Assets	25
Governance	14
Total:	149

Category	Workstream	Risk Title	Cause	Effect	Risk Owner (Group)	Controls (Mitigating Actions)	Further action required	Risk Before Mitigation	Residual Risk	Risk ID
Benefits - Cash	Strategic Risk	There is a risk of a significant budget gap for new Somerset Council in 2023/24 when Districts and County budgets combined, significantly impacting the financial sustainability of the new unitary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Councils use once-off sources of funding to balance their 2022/23 budgets which creates a budget 'gap' for 2023/24 for Somerset Council - National changes in how councils are funded due April 2023 - Costs of demand & inflationary pressures increase above previous forecasts - Short term approach to borrowing for longer terms needs in rising interest rate environment 	Reductions in service budget and levels	Finance Workstream	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development of 2022/23 baseline budget for new Council by end of May 2022 to provide basis for the development of MTFP for new Somerset Council and the 2023/24 budget 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Finance & Assets Protocol in place across the 5 councils - S24 notice from DLUHC which takes effect from May 2022 - Budget Monitoring processes in the 5 councils 	Very High	Very High	10
Cost	Strategic Risk	Loss of staff from County and District Councils deemed essential to the programme delivery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Staff leave due to uncertainty - Loss of key staff with specific skills and knowledge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Delays in the delivery of the Programme implementation plan - Additional cost of resourcing eg temporary labour - Knock-in impacts to BAU service delivery - Insufficient level of experience and expertise to deliver the new council operations 	People Workstream	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Analysis of staff on fixed term contracts to 31/3/23 2. Explore mutual aid 3. Appointment of Chief Executive for SCC and new Council agreed by Full Council end of July 2022 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use of interim staff - Redeployment - Recruitment Protocol - Staff engagement to support development of culture (building on existing culture) throughout the lifetime of the programme 	Very High	High	12
Benefits - Cash	Strategic Risk	Failure of workstreams/projects to achieve their expected financial benefits as described in business case (£18.5m p.a. after 2 years)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Significant Workstream failure. - Loss or non-delivery of Essential products. - Unrealistic expectations of benefits assigned to workstreams or products 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of achievement of promised overall programme benefits. - Programme does not meet stakeholder expectations 	Finance Workstream	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Robust benefits realisation plan in place - Early modelling / forecasting of cash-benefits - Monitoring through programme reporting framework including escalation and intervention - Dedicated LGR Programme Manager (now in post) 	<p>Tranche 1 products agreed</p> <p>Work on Tranche 2 products started</p>	High	High	15
Quality	Strategic Risk	Loss of opportunity to align public and VCSE services to new operating model and outcomes defined in the Business Case	Ineffective partnership working / poor relationships between the five Somerset councils; partnership working between SCC and Police, Fire, CCG, Acute Hospital Trusts, ICS, and VCSE.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduced financial and non-financial benefits. - Poor relationships between partners and new authority. - Transformational opportunity lost, delayed or reduced - Negative impact on cross cutting outcomes for communities - Reputational damage for new Council 	Communities, Customers and Partnership Workstream	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Ensure LGR Advisory Board remains inclusive, transparent and accessible (CCP) 2.Stakeholder management plan(s) for critical products and across workplans (CCP) 3.External communications on purpose and benefits of the LGR programme (Comms) 4. Senior officer engagement with VCSE and partners (CCP) 5. VCSE and public voice represented (CCP) 6. Use of the Customer Panel to hear the voice of the public and users (CCP) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Complete partner and stakeholder mapping exercise (CCP) 2.Targeted engagement with all strategic partners (CCP) 3.Effective ongoing communications with all stakeholders about LGR programme and its objectives (Comms) 4.Effective LCN's 5.Services thinking about the relationship with the public and VCSE in design and delivery (SA) 	High	High	14
Quality	Strategic Risk	Design / products to create the new unitary council will not have the community as a central focus in the design of the new operating model	Focus is disproportionately on 'safe and legal' service delivery /Legacy ways of working are carried forward to implementation of the new authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Organisational culture is not community focussed -Inefficient partnership working. - Poor outcomes for communities. - Failure to deliver planned business case benefits 	Communities, Customers and Partnership Workstream	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Engagement with all workstreams to secure agreement / recognition that communities focus goes beyond 'safe and legal' (CCP) 2. Ensure interdependencies are identified and managed, through iterative discussion and collaboration (CCP) 3.Specifically, engage with People workstream to support an ethos and culture of communities and customers first (CCP/People) 4.Involve customers and communities in the design of products and services (CCP) 5.Learn from customer experience and feedback (CCP) 6.Develop sound business cases to underpin sufficient resourcing to deliver communities focused objectives (CCP/Finance) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Programme and workstream checkpoint review criteria 2. Ensure LGR Advisory Board remains effective, inclusive, transparent and accessible (PSG) 3. Embdoy community focus as a critical requirement of operating model development through workshops, research and engagement (CCP) 4. Ensure TOM development reflects emerging customer strategy and principles (CCP) 	High	High	19
Scope (Programme Deliverables)	Strategic Risk	Unforeseen emergency or business continuity interruption or rising tide situation that requires staff to be directed from the day job into incident response.	Civil Contingency / external event requiring standing up of councils resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inadequate resources in project delivery - Lack of management capacity - Reallocation of programme or existing council resources to support response and recovery 	Service Alignment Workstream	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create and maintain a Business Continuity Plan (BCP) for the LGR Programme (signed off by Programme Board) including: Engagement with Workstreams to develop the BCP, Engagement with Somerset Local Authorities Civil Contingencies Unit to ensure alignment with wider BCP arrangements across the programme and 5 councils, internal comms to ensure awareness and buy-in for BCP, and desktop test of BCP. (Resource constraints have delayed completion of this piece of work however more staff have been approved for PMO) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Programme Board overview of programme and escalation as appropriate from Steering Group and PMO. 2.Existing business continuity arrangements in each authority 	High	High	13

Category	Workstream	Risk Title	Cause	Effect	Risk Owner (Group)	Controls (Mitigating Actions)	Further action required	Risk Before Mitigation	Residual Risk	Risk ID
Scope (Programme Deliverables)	Strategic Risk	The risk that the back-office ERP (Enterprise Resource Planning) system not sufficiently implemented to support the new authority	- Failure to ensure new Microsoft Dynamics finance system in place for 1 April 2023	- Inability to pay invoices, raise invoices and monitor spending during the year	Finance Workstream	Continued close management of implementation partner against published programme, clear governance and oversight including third party, independent governance role all reporting in to formal Steering Group	Implementation plan that delivers in excess of the minimum viable product	High	High	26
Quality	Strategic Risk	Lack of a decision around contracts that are reaching the end of their life between now and April 2024	No strategic decision has been taken about what to do with contracts that need renewing before April 2024 and in some cases, have already been extended once.	Reduction in service levels	Service Alignment Workstream		Engage with finance and procurement sub workstreams to ensure that decisions are made that allow sufficient time to put contracts/arrangements in place and to mobilise.	Very High	Medium	228
Scope (Programme Deliverables) Page 52	Strategic Risk	The risk that there are insufficient people resources to implement LGR Programme and deliver the approved business case	- the programme not seen as BAU and the no 1 priority by council members and chief officers (all 5 councils) - Staff not released from normal operational duties - Insufficient capacity within legacy councils - Lack of resilience across assigned workforce	- programme not delivered to quality, time and cost - non-cash and cash benefits not delivered - Delays in the delivery of the Business Case objectives or compromised quality delivered - Additional cost of temporary staffing to fill resource gaps - Unmanageable workloads on staff	People Workstream	1.Programme checkpoint review to identify resource requirements by work stream and function. This will inform the following:- Recruitment Protocol and its application across the five councils 2. Resource Management Plan 3. Strong programme management and reporting to allow identification and resolution of potential staffing issues 4. Work across all 5 councils to pause or cease activity, or rescope within LGR programme to deliver greater benefit 5. Resource constraints to be reviewed and escalated weekly to CEOs and the programme board. To be reported to members at each Joint Committee 6. Removal of duplication across the programme	1. early definition of resource requirements (capability and capacity) as part of gateway 2. Validation of 1 with PwC as QA partner incorporating lessons learned from previous LGR programmes 3. Resource shortfalls to be raised to five CEOs to address 4. Interim labour arrangements to be defined as a fall back plan. 5. - Dedicated LGR Programme Manager (in post from Jan '22) 6. PwC as quality assurance partner in place from Dec '21. 7. 17 February 2022 agreement to fund additional PMO, project specific and subject matter expertise to the programme.	Very High	Medium	11
Benefits - Non-cash	Strategic Risk	The risk that the LGR programme negatively impacts service provision and improvement activities of Children's Services and Adult Social Care.	- Organisational and resource focus on these services is reduced or insufficient. - Services not drawn sufficiently into the programme. - Development of culture of the new authority fails to embrace these services	- Performance of service for vulnerable adults negatively impacted. - Poor external perceptions of quality of services. - Potential Government intervention	Programme Management Office Workstream	1.Modelling of interdependencies between programmes, reflected in respective plans 2.Active consideration within the emerging Target Operating Model	1. Strong communication within the programme 2. Adherence to project guidelines around Change Control, Benefits realisation and risk. 3. Horizon scanning 4. Cross-cutting involvement of senior managers across workstreams in particular Service Alignment and Improvement 5. Quarterly reporting to Programme Board 6. PMO engagement and participation with Integrated Care System Governance	High	Medium	21
Benefits - Non-cash	Strategic Risk	Inter-Dependencies between workstreams not managed effectively	Collaboration between different workstreams has been limited and further partnership working is required to define interdependencies between workstreams and clarify what input from SMEs is required.	Inability to deliver cross-cutting products successfully and therefore benefits not realised	Programme Management Office Workstream	Tranche 1 product dependencies to be assessed after Tranche 1 product list is signed off on 8th March 2022. Quality assurance of products list.	- Programme tranches developed to aid management of the overall programme - A process/approach for management of dependencies to ensure impacts of change (time/cost/quality) are easily understood at both workstream and programme level. Programme level - consider as part of Benefits realisation, PMO providing assurance against delivery of programme capabilities	High	Medium	139
Reputation / Political	Strategic Risk	The risk that BAU activity within the Councils is impacted by stretched staff resources balancing LGR and BAU work	- Poorly managed deployment of staff. - Pull on already insufficient capacity in existing councils. - Leadership teams unable to stand down activities deemed vital for local government delivery. - Failure to prioritise, pause, stop or rescope existing BAU and development work in the 5 councils - Government changes requiring action/implementation during transition	- Reduced capacity to deliver non-LGR activity to required quality. - Reputational harm to existing and new councils - Loss of staff owing to workload / disruption to services - Staff wellbeing	Steering Group	1. Recruitment protocol 2. Staff engagement at local level 3. BAU processes at local level to ensure any additional work is scrutinised before agreeing to continue 4. Monitoring key performance indicators for any drop off in service provision		High	Medium	25

Category	Workstream	Risk Title	Cause	Effect	Risk Owner (Group)	Controls (Mitigating Actions)	Further action required	Risk Before Mitigation	Residual Risk	Risk ID
Scope (Programme Deliverables)	Strategic Risk	The risk that non-delivery or late delivery of key LGR products that other workstreams are dependent on	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Complexity of the programme not fully understood (no critical path). - Time pressure not allowing full analysis of interdependencies across products, projects and workstreams. - Lack of understanding of key dependencies within the project workstreams. - Lack of detail in product lists. - Assumptions that work is being delivered elsewhere 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Missed opportunities. - Siloed working. - Failure to deliver key products. - Delays to workstreams and ultimately the programme. - Re-engineering of solutions / rework required 	Programme Management Office Workstream	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Robust programme and project planning - Modelling of interdependencies incorporated into work plans and must have - Adequate resourcing of programme staff with appropriate capabilities and capacity to deliver workplans - Utilise Lessons learned from other programmes. - Dedicated LGR Programme Manager (now in post) 	Reliable critical path is available, with regular opportunities to monitor and course-correct when necessary. Regular opportunities for project managers to review with workstream and sub-workstream leads. Review of workstream and programme scorecards	High	Medium	23
Scope (Programme Deliverables) Page 53	Strategic Risk	Uncontrolled change to the scope of the LGR programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Changes to programme or workstream scope made outside of agreed tolerances for escalation or decision-making - Inadequate impact assessment of any proposed change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Failure to deliver the new council to agreed time, cost and quality. - Failure to deliver agree financial and non-financial benefits. - Missed transformation opportunities for the new authority - Impact on capacity of teams to manage and deliver the programme: rework, wasted effort and reduction in shared understanding of programme priorities and required activity 	Steering Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change Control framework (February '22) for the programme including shared ownership by all programme staff. - Strong communication within the programme promoting adherence to guidelines around Change Control, Benefits realisation and risk. - Quality assurance of workstream reporting 	Programme Implementation Manual outlining decision-making tolerances and purpose of change controlCurrent Programme governance arrangements: PMO, Programme Steering Group and Programme Board to identify and (Change control process to be in place from early February '22)	High	Medium	27
Scope (Programme Deliverables)	Strategic Risk	The risk that there is insufficient capacity to manage the people side of change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Capacity at management level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Where programme outcomes and benefits results are dependent on collective, proficient, sustained adoption of new ways of working 	People workstream	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Change management approach, quality framework and tools established and in use 2. Supplementary offer to strengthen change capabilities started and will continue to evolve, e.g. targeted interventions and coaching, high risk, high need products in T1 3. Validation of approach and priorities with PwC and our Unitary partners 4. Working closely with comms and People workstream 5. Plans in place to identify and collaborate with wider change assets across all organisations 6. Mobilisation of tactical change management resource to work alongside and support existing network of change management across all organisations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2. Evidence based approach to defining extent and impact of T1 products to define level of need and target resource where needed most 3. Application of data and insight from across WS to build programme change plan and EIA support 4. Embedding change management within current assurance processes practice and reporting 5. Nominated Lead for People Change 	High	High	309
Scope (Programme Deliverables)	Strategic Risk	The risk that delivery of ICS implementation is not effectively joined-up with LGR implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interdependency between ICS and LGR is not sufficiently understood or acted upon 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Failure to deliver programme to agreed time, cost and quality. - Failure to deliver expected benefits. - Missed transformation opportunities 	Service Alignment Workstream		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Understanding of interdependencies incorporated into LGR work plans and must have - Adequate staff resource across both programmes with appropriate capabilities and capacity to address the work 	Medium	Medium	22
Cash	Risk	There is a risk that legacy		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Threat to opening financial position of the council 	Workstream					

Monitoring and review

Programme level risks are monitored and reviewed as follows:

1. Monthly reports to Programme Steering Group
 1. Discussions about the current risks on the register which can include reviews of current risks
 2. Identification of any new risks that the Group wish to further consider from which work will be undertaken to determine the risk and the actions being taken to reduce or mitigate the risk
2. Monthly reports to Programme Board
 1. Identification of any specific they wish to further consider or investigate
3. Weekly discussions with Programme Management Office
 1. Identification of any further mitigation or controls that need to be added
 2. Identification of any new risks for consideration
4. Discussions with workstreams as needed based
 1. Support to the workstreams on risks in general
 2. Identification of risks that need to be escalated to programme level
5. Working with PwC to align issues through their assurance work with Programme Level risks

Recommendations

1. To note the 17 risks currently on the programme risk register
2. Identification of any further risks that the board wish the programme to consider
3. Identification of frequency of future reports to the Board

This page is intentionally left blank

Together we are delivering your

New Somerset Council

Board review of Programme Strategic Objectives
(Alyn Jones, Alastair Higton)

To review Strategic Objectives and recommend amendments to Executive

29th July 2022

Author:
Alyn Jones, Alastair Higton

Key points for discussion:

To review Strategic Objectives and recommend amendments to Executive

Ask of Implementation Board:

To endorse findings:

- Strategic Objectives appear to remain fit for purpose, clear and high level.
- Deliverables and Business Plan objectives have not changed however for objective 3, “Decarbonisation” requires firming up to reflect climate and ecological emergency declarations.

To endorse proposal to Executive to amend the Implementation Plan

- To add additional introductory context to the Strategic Objectives

To review Strategic Objectives and recommend amendments to Executive

- Why?
 - To keep programme fit for purpose in current political and financial climate, meet requirement to maintain the Implementation Plan
- What is the context of the review? What do we need to think about?
 - Against financial context – MTFP
 - Against political context – Administration objectives and policy
 - Against programme risk
 - Experience of the programme so far
- Proposed lines of inquiry / changes
 - Potential impacts on programme and products
 - What outcomes does the Implementation Board seek?

LGR Programme Strategic Objectives

Objective 1

Create a new unitary Council for Somerset that delivers the approved business case on 1 April 2023.

Business Case objectives

- Create a strategic and powerful voice to speak up for our county
- Give residents more say over decisions that impact them and their communities
- End confusion over which council does what for our residents
- Reduce duplication and waste

Key deliverables

- Structural Changes agreed by Parliament
- Safe and effective elections
- Governance agreed with new administration
- All council staff in post
- LCNs established and operating
- Asset and service devolution opportunities in place

LGR Programme Strategic Objectives

Objective 2

Enable performance capability – to deliver business case vision on 1 April 2023.

Business Case objectives

1. Establishing one council listening to the needs and concerns of residents, parishes and business, providing clear accountability to the public
2. Facilitating sustainable delivery of outstanding public services to improve the quality of life of all Somerset's residents and businesses
3. Empowering communities and embedding delivery at local level to increase community resilience and the ability to respond to local challenges
4. Giving a much stronger voice for Somerset on a national and international stage
5. Offering consistent leadership with key partners to better influence local service delivery
6. Reducing duplication and provide better value across the entire county

Key deliverables

- Statutory and Senior Officers appointed
- Budget set
- HR and Payroll Systems in place
- Council tax arrangements in place
- Finance management systems in place
- Customer access points in place

LGR Programme Strategic Objectives

Objective 3

Develop the new council to optimise benefits and opportunities from 1 April 2023 to 31 March 2025.

Business Case Objectives

- Invest in Somerset
- Develop better services
- Deliver better value for money for our taxpayers (that's all of us)
- Cut red tape and bureaucracy

Key deliverables

- Customer Strategy
- Transformation Roadmap
- Define service delivery methodology
- Build staffing structure, values and culture
- Decarbonisation

Context of the review

- Against financial context:
 - In-year savings
 - MTFP for 2023-24 and beyond
 - LGR role in delivering savings
- Against political context – Administration objectives and policy
 - Consistent with programme however one key theme to consider:
 - Ecological emergency declaration – product design impact?
- Against programme risk
 - Reduced availability to staff to deliver
 - Alignment with other public services
 - Relationships with Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE) and communities required to be strong, to drive development of the programme so it is effective
- Experience of the programme so far
 - Significant input of resource – people: loss/insufficient FTE, extreme difficulty recruiting.
 - Budget is on track however little scope for increased spend without increased budget
 - Tranche 1 products are critical for day one operations must be primary focus.
 - External challenges eg endemic Covid, economic pressures have an impact on LGR and BAU (in turn impacting on LGR)

Broad findings

- Strategic Objectives should therefore
 - Support financial planning (ie not create additional cost pressures in-year)
 - Retain focus on Tranche 1 products and delivering a function council
 - Understand the staffing / recruitment challenges esp. with winter pressures expected. Not trying to do everything or too much for day 1
- Business Case can be flexible to changing policy requirements
 - Ecological emergency
 - Decision-making / engagement preferences
 - Tranche 1 products that may change direction eg LCNs.

Proposal

- Strategic Objectives appear to remain fit for purpose, clear and high level.
- Deliverables and Business Plan objectives have not changed however for objective 3, “Decarbonisation” requires firming up to reflect declared climate and ecological emergencies.
- There is an opportunity to add some valuable context.
- Propose to add the following as an introduction to the Strategic Objectives (subject to Executive approval:

After review of the Strategic Objectives by the Implementation Board on 29th July 2022, additional context was approved by the Implementation Executive, to ensure that use of the Strategic Objectives remained appropriate:

- The programme operates in a context of financial pressure both in-year and future years, as well as recruitment and retention challenges. Therefore financial benefits and critical activity must be maximised and unnecessary work (business-as-usual and LGR) be reconsidered where appropriate in order to release financial or staff resources. LGR has a key role of play in delivering a financially sustainable council.
- The programme should consider its activity in the context of the Somerset Climate Emergency Declaration and more recently, ecological emergency declaration.
- There is a risk that if relationships with Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE), communities and other public sector partners are not strong, programme benefit (including reduced or redirected demand leading to savings) will not be fully achieved.
- Tranche 1 products remain the prime focus of programme delivery
- The emerging Council Plan will add additional context to the LGR programme.

This page is intentionally left blank

Together we are delivering your

New Somerset Council

Communities, Customers & Partnerships Workstream

Local Community Networks [LCN's]

29th July 2022

Local Community Networks [LCN's]

29th July 2022

Author:
Jan Stafford

Key points for discussion:

- Milestones and phasing of LCN development and implementation
- Approach to engagement & consultation
- Timetable for delivery
- Consider establishing a small Member/Officer LCN Task & Finish Group

Ask of Implementation Board:

- Endorse the emerging Phases to creation of LCN's
- Endorse the proposed approach to engagement & consultation
- Approval for setting up an LCN Working Group

LCN's (One Somerset Business Case)

Local Community Networks (LCNs) will give communities power to influence decisions about their local area. They will be an important part of how our new Somerset Council works – making sure that local areas will have an ongoing voice to shape their new council to suit their local needs.

Key points

- LCNs to cover every part of the county
- Flexibility to set their own priorities
- Formal power as 'Committees of the Council'
- Dedicated council officer support
- Ability to influence Council priority and spend
- 6 to 8 meetings a year

Membership

- Unitary Councillors
- City, Town and Parish Councillors
- Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise
- Local NHS, Police, Schools and other services
- Local Business
- Other engaged residents

Possible Roles of LCNs – what they might do

- **A forum for local discussion, listening, action, consultation and oversight** - A community forum, a community voice.
- **Achieve local ambitions and improve outcomes** - bringing Council, partners and communities together
- **Tackle local issues and priorities** – Using local data and community driven evidence
- **Act as cabinet committees** - core to how Somerset Council recognise and respond to a variety of needs
- **Promote active community decision making** - provide a focus for local engagement and a way to engage more young people
- **Planning** - decisions and policy
- **Licensing for localities**
- **Access to and administer community grants** (including climate change grants)
- **Support prevention activities** – promote/support local initiatives
- Promote and prioritise **Small Improvement Schemes**
- Instruct Small Highways works carried out by a **Highway Steward**

Additional considerations....

- There needs to be recognition that the larger the population the more of the suggested powers are realistically possible in financial and governance terms. (for example – delegation of planning decisions to an LCN area is only possible a small number of LCNs).
- Careful consideration to the role, function and powers of LCNs to ensure they make a valuable contribution to local communities.
- LCN boundaries would need to take account of the output from any Community Governance Review and the following Local Government Boundary Commission for England Review – need to consider flexibility and build in time for review.
- Consider workload of a Unitary Councillor – representing several LCNs would result in a significant increase in meetings and workload which would be unsustainable.

LCN Design Principles

- LCNs will “Committees of Council” with powers including spending
- LCN boundaries will be constructed around parish boundaries
- LCNs will convene within their geography or virtually
- A unitary division and parish council to sit within one LCN area (however, clusters of parishes could work together on other shared priorities)
- LCN budgets to include revenue and capital expenditure for agreed local priorities
- Each LCN to be supported by a dedicated LCN manager
- A unitary council Director or Senior Manager to champion each LCN and its community
- Any spending decision by the LCN must carry the support of the majority of unitary councillors
- City, town and parish councils to be represented on the LCN. One representative each. Other representatives from the voluntary sector, business, health, education, police and fire
- LCNs to work with partners and the city, town and parish councils to deliver their vision, objectives and priorities for their places across the community.
- LCNs to work within the agreed policy framework and approved decisions of the new unitary council
- LCNs will need to work collaboratively at the Primary Care Network (PCN) level for some cross-boundary health and social care issues

LCN Values

- LCN design to be co-produced with communities and partners
- LCNs to reflect the 7 recommendations from Somerset Association of Local Councils (SALC) and Society of Local Clerks (SLCC)
- LCNs designed around Somerset's natural communities.
- Each LCN to have a detailed Joint Strategic Needs Analysis (JSNA) identifying the community profile and social, economic, environmental, health challenges communities face.
- LCNs to develop their objectives and work programme from this evidence base and local priorities.

LCN Development – Current Position

- Three LCN Pilots underway – currently developing evaluation framework
- LCN Geographies options analysis developed and in draft
- Draft Terms of Reference prepared
- Initial financial modelling re number of LCNs and staff resourcing

LCN Governance

- Terms of reference [TOR] have early draft - reflects LCN Principles and learning from other areas
- Include Unitary Members, T&PCs, Police, NHS, VCSE and other partners
- Governance support to develop draft ToRs and links to Constitution
- Role of the Unitary Member, community leadership, advocate, broker
- Pilots developing own ToRs – formality plus flexibility

To be confirmed/Agreed

- Decision making – encourage consensus approach / participative democracy with formal voting kept to minimum
- LCN Chairs – Unitary Members or independent?
- Parish and Town Councils – one representative each, however some parishes are seeing this as each having a formal vote
- Hybrid arrangements and decision making

LCN Development Approach – By April 2023

Key points

- Define and confirm number & boundaries for LCN's
- Clarity of role for the LCN and members
- Membership and Governance arrangements finalised
- Meetings fully scheduled as part of democratic calendar
- Supporting evidence and information packs in place
- Evaluation framework for Pilots created and learning shared
- Create an initial LCN Data pack/Profile [minimum bespoke]
- Initial ideas on LCN Digital presence
- LCN Communications Plan - engagement & consultation and launch of FAQ's
- Initial financial costing to establish the LCN – eg: LCN Officer & Governance support
- Research and learn from other Unitary authorities to shape our thinking
- Agree a Charter for Somerset
- LCN Reporting Framework and linked to corporate planning
- Recruit and establish an LCN Team

Comment / Benefits / Risks

- Approach is reflected in implementation plan
- Any change will need careful comms
- Depends on geographies consultation starting in August – peak holiday time, Parishes have raised concerns
- Are we running ahead of Corporate Plan, Operating Model and budget setting?
- May miss opportunities to link with ICS/PCN etc
- Requires early investment
- Resourcing implications for other service areas
- **Establish a small Member/Officer LCN Task and Finish Group**

LCN Development Approach – By April 2024 +

Key points

- Evaluate year 1 of operation and implement changes
- Establish LCN sharing network/toolkit/resources to help other LCN's
- Evaluate proposals for the integration of Planning and Licensing into LCN's
- Undertake Financial review and consider devolved/delegated budgets to LCN's
- LCN's become a vehicle for Service and Asset Devolution conversations
- Understand Community Development resources across the new authority and consider revised models of delivery
- Draft a Somerset Guide to Localism – culture and development programme
- Explore further alignments of LCN's to other community-based services
- Training and upskilling of City, Town & Parish Councils

Comment / Benefits / Risk

- Pilots given time to demonstrate results and inform future development
- Incremental approach to ensure full integration and alignment with Operating Model and corporate priorities
- Incremental approach to investment potentially of multiple years
- First meeting of each LCN could be workshop – enable co-design
- Draw on existing skills / expertise of LA staff in forming team (builds on current community development provision)

Asset and Service Devolution Approach

Key points

- Focus on progression of Bridgwater Pilot
- Initial work on policy framework and prospectus ahead of Vesting Day, with further development after.
- LCN team can develop dialogue with T&PCs and other stakeholders in tandem with working to develop priorities and agenda for each LCNs
- Develop a prioritised and resourced programme of asset and service devolution post vesting day.

Comment / Benefits / Risk

- Complex topic to be co-ordinated across several service areas, requiring careful consideration, strong stakeholder engagement and realistic expectations
- Time to consider relationship with MTFP
- Time to learn from the Pilot
- Capacity constraints and dependencies mean focus for further devolution will be implemented post vesting day as part of service transformation, with further preparatory work undertaken ahead of that
- Challenges of managing expectations – ranging from T&PCs who want to push ahead (precept now) through to those who are concerned about ‘burden’ – need effective comms on this as a priority

LCNs – Indicative Timescale for April 23

What	Who	When
Consider role, geographies, governance and funding of LCN	Executive Members	July 22
Refine governance and financial modelling, linked to MTFP	CCP Workstream leads, with Governance & Finance	July – Sept 22
Engagement and Consultation on Geographies	Targeted stakeholder engagement Wider public consultation Analysis and recommendations	July 22 30 th Aug – 7 Oct Oct 22
Formal Decision Paper including resourcing plan	Executive	Nove 22
Recruit and establish LCN Team	CCP workstream	Dec 22 – Mar 23
First phase of Pilot evaluation undertaken and learning shared	CCP Workstream	Oct – Nove 22
Charter for Somerset – First draft	Somerset Association of Local Councils	Sept 2022
Research and learning from others	Members & Officers	Ongoing
Develop an LCN Reporting Framework	CCP with Business Intelligence Workstream	Jan 23 – Mar 23
Create an initial LCN Data pack/Profile and initial thoughts on LCN Digital presence	CCP with Business Intelligence Workstream	Dec 22 – Mar 23
LCN Communications Plan	LGR Communications with CCP	Ongoing

Consultation & engagement

- Engagement during July with consultation during August/ September/October [6 weeks]
- Consultation focus on:
 - 2/3 geography options
 - Headlines on role, governance and initial funding
- Using survey, on line offer, targeted letters
- Comms plan to raise profile [including Frequently Asked Questions]
- Item at the City, Town & Parish Councils Conference on 5th October
- Support by Members and Officers to raise profile of consultation with key stakeholders
- Conversation with the Pilots

Somerset County Council
LGR Implementation Board
– 29 July 2022

LGR Advisory Forum

Lead Officer: Alyn Jones, Programme Director

Author: Steve Coomber, LGR Communications Lead

Contact Details: s.coomber@somersetwestandtaunton.gov.uk

Executive Lead: Cllr Val Keitch

1. Summary

- 1.1.** Following establishment of the LGR Implementation Board and LGR Joint Scrutiny Committee, this report proposes a revised approach to give partner groups greater influence within the LGR governance structure and a more compelling platform for engaging Somerset residents in matters which interest them most.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1.** An LGR Advisory Forum, comprised of representative partner organisations and Chaired by the Executive Lead Member for LGR, should be formed to fulfil the terms of reference previously agreed for the LGR Advisory Board. Revised terms of reference and proposed membership are attached at Annexes A and B respectively.
- 2.2.** Partner and public representation should be facilitated through separate events, supported by the LGR Advisory Forum. As follows:
- **LGR Advisory Forum meetings** held every six weeks and preceding LGR Implementation Board meetings by one week. Meetings will be attended by Forum members only. The Forum will approve a Memorandum following each meeting to be submitted to both the LGR Programme Board and LGR Implementation Board for consideration.
 - **Public events** will be held as part of a broader public engagement plan. Five events prior to vesting day will focus on the challenges identified in the 2019 Future of Local Government in Somerset Report, and build on the ambitions of the agreed unitary business case. The LGR Advisory Group will be asked to support these events by engaging their own constituents in the discussion.

3. Background

- 3.1.** Prior to the election, LGR Advisory Board meetings were the primary vehicle for both public and stakeholder engagement. The Board included eight elected members, and representatives from public services, the voluntary sector and City, Town and Parish Councils.
- 3.2.** Advisory Board meetings were normally held in town and village halls, although

some were held online during the pandemic. Events were often well attended and discussion constructive. A summary of comments was reported to the LGR Joint Committee and has been important in shaping the approach on Local Community Networks (LCNs) – now before Implementation Board.

- 3.3.** As the LGR Programme enters a period of more rapid change, in the approach to vesting day, a more focused forum for key partners to offer clear and direct advice is needed to make sure these relationships work on day 1.

4. Implications

- 4.1.** The active participation of key partners in developing products such as an effective Target Operating Model, service standards, and the wide range of strategies and policies that are required to be in place on Vesting Day and beyond, is of crucial importance to the success of the LGR Programme. A dedicated forum is required to consider these detailed matters.
- 4.2.** The terms of reference agreed for the LGR Advisory Board will remain broadly the same, as members of the Forum will still be invited to support public and community engagement. However, the scope is revised to reflect the current priorities of the LGR Programme (Annex A).
- 4.3.** Advice from the LGR Advisory Forum will be formalised through a Memorandum which the forum will be asked to approve following each meeting. This will be presented to the following LGR Implementation Board for consideration and a response, by the Advisory Forum Chair.
- 4.4.** The Memorandum will also be discussed at the subsequent LGR Programme Board meeting and published publicly on the New Somerset Council website.
- 4.5.** Meetings will be held online and within office hours to accommodate partner organisation representatives.
- 4.6.** The Advisory Board previously included eight elected representatives. Members are able to engage with and influence the LGR Programme through a number of channels. It is therefore, recommended that the revised membership for the LGR Advisory Forum include external stakeholders whose cooperation will be crucial for realising the benefits of the new council, alongside the Executive Lead Member for LGR and the LGR Programme Director.
- 4.7.** Previous members included representatives from local councils, the voluntary and community sector and some public services. These members will be invited to join the LGR Advisory Forum.
- 4.8.** To reflect this administration's vision for a fairer, greener and flourishing Somerset, it is recommended that representatives from the business sector, environmental and education sectors are also invited to join. (Annex B)

- 4.9.** A full public engagement plan will be prepared for review by the Implementation Executive to ensure that wider views of people and communities continue to shape development of the new council. That will include five events prior to vesting day, which will be developed with support of the LGR Advisory Forum. These will focus on the big strategic challenges that concern everyone in Somerset and provide a space for thought leadership, ideas and learning.

5. Background papers

5.1. Annex A – LGR Advisory Forum – Terms of Reference

Purpose

The purpose of the Forum is to ensure that LGR in Somerset is delivered effectively and with appropriate stakeholder engagement and involvement. The Forum will:

- Engage with residents, partners, stakeholders, and others to promote engagement with and understanding of the new authority as it develops.
- Advise on the design and delivery of the cash and non-cash benefits expected from the new authority.

The Board will have an advisory role only and no decision-making or scrutiny role.

Scope

The Advisory Forum will consider key LGR products including the Target Operating Model, service standards and strategic policies. Participants will address issues of concern to the constituents which they represent and may ask to include items for discussion to the meeting agendas.

The Advisory Forum will also be asked to support a series of public engagement events outlined in a separate plan. Support may include raising awareness of events, inviting wider participation and presenting their own priorities to a public audience.

LGR Advisory Board Place in LGR Governance

Proposals, ideas and recommendations from the Forum will be fed into the Implementation Board and LGR Programme Board, in the form of a Memorandum agreed after each meeting.

5.2. Annex B – Proposed Membership

Organisation	Representative
SCC	Cllr Val Keitch, Chair
SCC	Alyn Jones – LGR Programme Director
SALC	Cllr David Mitten - Chairman
	Justin Robinson - CEO
SLCC	Rob Smith, Chief Executive
	David Mears – Town Clerk Bridgwater
	Paul Wynne – Town Clerk
NHS	Ed Ford, Chairman Somerset CCG
Police	Richard Turner, Police Superintendent
Spark Somerset (Voluntary Sector)	Katherine Nolan, Chief Executive
Arts Council	Paul Goddard
Historic England	Rebecca Harfield
Federation of Small Businesses and Chamber of Commerce	
Environment (consider Environment Agency)	
Education	

Together we are delivering your
New Somerset Council

Somerset Local Government Reorganisation – Consequential Parliamentary Order on LGR

Lead Officers: Scott Wooldridge, Monitoring Officer, Somerset County Council
Melanie Wellman, Monitoring Officer, Sedgemoor District Council

Author: Scott Wooldridge, Monitoring Officer, LGR Programme Board

Contact Details: swouldridge@somerset.gov.uk

1. Summary / Background

- 1.1. This report follows on from the Government’s approval to the Somerset (Structural Changes) Order (SCO) in March 2022. The SCO sets out that Somerset Council (a unitary council) will be established for Somerset from 1 April 2023 and the existing four district councils will be dissolved.

This report highlights certain rights, functions and legislative amendments (known as Consequential Parliamentary Order(s)) which need to be addressed as a consequence of the creation of Somerset Council on 1 April 2023.

The Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) is responsible for preparing any Consequential Parliamentary Order. Following the approval to the SCOs, DLUHC are engaging with Cumbria, North Yorkshire and Somerset councils regarding the potential content of any Consequential Parliamentary Orders with the aim of finalising these by Autumn 2022 for consideration by both Houses of Parliament in early 2023 to ensure they are approved ahead of vesting day on 1 April 2023

2. Recommendations

2.1. That the LGR Implementation Board supports and recommends to the County Council's Executive that:

- i) The matters set out in Appendix 1 be submitted to DLUHC for inclusion in a Consequential Parliamentary Order (also known as a Supplementary Provision and Miscellaneous Amendments Order) as a consequence of the Somerset (Structural Changes) Order 2022.**

- ii) The Monitoring Officer of Somerset County Council is granted delegated authority, in consultation with the Leader of Somerset County Council, to submit the matters set out in Appendix 1 to DLUHC and to submit any further matters to DLUHC that may arise along with taking all actions necessary to progress the drafting of the Order.**

3. Reasons for recommendations

3.1 DLUHC have asked local councils to identify any potential matters that would require specific provisions within a Consequential Parliamentary Order for consideration and approval by Government before vesting day.

3.2 The terms of reference for the LGR Implementation Board include within its functions 'review and make recommendations to Somerset County Council's Executive on submissions to DLUHC in relation to the preparation orders and directions consequential to the SCO including those dealing with civic and ceremonial matters. This includes all matters relating to the transition of mayors, sheriffs, chartered trustees and insignia'

4. Other options considered

4.1. The only other alternative is not to submit a response to DLUHC but this is not recommended as that would increase the risk that specific matters are not satisfactorily resolved ahead of vesting day.

5. Links to Business Case

5.1. This report supports the delivery of the Business Case.

6. Consultations and co-production

- 6.1. The proposals in this report have been discussed and endorsed by the LGR Programme Board comprising the Chief Executives of the five councils.

7. Financial and Risk Implications

- 7.1. The main resources implications relate to the work of the Monitoring Officers and Legal Services of the five councils liaising with DLUHC.
- 7.2. As identified in 4.1 above, the main risk is that specific matters identified by the five councils are not included within any Consequential Parliamentary Order. Early engagement with DLUHC has been a key mitigation to that risk.

Likelihood	2	Impact	4	Risk Score	8
------------	---	--------	---	------------	---

8. Legal and HR Implications

- 8.1. Following on from the SCO, a Consequential Parliamentary Order is made by Secretary of State where there is a requirement to amend various pieces of legislation which refer to the current district councils that will be dissolved as part of the establishment of the new Somerset Council.

Each of the five councils' Monitoring Officers have been involved in the proposed submission to DLUHC (set out in Appendix 1) which will inform the development of any Consequential Parliamentary Order.

9. Other Implications

9.1. Equalities Implications

No specific equalities implications have been identified.

10. Background

10.1. Structural Changes Order (SCO)

Following the Secretary of State's decision in July 2021, extensive collaborative work was undertaken by the five councils to support the implementation of the single unitary council (Somerset Council) on 1 April 2023. Through partnership the programme governance arrangements have been jointly established and operating since summer 2021.

In March 2022, the Secretary of State made the Somerset (Structural Changes) Order 2022 which sets out that Somerset County Council will

become the sole principal authority for Somerset from 1 April 2023, known as Somerset Council, and the existing four district councils will be wound up and dissolved on 1 April 2023. The functions exercised by the current four district councils will transfer to the new Somerset Council on 1 April 2023, together with all property and assets.

10.2. Following the May 2022 elections, the Executive of Somerset County Council are responsible for oversight and managing the transition to the new Somerset Council with support from the LGR Implementation Board and the overview and scrutiny through the LGR Joint Scrutiny Committee.

10.3. Consequential Parliamentary Order

There are certain matters such as membership of Exmoor National Park Authority and charter rights for Markets and Fairs which require a specific statutory order for a transfer to take effect. There are also pieces of legislation which refer to the current councils and require amendment as a consequence of the SCO.

10.4. It is anticipated that for LGR in Cumbria, North Yorkshire and Somerset that the Secretary of State needs to make a Consequential Parliamentary Order also referred to as a Supplementary Provision and Miscellaneous Amendments Order ("the Order") to give legal effect to the necessary transfers. The matters that have been identified for potential inclusion in such Orders are set out in Appendix 1, together with comments on whether these apply in respect of the structural changes in Somerset.

Should it become apparent there are further matters which need to be addressed in the Orders, then delegation is sought for the County Council's Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the County Council's Leader of the Council, to refer these to DLUHC for consideration, to ensure that the legislative timetable is not delayed.

11. Background Papers

11.1. Somerset (Structural Changes) Order 2022

LGR Implementation Board terms of reference June 2022

Secretary of State decision on approved business case for single unitary council in July 2021

Report Sign-Off

Appendix 1 Local Government Reorganisation in Somerset – submission to DLUHC regarding potential Consequential Parliamentary Order

This paper highlights certain rights, functions and legislative amendments which need to be addressed as a consequence of the creation of a unitary council in Somerset and set out in the Somerset Structural Changes Order agreed in March 2022.

The Somerset Structural Changes Order 2022 dissolves the existing 4 district councils with effect from vesting day on 1 April 2023. The functions exercised by the four district councils transfer immediately to the new Somerset Council (a continuing authority with the county council's functions and district councils' functions).

However, there are certain matters including ceremonial arrangements and charter rights which require a specific statutory order for a transfer to take effect. There are also pieces of legislation which refer to the current councils and require amendment as a consequence of the Somerset (Structural Changes) Order.

The Secretary of State therefore needs to make a Supplementary Provision and Miscellaneous Amendments Order ("the Order") to give legal effect to the necessary transfers. The matters that have been covered in previous such Orders are listed below, together with comments on whether these apply in respect of the structural changes in Somerset.

Pension Fund Transfer

The local government pension fund is currently maintained by Somerset County Council (the continuing authority) then it is assumed that no specific provisions need to be made in the Order for the Secretary of State. The County Council is a relevant administering authority under the Local Government Pension Scheme Regulations 2013.

Charter Rights for Markets and Fairs

Rights, such as market rights and the rights to hold fairs that have been granted to, or vest in, the current councils by Royal Charter, do not transfer under the transitional Regulations and need to be included in the Order. Rights to markets and fairs have been identified as follows:

Bridgwater Fair Market – established by Charter of King John and renewed in 1613. Legislation.gov records a local act in 1857. This fair and market falls within the Sedgemoor District Council area.

Taunton Fair Market – listed in gazetteer of Markets and Fairs in England and Wales as having a Charter Market and Fair. This fair and market falls within the Somerset West and Taunton Council area.

Shepton Mallet market – operates under a charter dated 1318 (Edward II). This market falls within the Mendip Council area.

Wells Market – operates under a charter dated 1290 (King John). This market falls within the Mendip Council area.

Frome Market is a statutory market under the Frome Markets Act 1874 although there was possibly a charter issued by Henry VII in 1494. This market falls within the Mendip Council area.

Glastonbury Market is treated like a charter market but can find no evidence of the charter though it is known to be very ancient. This market falls within the Mendip Council area.

Street Market – operates under general statutory powers under S50 Food Act 1984, though a consequential order may not be required in this instance.

Relevant provisions will therefore need to be included in the Order to transfer these rights to Somerset Council.

Charter Trustees

The only Charter Trustees in Somerset are the Taunton Charter Trustees that were established by The Local Government (Structural and Boundary Changes) (Supplementary Provision and Miscellaneous Amendments) Order 2019 as part of the local government re-organisation to establish the Somerset West and Taunton Council. The trustees comprise district members for the Town wards and the Mayor is elected from the trustees. Somerset County Council and Somerset West and Taunton Councils are progressing a Community Governance review for the potential establishment of a new Taunton Town Council ahead of vesting day. The

Community Governance review is scheduled to be considered by October 2022.

If there is a new Taunton Town Council the Charter Trustees are subsumed into the new Town Council by law. If not, the Charter Trustees remain and the Order will need to ensure that the elected representatives for the new Somerset Council divisions corresponding to the former Somerset West and Taunton district council wards, become the trustees. Whether the Order needs to address this is dependent on the outcome of a Community Governance review for Taunton.

Housing Revenue Account and Amendment of the Local Authorities (Capital Finance and Accounting) (England) Regulations 2003

The Dorset Order included this to make provision for housing revenue account debt and share capital in relation to the new Somerset Council. Somerset West and Taunton Council and Sedgemoor District Council have Housing Revenue Accounts and there will be a requirement to include these particular provisions in the Order for Somerset Council.

Areas of Natural Beauty

Within Somerset there are four Areas of Natural Beauty, the Quantocks, the Mendip Hills, the Blackdowns, Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs. Review of the legislation has not identified the need for any specific provisions to be included in the Order by the Secretary of State.

Internal Drainage Boards

The Axe, Brue and Parrett Internal Drainage Boards were established by the Land Drainage Act 1991. Sedgemoor District Council has membership on these Boards and there will be a need to ensure that after vesting day Somerset Council has membership on these Boards. Therefore the Order will need to include provisions to ensure the new Somerset Council has appropriate representation on these Boards.

Exmoor National Park Authority

The Environment Act 1995 deals with the constitution of National Park Authorities and says that in relation to their constitution the total number of local authority members and parish members must exceed the number of other members (s.63(5) and schedule 7 part 1 para 1(3)).

The National Park Authorities (England) Order 2015/770 sets out the constitution of Exmoor National Park Authority (article 4 and schedule 1 part 1) and which authorities appoint members of the NPA and in what numbers (article 4 and schedule 1 part 2).

In relation to Exmoor National Park Authority the total membership is 22, of which there are 12 Local authority members and 5 members appointed by the Secretary of State as parish members.

Of the local authority members:

- 2 are appointed by Devon County Council
- 2 are appointed by North Devon District Council
- 4 are appointed by Somerset County Council
- 4 are appointed by "West Somerset District Council"

It is notable that since the reorganisation of Taunton Deane BC and West Somerset DC there has been no change to the 2015 Order. Without any modification, after vesting day Somerset Council would only have the County Council membership of 4 representatives. This will affect the statutory balance required between the representation of principal authorities on the Authority. Therefore, the Order will need to include specific provisions to ensure Somerset Council has the 8 representatives for the county of Somerset.

The specific provisions that need to be amended relate to schedule 1 part 2 of the National Park Authorities (England) Order 2015/770 with effect from the reorganisation date to:

1. In column 2 delete the words West Somerset District Council, and delete the corresponding "4" from the same line in column 3
2. In column 3, on the line corresponding to the words "Somerset County Council" in column 2, substitute for the number "4" the number "8"

Lord-Lieutenant and Sheriff

The relevant legislation relating to these are the Lieutenancies Act 1997 and the Sheriffs Act 1887. Note in respect of the Lord-Lieutenant for Somerset and the Sheriff this covers the council areas of Somerset County Council, Bath and North East Somerset and North Somerset. Neither BANES or North Somerset are part of the Somerset Structural Changes Order 2022. The Lord-Lieutenant appoints the clerk for their area, and this has been Somerset County Council for many years. Like Buckinghamshire, it is not considered that the Order needs to include provisions in relation to the Lord-Lieutenant and the Sheriff because these are already County based appointments and there is no disaggregation of authorities which was the case in Dorset.

Port and Harbour Authorities

There is a port authority at Bridgwater (Bridgwater Navigation and Quays Act 1845; Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation (No.1) Act 1908 (Local Act); Bridgwater Port and Navigation Order 1908; Port of Bridgwater Pilotage Confirmation Order 1921) with functions undertaken by Sedgemoor District Council.

Somerset West and Taunton Council are the statutory harbour authority for the ports of Watchet and Minehead. It is also the Competent Harbour Authority (under the Pilotage Act 1987) for Watchet.

There is therefore a requirement for specific provisions in the Order by the Secretary of State relating to Port and Harbour Authorities.

Burial Grounds and Closed Churchyards

Mendip District Council as the Burial Authority has responsibility for the following burial grounds - (1) Street (Cemetery Lane) (2) Shepton Mallet (Waterloo Road) Frome (Warminster Road). Glastonbury Cemetery is owned by Glastonbury TC and Wells Cemetery is owned by Wells City Council. MDC maintains 23 closed churchyards.

Sedgemoor District Council as the Burial Authority has responsibility for 24 closed churchyards.

There may therefore be a requirement for specific provisions in the Order by the

Secretary of State.

Memorial Gardens

Somerset West and Taunton are trustees for Galmington playing fields and Greenway Recreation Ground with responsibility for maintenance. This may require specific provisions in the Order by the Secretary of State.

Public Space Protection Orders

Mendip District Council has the following orders where it is anticipated may need to be incorporated in the Order by the Secretary of State:

1. PSPO No. 1 of 2021 -Dog fouling, dog control and street drinking - district wide - expires in July 2024
2. PSPO No.2 of 2021 (Exclusion of Dogs from play areas for the under 5s) - expires July 2024
3. Draft PSPO - MDC (Unauthorised Encampments) - consultation underway

Sedgemoor District Council has the following orders where it is anticipated may need to be incorporated in the Order by the Secretary of State:

1. Sedgemoor District Council Public Spaces Protection Order (No 1) (Alcohol Consumption) 2020
2. Sedgemoor District Council Public Spaces Protection Order (No 2) (Miscellaneous Provisions) 2020
3. Sedgemoor District Council Public Spaces Protection Order (No 3) (Dogs) 2020

Carnivals and twinning

Still being investigated – whether specific acts / orders relate to the various carnivals that take place in Somerset e.g. Bridgwater Carnival and the various twinning arrangements across Somerset.

Consultation

Information has been sought from all Monitoring Officers in the Governance workstream.

Scott Wooldridge

Monitoring Officer, Somerset County Council

Somerset County Council
LGR Implementation Board
– 29 July 2022

LGR Implementation Board – Meeting Dates & Membership

Lead Officer: Scott Wooldridge – Monitoring Office & Strategic Manager – Governance & Democratic Services

Author: Andrew Melhuish – Democratic Services – Service Manager

Contact Details: Andrew.melhuish@somerset.gov.uk

1. Summary

- 1.1.** The LGR Implementation Board was formed following a report to Executive on 15 June 2022.
- 1.2.** The Board is required to agree its meeting dates and venues for meetings and to note the membership.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1.** To agree the meeting dates and proposed venues for meetings as set out in 3.4.
- 2.2.** To note the membership of the LGR Implementation Board as set out in 3.5.

3. Background

- 3.1.** On 15 June 2022 the Executive agreed to establish an LGR Implementation Board to monitor the LGR programme and provide advice and recommendations on its implementation to the Executive of Somerset County Council.
- 3.2.** The LGR Implementation Board will exist until 31 March 2023 and consist of 9 members, 3 from Somerset County Council (nominated by the Leader of that Council), 2 members of Somerset County Council (nominated by the Leader of that council's largest Opposition political group), 1 member of each of the 4 districts (nominated by the Leader of their respective council).
- 3.3.** The Terms of Reference require the Board to agree a schedule of meeting dates and to determine a programme of meeting locations around the county of Somerset.
- 3.4.** All meetings will be held at 2.00pm on the dates listed, with venues to be confirmed:
 - 9 September 2022 – County Hall, Taunton
 - 21 October 2022 – Venue to be confirmed
 - 2 December 2022 – Venue to be confirmed
 - 13 January 2023 – Venue to be confirmed
 - 24 February 2023 – Venue to be confirmed
- 3.5.** The membership of the Board is:
 - Chair of Board: Cllr Val Keitch – Somerset County Council (Lead Member for

Local Government Reorganisation & Prosperity)

CLlr Liz Leyshon Somerset County Council (Deputy Leader of Council and Lead Member on Finance and Human Resources)

CLlr Bill Revans – Somerset County Council (Leader of Council)

CLlr David Fothergill – Somerset County Council (Leader of the Conservative Group)

CLlr Fay Purbrick- Somerset County Council (Opposition Spokesperson for LGR; Opposition Spokesperson for Communities)

CLlr Federica Smith-Roberts - Somerset West & Taunton Council (Leader of Council)

CLlr Ros Wyke – Mendip District Council (Leader of Council)

CLlr John Clark – South Somerset District Council (Portfolio Holder for Economic Development)

CLlr Duncan McGinty – Sedgemoor District Council (Leader of Council)

4. Consultations undertaken

4.1. None required to support this report.

4.2.

5. Implications

5.1. No specific financial or risk implications have been identified in respect of the recommendations in this report.

5.2.

6. Background papers

6.1. Executive Report – 15 June 2022.

Note For sight of individual background papers please contact the report author

Decision Report - Executive Decision

Forward Plan Reference: FP/22/05/02

Decision Date – 15/06/22



Local Government Reorganisation in Somerset – Programme Implementation Plan and establishment of an Implementation Board

Lead Member(s): Bill Revans - Leader of the Council

Val Keitch - Lead Member for Local Government Reorganisation and Prosperity

Local Member(s) and Division: No direct impact on specific Divisions or Members

Lead Officer: Alyn Jones – LGR Programme Director

Author: Alastair Higton – LGR Programme Manager

Contact Details: AGJones@somerset.gov.uk 07815 140222, ARHigton@somerset.gov.uk
07977 410446

1. Summary / Background

- 1.1.** On 17 March 2022 the Secretary of State made the Somerset (Structural Changes) Order 2022 (the SCO). The SCO sets out the mechanism for the reorganisation of local government and the establishment of a single unitary council in Somerset on 1 April 2023.

In particular, the SCO requires that during the period from 10 May 2022 until 31 March 2023 the Executive of Somerset County Council will be the LGR Programme "Implementation Executive" and be responsible for:

- Ensure delivery of "effective, efficient and timely transfer of the district councils' functions, property, rights and liabilities." In other words, to ensure delivery of a new council.
- Hold and keep under review an Implementation Plan including plans, timetables and budgets that support delivery of the new unitary council's functions on (or after) 1 April 2023.

- 1.2.** In line with the SCO and the new Administration's intentions for the programme, this paper recommends the creation Implementation Board to monitor the programme and provide advice and recommendations on its implementation to the Executive of Somerset County Council. To provide oversight on behalf of the County's Executive in relation to the implementation of a single tier of local government in Somerset and any related matters, namely:

- Ensure delivery of "effective, efficient and timely transfer of the district councils' functions, property, rights and liabilities."
- Hold, oversee delivery and keep under review an Implementation Plan (approved by the SCC Executive Committee) including plans, timetables

and budgets that support delivery of the new unitary council's functions on (or after) 1 April 2023

- Overseeing development of the new council's Constitution and the Schemes of Delegation
- Overseeing plans to align existing change activities across the councils
- Having regards to the business case approved by the Secretary of State: this means there is scope within it for flexibility to reflect changes in emphasis

1.3. In addition, the role of the Implementation Board will be to review the current LGR Implementation Plan, particularly the objectives of the programme, and recommend to the Executive how to ensure they remain appropriate. The Implementation Plan can be found in Appendix A to this report, and it is anticipated that the Implementation Plan be updated quarterly and presented to the SCC Executive for their approval. It is good practice to review and update the Implementation Plan at least quarterly for the SCC Executive to approve.

1.4. Terms of reference for the Implementation Board, including proposals for Membership, can be found in Appendix B to this report

2. Recommendations

2.1. The purpose of this report is for the Executive to:

2.1.1 Note the current Implementation Plan for LGR Programme in Somerset prepared in line with SCO requirements.

2.1.2 Approve creation of an Implementation Board to monitor the LGR programme in Somerset and provide advice and recommendations on its implementation to the Executive as set out in the terms of reference attached in Appendix B.

2.1.3 Agree that SCC's nominations to the Implementation Board be approved by the SCC Executive.

3. Reasons for recommendations

3.1 The purpose of the recommendations is to discharge duties required by the Somerset (Structural Changes) Order 2022 and ensure effective and transparent governance and delivery of the LGR Programme.

4. Other options considered

4.1. The alternative governance option, to not create an Implementation Board, would have reduced the inclusivity of the programme and was rejected on that basis.

4.2. No alternative options were considered regarding production of an Implementation Plan, which is a requirement of the SCO.

5. Links to Council Policy and Budgets

- 5.1. LGR in Somerset, LGR Programme and recommendations in this report are consistent with the County Vision to improve lives. The financial benefits of delivering the new Council are £18.5m per year after the 2 year payback period.
- 5.2. Opportunities for significant transformation and improvement in line with Council policy as a result of unitarisation are also anticipated and will deliver additional financial and non-financial benefits

6. Consultations and co-production

- 6.1. Consultation has been undertaken informally with the new Administration and formally through each of the 5 Councils through the Programme Board, Programme Steering Group and members of the Governance Workstream. This report and recommendations reflect those discussions, as well as feedback from those required to provide sign-off for the final report.

7. Financial and Risk Implications

- 7.1. No specific financial or risk implications have been identified in relation to the recommendations in this report.
- 7.2. Establishment of an Implementation Board and publication of an Implementation Plan will however mitigate programme risks including financial ones which are expected to include:
 - Stronger partnerships and working relationships
 - Managing change effectively
 - Ensuring stronger collaboration and coproduction for better outcomes.
 - The importance of transparency, programme oversight and informed decision-making

The Programme Risk Register is appended to the Implementation Plan.

8. Legal and HR Implications

- 8.1. No specific implications have been identified in relation to the recommendations in this report.

9. Other Implications

9.1. Equalities Implications

No specific implications have been identified in relation to the recommendations in this report: the proposed Implementation Board will not be a decision-making group however due regard will be given to the equalities implications of its work. Any decisions taken to the SCC Executive relating to LGR will be subject to equalities considerations. It should also be noted that the LGR Business Case includes a full Equalities Impact Statement.

9.2. Community Safety Implications

No specific implications have been identified in relation to the recommendations in this report.

9.3. Sustainability Implications

No specific implications have been identified in relation to the recommendations in this report.

9.4. Health and Safety Implications

No specific implications have been identified in relation to the recommendations in this report.

9.5. Health and Wellbeing Implications

No specific implications have been identified in relation to the recommendations in this report.

9.6. Social Value

No specific implications have been identified in relation to the recommendations in this report, however the creation of an LGR Implementation Board will provide oversight and input into planning and decision-making and support social value outcomes generated by the implementation of a single unitary authority for Somerset.

10. Scrutiny comments / recommendations:

10.1. The proposed decision has not been considered by a Scrutiny Committee owing to the timing of this report and establishment of Joint Scrutiny arrangements.

11. Background Papers

11.1. Appendix A: Somerset Council Implementation Plan
Appendix B: Draft Terms of Reference for LGR Implementation Board
Appendix C: [Structural Changes Order](#) - and [Explanatory Note](#)

Report Sign-Off		Date completed
Legal Implications	Tom Woodhams	27/05/22
Governance	Scott Wooldridge	30/05/22
Corporate Finance	Jason Vaughan	30/05/22
Human Resources and ICT	Chris Squire	27/05/22
Property	Paula Hewitt / Oliver Woodhams	06/06/22
Procurement	Claire Griffiths	27/05/22
Senior Manager	Alyn Jones	26/5/22
Commissioning Development	Sunita Mills / Ryszard Rusinek	27/05/22

Executive Lead Member	Cllr Val Keitch	30/05/22
Consulted on report		
Opposition Spokesperson	Cllr Faye Purbrick	06/06/22
Scrutiny Chair	Cllr Gwil Wren	07/06/22

This page is intentionally left blank