

Local Government Reorganisation Joint Scrutiny Committee

Friday 19 August 2022

**10.00 am John Meikle Room, The Deane
House, Belvedere Road, Taunton**



To: The Members of the Local Government Reorganisation Joint Scrutiny Committee

Cllr S Buller, Cllr Cllr T Butt Philip, Cllr Cllr M Chilcott, Cllr B Crow, Cllr Cllr T Deakin, Cllr Cllr B Filmer (Chair), Cllr P Ham, Cllr B Hamilton, Cllr C Inchley, Cllr M Lithgow, Cllr D Mansell, Cllr P Maxwell, Cllr H Prior-Sankey, Cllr D Rodrigues, Cllr J Roundell Greene and Cllr B Smedley

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 - Date Not Specified

For further information about the meeting, please contact Jamie Jackson jajackson@somerset.gov.uk or Clare Rendell clare.rendell@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 on request prior to the meeting in large print, Braille, audio tape & disc and can be translated into different languages. They can also be accessed via the council's website on www.somerset.gov.uk/agendasandpapers



RNID typetalk

AGENDA

Item Local Government Reorganisation Joint Scrutiny Committee - 10.00 am Friday 19 August 2022

****Public Guidance notes contained in agenda annexe****

1 Apologies for Absence

To receive Members' apologies.

2 Minutes of the Previous Meeting (Pages 9 - 16)

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 ask a question or make a statement about any matter on the agenda for this meeting. These questions may be taken during the meeting, when the relevant agenda item is considered, at the Chair's discretion.

5 Appointment of Vice Chair

6 LGR Joint Scrutiny Committee Terms of Reference (Pages 17 - 28)

7 LGR Programme Progress Update (Pages 29 - 42)

8 LGR Programme Risk Review (Pages 43 - 68)

9 LCN Approach to Consultation (Pages 69 - 82)

10 Summary of Outcomes from Implementation Board on 29th July 2022 (Pages 83 - 86)

11 Work Programme and Meeting Cycle (Pages 87 - 88)

Dates of Future Meetings:-
30 September 2022 at 10am
11 November 2022 at 2pm
16 December 2022 at 10am

3 February 2023 at 10am
17 March 2023 at 10am

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. 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.

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.

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

This page is intentionally left blank

LOCAL GOVERNMENT REORGANISATION JOINT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Meeting held in the Canalside Conference Centre, Marsh Lane, Huntworth, TA6 6LQ on Monday 7 March 2022 at 2.00 pm

Present: Cllr S Wakefield (Chair), Cllr B Filmer (Vice Chair), Cllr A Bown, Cllr S Buller, Cllr P Ham, Cllr B Hamilton, Cllr T Grimes, Cllr A Groskop, Cllr C Inchley (from 14.15), Cllr T Munt, Cllr J Lock, Cllr P Maxwell, Cllr L Redman, Cllr D Rodrigues, Cllr W Wallace and Cllr R Williams

Other Members present: Cllr D Fothergill and Cllr F Purbrick

Other members present virtually: Cllr F Nicholson, Cllr C Paul, Cllr P Clayton, Cllr S Coles, Cllr D Hall, Cllr D Johnson, Cllr T Lock, Cllr B Revans, Cllr E Firmin, Cllr Farbahi, Cllr J Hassall, Cllr J Lloyd, Cllr P Seib, Cllr B Weston, Cllr L Whetlor and Cllr R Wyke

Apologies for absence: None

1 Minutes of the meeting held on 31 January 2022 - Agenda Item 2

The Minutes of the LGR Joint Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 31 January 2022 were approved, subject to some minor typographical amendments being made.

2 Declarations of Interest - Agenda Item 3

The Committee noted the details of the personal interests of all Councillors present already declared in relation to their membership of County, District, Town and Parish Councils.

3 Public Question Time – Agenda Item 4

Mr N Hall, a resident in Somerset, provided the following statement to the Committee: -

“Good afternoon – my name is Nick Hall. I live in Pilton, near Shepton Mallet.

It is important to have free speech and something we take for granted. My thoughts are with the people of Ukraine who are fighting for that right.

Chair, I appreciate your acceptance at the last meeting that the issues I had raised were likely to be ones that your committee wants to consider.

You also stated that Mendip District Council could also address these issues ahead of the formation of the new Somerset Council. Unfortunately I see little evidence of this and in fact the situation is worsening.

Glastonbury Festival Events Ltd (GFEL) is now seeking approval to increase Festival attendance from 203,000 to 210,000.

I believe that this drive for a larger Festival is leading to new buildings, new concrete tracks and hedgerows being removed. Also a long list of suspected planning breaches remains unresolved.

GFEL talk about being a good neighbour, but these aren't the actions of one.

And surely a Festival for 203,000 people is large enough?

Rather than making it bigger, why not make it better? Perhaps less environmental impact?

The Premises License specifies a number of requirements before the approval to increase attendance can be granted. We are struggling to engage Mendip District Council to provide us with assurances that these License requirements will be met.

From 5th May (or some date around that) the new Somerset Council will have increased responsibility for the regulation of the world's largest green field music festival. Some of us in our village would like to help shape a better course of action.

So please can I make further request that someone from the new Somerset Council engages with us to help resolve our immediate issues?"

The Chair thanked Mr Hall for his comments and for attending the meeting and advised that a written response will be provided. The comments will also be forwarded to the LGR Joint Committee.

4 **LGR Programme update (including assurance feedback from PwC) –**
Agenda Item 5

The LGR Programme Director, Alyn Jones gave a PowerPoint presentation updating the Committee on the LGR programme, covering the following matters: -

- Programme overview, strategic objectives, progress
- PwC Monthly feedback report for January 2022 ("PwC said, we did" process)

- Activity during February
- The next 3 months
- Programme risk register

Mr Jones highlighted the following in his presentation: -

- The LGR programme strategic objectives: -
 - Objective 1 – create a new unitary Council for Somerset, that delivers the approved business case on 1 April 2023
 - Objective 2 – enable performance capability - to deliver business case vision on 1 April 2023
 - Objective 3 – develop the new Council to optimise benefits and opportunities from 1 April 2023 to 31 March 2025
- The programme governance for the programme and workstream level
- Advised that the LGR programme has been broken into 'tranches', moving from transition to full transformation, which is required in the business case. He also highlighted the firm link into the medium-term financial planning process (MTFP) so can ensure are delivering the benefits set out in the business case and being sure have the building blocks in place to support the MTFP process for the new organisation.
- The LGR scorecard – there are 82 individual workstream scorecards that are required to populate the document, and the complete document will be available for the Joint Committee meeting.
- PwC monthly feedback report – PwC provide 'critical friend' challenge and advice to the programme and Mr Jones referred to the key elements of their feedback and the "PwC said, we did" process.
- Work undertaken recently and activity during February, highlighting the staff briefings, regular all-Council member briefings and the Structural Change Order (SCO) passing through Parliament. The House of Lords hearing takes place on 9 March and following that it will go to the House of Commons for final vote on 14 and anticipate receiving a copy of the SCO by no later than 15 March, which will enable the statutory Notice of Election being issued.
- Outlined activity / work over next 3 months, including working towards the council election on 5 May and programme checkpoint, as will be 11 months from Vesting Day.

The Committee discussed the presentation, and the following is a summary of the areas raised: -

- Customer access points, culture / pace of change in transition and need to learn from each other. Need to be careful about the level of ambition when designing target operating model and to change gradually over the transition period.
- Explanation of the 'LGR scorecard' – Mr Jones explained in view of the size and complexity of the programme, the scorecard is critical as it will provide

assurance and enable oversight. It is essentially a tracking tool, to see how are performing.

- Would be useful if the risk register was prioritised and need to know what *hasn't* been progressed in terms of the 'PwC said, we did' so there is a full picture of what's happened. Mr Jones said that had tried to cover this in the next steps section / slides.
- Concerns expressed and issue of scrutiny / oversight going forward if the paper to be considered later at the meeting (at agenda item 9) is agreed.
- Questions around the budget setting processes, whether have budgets to implement the process, how ensure all 5 Councils have been robust and the assets protocol in terms of outcomes for communities. Mr Jones confirmed that with regard to the budget setting process, it was why wanted to ensure the programme plan was cognizant of the MTFP and have the necessary steps in place. The assets protocol is part of that step and any section 24 notice linked to the SCO also provides that control. Outcomes for communities are front and centre in the programme. The programme is high paced and need to ensure using the implementation budget to best effect and can respond to requests form workstreams for additional support as swiftly as possible.
- How will measure the business case objectives 'better services', 'better VFM' (objective 3)? Mr Jones provided this by way of an example of the mapping work being done and 'products' (what need to do to be fit for purpose) for example the establishment of one single phone number and website for all council services from April 2023, for the whole of Somerset, to avoid duplication (which will avoid duplication of effort too). The business case sets out what outcome should be in order to deliver better local services.
- Satisfied have sufficient staffing and resources and programme management office in place? Mr Jones explained that the programme is building and are recruiting to ensure have resources at the right time. There are 400+ people involved in the programme overall and there has been some backfilling in place. In response to questions, Mr Jones agreed to (a) find out the number of full-time equivalent staff on the programme and (b) with regard to resources, to raise with the Programme Board the situation in the District Councils and if each had included extra resources towards the unitary plan and backfilling of posts.
- Question about where the planning function will 'sit' in the new authority. It was clarified that this will be a decision for the new administration and leadership team of the new organisation – the planning function will not be devolved to the local Community Networks (LCNs) and organisationally, will be done at least the same level as before.
- Query about the role of the Advisory Board going forward. Mr Jones confirmed that it is likely to continue, to advise / guide the programme.

The LGR Joint Scrutiny Committee agreed: -

To recommend to the LGR Joint Committee (the LGR Implementation Executive after the SCO is signed off), that the reporting of the advice / activities of PwC include the recording of advice which has not been progressed / taken forward.

The voting was as follows: -

For – 10 votes

Against – 6 votes

Abstention – 0 votes.

5 LGR Risk Register - Agenda Item 6

The Acting Strategic Manager Business Change, at Somerset County Council, Alastair Higon, gave a PowerPoint presentation on the LGR Risk Register.

The Committee discussed the presentation, and the following is a summary of the areas raised: -

- LGR Risk Summary – helpful to have more details on the risks by category and priority area. It was confirmed that all actions are being considered and actively managed by each local authority and section 151 officers. For this reporting period (February), there are 19 'active' strategic (programme-level) risks identified and there are a further identified 56 other risks within LGR workstreams, who are actively managing mitigating actions for these and escalating via scorecards as required. A new member of the PMO team will be leading the risk work.
- Request for update on the Enterprise Resource Planning system (risk ID 26) – Mr Higon explained that once the discovery phase is completed can assess and understand better how interacts with the programme
- Question about monitoring the programme level risks until new arrangements are in place. Mr Jones confirmed how the risks will be managed - overseen by officers in that period / the Programme Board as the accountable body that will be considering and holding the programme to account. As Programme Director have role to review those risks and ensure that suitable action is being taken. PwC have oversight role as well.
- Concerns about duplicate wording of risk ID 20 and 21 relating to Children's services and adult social care, which shows lack of understanding and does not give confidence in some of the other risks detailed in the paper. It was explained that the document is reporting on programme level risks, and they are being managed and overseen by those service areas. In the light of feedback, it was agreed that the programme office will review the risk register i.e. how articulated and if the score is appropriate and the linkage to the programme and those services.

- The need for effective scrutiny should be included in the risk register (including any gap in the 'interim' period going forward i.e. the pre-election period and until arrangements are established following the elections).

The LGR Joint Scrutiny Committee noted the work on the LGR Risk Register and officers agreed to review how the LGR risk summary information is presented in future reporting.

MEETING ADJOURNED 16.00 – 16.10

6 LGR Implementation Budget Update – Agenda Item 7

The Strategic Director and Section 151 Officer for Sedgemoor District Council, Alison Turner gave a PowerPoint presentation which provided an update on the LGR implementation budget. A copy of the presentation will be circulated following the meeting.

Ms Turner highlighted the following in her presentation: –

- implementation costs and the spend profile for the £16.5m implementation costs;
- principles and process for applying for resources;
- criteria for approving resources from the implementation budget;
- implementation costs – governance and monitoring. Each of the 7 budgets has named responsible budget holder(s);
- implementation bids; and
- next steps – the product list has been divided into tranches which has been useful to align to the resource requests. Approved bids will be added as commitments to the Implementation Budget monitor and workstream leads are responsible for managing the budgets they requested. Budget monitoring will continue on a monthly basis to the Programme Steering Group and Board

A question was asked about underspends / overspends in the budget. Ms Turner explained that the funding is a total figure, if not used in 2021/22 it will be carried forward into 2022/23 or 2023/24. There is clear budget monitoring process in process in place and any overspend go through normal processes. The LGR budget split between Somerset CC and Districts is 80/20% and there is a contingency in the total budget of £1.5m.

The LGR Joint Scrutiny Committee noted the implementation budget update.

7 Local Community Networks (LCN) Update – Agenda Item 8

The Head of Corporate Services for Mendip District Council and LCN project lead, Sara Skirton, gave a PowerPoint presentation which provided an update on the Local Community Networks (LCN) and progress to date and some feedback and early lessons from the 3 LCN pilots. LCNs are fundamental to the business case and plans are being developed for between 15 – 20 LCNs across the county, to give communities influence over decisions about their local area. They will have flexibility to set their own priorities based on evidence and they will be formal committees of the new Council.

The Committee discussed the presentation, and the following is a summary of the areas raised: -

- Parish & Town Councils are concerned about what being asked to do, in terms of time commitment; how will people be encouraged to stand and support which will be provided etc? Ms Skirton said that each LCN will have dedicated support (manager) from the officer cohort, and they will have, through identifying priorities, the ability to influence Council priorities and in terms of frequency of meetings, it is estimated will be 6 to 8 meetings a year, but that that is to be determined.
- Engagement with Parish & Town Councils – Ms Skirton outlined the ongoing engagement and recognise their concerns; all will be in a LCN but not forced to engage; recognise capacity constraints; are meeting every 2 weeks with Town & Parish clerks.
- Powers / services of LCNs and needs to be clarity on terminology used about the role of LCNs as well - – Ms Skirton clarified that assets and services won't be devolved to LCNs and will have an influencing role.
- Question on the role of elected members on LCNs – Ms Skirton said that they will have fundamental role.
- Comments on governance of the LCNs, and potential tension between LCNs and Town / Parish councils and their different roles.
- Geography of LCNs – will develop and consult on potential LCN boundaries and are learning more from similar networks in other unitary areas. Initial options will be considered by the LGR advisory board early summer 2022 and there will be stakeholder and public engagement. Geographies will be formally agreed by end 2022. A LCN will not divide across a Town or Parish Council, however there will probably be some LCNs where a unitary councillor division will sit across 2 boundaries, at least until the boundary review and 2027 elections.
- LCNs could be big committees and could be tensions there. The Business case envisages 4 – 9 unitary councillors on each LCN and until 2027 elections and boundary review there may be councillors sitting on 1 or more LCN.
- Outcome / feedback from pilots – provides the opportunity to test what works and what doesn't work.

The LGR Joint noted the LCN update.

8 **Future Meetings and Work Programme – Agenda Item 9**

The Scrutiny Manager for Somerset County Council, Jamie Jackson presented a report regarding the future of the LGR Joint Scrutiny Committee. Mr Jackson explained that subject to the Structural Change Order (SCO) coming into effect on / around 15 March 2022, this will be the last meeting of the Joint Scrutiny Committee in the current form. It will be for the newly elected Council following the elections in May 2022 to determine any future scrutiny or joint scrutiny arrangements.

The Committee discussed the report and expressed its deep concern about the scrutiny role during the period until future joint scrutiny arrangements are established following the May 2022 elections.

The LGR Joint Scrutiny Committee:

- 1. Noted that subject to the SCO coming into effect, this is the last meeting of the Joint Scrutiny Committee under its terms of reference.**
- 2. Unanimously agreed that the LGR Joint Committee look at how to maintain and continue scrutiny in the interim period – that is 15 March 2022 until arrangements are established following the May 2022 elections.**
- 3. Asked the Scrutiny Manager to discuss with the Monitoring Officer for view on options available to the Joint Scrutiny Committee.**

(The meeting ended at 5.06 pm)

CHAIR

Somerset County Council
Local Government Reorganisation Joint Scrutiny Committee
– 19 August 2022

Local Government Reorganisation Joint Scrutiny Committee Terms of Reference
Lead Officer: Scott Wooldridge, Monitoring Officer and Strategic Manager–Governance & Democratic Services

Author: Clare Rendell, Senior Democratic Services Officer

Contact Details: clare.rendell@somerset.gov.uk

1. Summary

- 1.1.** The Local Government Reorganisation Joint Scrutiny Committee was re-established following the Annual General Meeting in May 2022. Its functions will be to provide the joint overview and scrutiny function for Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) and the Constituent Councils will be asked to delegate the overview of the LGR Implementation Plan and LGR Implementation Budget to the Joint Scrutiny Committee (JSC).

2. Recommendations

- 2.1.** To note the Terms of Reference for the LGR Joint Scrutiny Committee.

3. Background

- 3.1.** At the Annual General Meeting on 25 May 2022, the Council agreed to re-establish a LGR Joint Scrutiny Committee to provide the joint overview and scrutiny function for the LGR Programme.
- 3.2.** The LGR Joint Scrutiny Committee will exist until 31 March 2023 and consist of 16 members, 8 from Somerset County Council and 2 members of each of the 4 District Councils (the relevant overview and scrutiny committee of each Constituent Council will nominate members from their own membership to the JSC)

4. Consultations undertaken

- 4.1.** The Committee meetings are open to all Councillors to attend and contribute to its meetings.

5. Background papers

- 5.1.** Further information can be found in the agenda pack for the Annual General Meeting held on 25 May 2022 which has been published on the council's website.

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

This page is intentionally left blank

Local Government Reorganisation - Joint Scrutiny Committee

Terms of Reference

1. Purpose

- 1.1 Mendip District Council, Sedgemoor District Council, Somerset County Council, Somerset West and Taunton Council and South Somerset District Council (“the Constituent Councils”) are proposing to form a Joint Scrutiny Committee, known as the Local Government Reorganisation Joint Scrutiny Committee (“JSC”) to provide overview and scrutiny of the Local Government Reorganisation (“LGR”) Implementation Plan and LGR Implementation Budget in relation to the implementation of a single unitary council (Somerset Council) for Somerset on 1 April 2023.
- 1.2 The establishment of Somerset Council as the single unitary council is set out in the Somerset Structural Changes Order 2022 which further defines the functions and responsibilities of the County Council’s Executive and the Implementation Team.

2. Governance

- 2.1 The JSC will act as a Joint Committee under s 101 and s 102 Local Government Act 1972 and as an overview and scrutiny committee under s 21 Local Government Act 2000 (as amended).

3. Scrutiny Function

- 3.1 The JSC will provide the joint overview and scrutiny function for LGR and the Constituent Councils will be asked to delegate the overview of the LGR Implementation Plan and LGR Implementation Budget to the JSC. This will be to the exclusion of the Constituent Councils own overview and scrutiny arrangements.

4. Roles, Duties and Responsibilities

- 4.1 The role of the JSC will be to exercise the overview of the LGR Implementation Plan and LGR Implementation Budget on behalf of the Constituent Councils in accordance with the powers outlined in S21 Local Government Act 2000 to include:-

- Developing a forward work programme of activities.
- Reviewing or scrutinising decisions made, or other action taken by the County Council's Executive and the proposed LGR Implementation Board.
- Seeking reassurance and considering whether the County Council's Executive and the proposed LGR Implementation Board is operating in accordance with the implementation plan for LGR and is being managed effectively.
- Holding the County Council's Executive and the proposed LGR Implementation Board to account by providing critical challenge to ensure that it provides the high-level strategic direction for the implementation of the new unitary Council.
- Reviewing progress in relation to the implementation plan and identifying to the County Council's Executive and the proposed LGR Implementation Board barriers to progress, best practice and possible improvements.
- Scrutinising the level of requests to be made to each Constituent Council for allocation from their revenue and capital allocations to support delivery of the implementation plan.
- Scrutinising the form, function, and constitution of the proposed local community networks (LCNs).
- Scrutinising the plans to align existing LGR related change activities cross the Councils.
- Scrutinising the development of the Somerset Council's annual budget 2023/24 and the associated medium term financial plan.
- Scrutinising the development of policies and protocols for Somerset Council and across the Constituent Councils for use during the transition period.

5. Membership / Substitute Members

5.1 The JSC will be made up of 16 members drawn from the overview and scrutiny members of the Constituent Councils as follows:

- Somerset County Council (8 members)
- Somerset West and Taunton Council (2 members)
- South Somerset District Council (2 members)
- Sedgemoor District Council (2 members)
- Mendip District Council (2 members)

It is proposed that the relevant overview and scrutiny committee of each Constituent Council nominates members from their membership to the JSC. Any subsequent appointments or nomination of substitutes is a matter for the Chair of the respective overview and scrutiny committee of each Constituent Council.

- 5.2 Political proportionality will apply to those appointments (and to that of any substitute) and the political representation should represent the political make up of each of the Constituent Councils.
- 5.3 Each member will have one vote.
- 5.4 Executive members of the Constituent Councils are precluded from sitting as members of the JSC.
- 5.5 The Chair of the relevant overview and scrutiny committee of each Constituent Council may appoint an overview and scrutiny member to act as a substitute where one of their members is unable to attend a meeting of the JSC. Substitutions may only be made on a meeting by meeting basis and if the appointed member(s) is unable to attend a meeting of the JSC. Any substitutions must be notified to the Scrutiny Officer of the Administering Council (as defined in Paragraph 9.1. below) ("the Scrutiny Officer") by 9.00am on the day of the relevant meeting.
- 5.6 Reflecting the importance of engaging with stakeholders across Somerset, the JSC will be able to invite representatives to meetings where it considers that they will contribute to the delivery of an effective scrutiny function.

6. Term

- 6.1 The Term of the JSC shall end on 31 March 2023 or earlier in the event of a decision of the five Constituent Councils to end the joint scrutiny arrangements.

7. Work Programme

- 7.1 The JSC will maintain a work programme of activities. Constituent Council scrutiny committees may ask the JSC to consider matters for inclusion in the work programme. The final decision will be a matter for the JSC.

8. Reporting Arrangements

- 8.1 The work and recommendations of the JSC will be reported to the proposed LGR Implementation Board and County Council's Executive as necessary. Members of the JSC may make reports to their own Constituent Councils in accordance with their own governance procedures.

9. Meetings, agendas, reports and minutes

- 9.1 The administering Constituent Council shall be Somerset County Council ("the Administering Council").
- 9.2 The Administering Council shall appoint a statutory scrutiny officer ("the Statutory Scrutiny Officer") as defined in S9FB Local Government Act 2000. The scrutiny officers from the other Constituent Councils shall work with the Statutory Scrutiny Officer in supporting the JSC.
- 9.2 The overview and scrutiny process will be open and transparent in accordance with the Local Government Act 1972 and meetings will be held in public (unless the JSC agree to exclude the press and public for part of the meeting) and accessible online to ensure increased transparency.
- 9.3 The agenda and supporting papers will be published by the Administering Council and circulated at least five clear working days in advance of meetings.
- 9.4 The minutes of any meetings will be published on the Administering Council's website and circulated to the other Constituent Councils as soon as practicable. The JSC will operate in accordance with the constitution of the Administering Council. The Constituent Councils (with the

exception of the Administering Council) will each provide a link to the agendas and minutes of the JSC on its website.

10. Frequency of meetings

- 10.1 The date, time and venue of meetings will be fixed in advance by the JSC, and a schedule of meetings agreed at its inaugural and/or subsequent meetings. The JSC will meet approximately every 8 weeks. Dates will be published on the website of the Administering Council. Additional meetings may be convened at the request of the Chair or Vice Chair.

11. Venue

- 11.1 Meetings of the JSC will take place in a number of locations across the County of Somerset and will be rotated around the Constituent Councils.

12. Election of Chair and Vice Chair

- 12.1 The Chair will be appointed by the County Council and the Vice Chair shall be a district council member. The Vice Chair will be elected at a meeting of the committee. In the absence of the Chair and Vice Chair, the meeting will elect a chair for that meeting.

13. Quorum

- 13.1 The quorum of the JSC shall be 9, including members from at least four of the five Constituent Councils.

14. Declarations of interest

- 14.1 JSC members are subject to the Code of Conduct for elected members adopted by the Constituent Council that nominated them including the requirement to declare relevant interests at formal meetings of the JSC.

15. Voting

- 15.1 Recommendations will generally be reached by consensus, but if a vote is required it will be by a simple majority of all members physically present at the meeting. Where there are equal votes the Chair of the meeting will have a second or casting vote.

16. Duty to attend, cooperate and respond

- 16.1 The JSC may require by invitation relevant members of the County Council's Executive, LGR Implementation Board and/or the Chief Executive Chair of the Implementation Team to appear before it to explain (in relation to all aspects of the JSC's work) any particular decision or series of decisions. The relevant members and Chief Executive should attend if so required, unless they have a legitimate reason for not doing so.
- 16.2 Following each meeting of the JSC, the JSC's recommendations (if any) will be submitted to the LGR Implementation Board and/or County Council's Executive for consideration. The LGR Implementation Board will be required to consider those recommendations at its next meeting and respond to the JSC indicating what (if any) action the LGR Implementation Board proposes to take. The response should be made within 7 days of the LGR Implementation Board meeting and will be published on the website of the Administering Council.

17. Call-in

- 17.1 Any 5 members of the Constituent Councils, to include members from at least 3 of the Constituent Councils, may request a call-in of a LGR related decision taken by the County Council's Executive. The call-in must be submitted in writing or by email to the Statutory Scrutiny Officer, indicating its support by all relevant parties along with the reasons for the call-in and proposed outcome(s). The Statutory Scrutiny Officer must notify the Monitoring Officer that administers the County Council's Executive and the LGR Implementation Board of the call-in request.

- 17.2 “Call-in” is a facility which members can use to challenge Key Decisions where the JSC has not been involved prior to the decision being taken or where a member believes a decision has been taken without the proper process having been followed.

A key decision is defined as:

- (a) Resulting in the local authority incurring expenditure** which is, or the making of savings which are, significant having regard to the local authority’s budget for the service or function to which the decision relates; and / or
- (b) Significant in terms of their effect on communities living or working in an area comprising two or more wards or electoral divisions in the area of the local authority.

**There is no definition in the legislation of the word ‘significant’ in (a) above. Therefore, for the purposes of LGR key decisions the financial threshold at or above which a financial decision is significant (and a Key Decision) will be a total value of £500,000 for capital / revenue expenditure or savings.

Call-in of Key Decisions is subject to the following rules:

(a) General provisions:

- (i) Call-in should be used on an exception basis and not to unnecessarily delay delivery of the Structural Changes Order and / or the implementation plan for the Somerset Council;
- (ii) An individual Key Decision should normally only be subject to scrutiny once, whether pre or post decision;
- (iii) Key Decisions cannot be called in where the decision requires urgent implementation. Urgent implementation requires the approval of the Leader of the County Council and the Chair of the JSC and their approval shall be recorded in the relevant report;
- (iv) Call-in only applies to decisions. Recommendations (for example, made by the LGR Implementation Board to the County Council’s Executive) cannot be called-in.

(b) Scrutiny of Key Decisions before they are taken:

This should focus on ensuring that the decision-maker has all the necessary information, to take a fully informed decision and that any procedures have been properly followed. Any scrutiny review at this stage should not pre-empt the decision. The decision-maker must take the views of the JSC into account before taking the decision.

(c) Scrutiny of Key Decisions after they are taken but before they are implemented:

(i) Key Decisions are published to all members and the public (via the website) within 2 working days of the decision date;

(ii) Key Decisions (unless urgency is agreed) must be called-in (following the process outlined in 17.1 above) within 5 working days of publication or the decision will be implemented automatically.

(iii) The Chair and the Vice Chair of the JSC will consider call-in requests against the principles of good decision-making and will either agree the request or detail their reasons for rejecting the request in a report to the next available meeting of the JSC. In reaching their conclusion they will take advice from the Statutory Scrutiny Officer and the Monitoring Officer and a summary of that advice will be included in the report to the JSC;

(iv) A call-in must specify the subject matter, the reason(s) for it, information required to enable full consideration and the preferred outcome;

(v) Each call-in will be considered at the next meeting of the JSC unless an alternative is agreed with the decision-maker;

(vi) The JSC having considered a call-in will report to the decision-maker;

(vii) Where an item has been subject to pre-decision scrutiny of the process, post decision call-in should normally only relate to the decision itself;

(viii) If there is no pre-decision scrutiny of an item then the process and/or the decision may be the subject of call-in.

(d) Scrutiny of Key Decisions after implementation:

This should only occur where the decision-maker was required to make a decision that was time critical or at a later stage to gauge the effect of the decision. Scrutiny in these circumstances is not part of the call-in process.

18. Code of Conduct

- 18.1 Members of the JSC are expected to observe the “Seven Principles of Public Life” (the ‘Nolan’ principles) and shall be bound by their Constituent Council’s Code of Conduct in their work on the JSC. Members are expected to act in the interests of the JSC, except where this would result in a breach of a statutory or other duty to their Constituent Authority or would be in breach of their Constituent Council’s Code of Conduct.

19. Access to information

- 19.1 JSC meetings are regarded as a council committee for the purposes of the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985. Meetings will be open to the press and public unless it is necessary to exclude the public in accordance with Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972. All agendas, reports, and minutes of the JSC will be made publicly available, unless deemed exempt or confidential in accordance with the above Act. The Freedom of Information Act 2000 provisions shall apply to all business of the JSC.

20. Rules of Procedure

- 20.1 Save as outlined in this Terms of Reference the procedures followed at the JSC meetings shall be in accordance with the overview and scrutiny procedure rules of the Administering Council. In the event of any conflict between this Terms of Reference and the relevant overview and scrutiny procedure rules, the provisions of these Terms of Reference shall prevail.

This page is intentionally left blank

Together we are delivering your

New Somerset Council

Programme update

Alyn Jones, Alastair Highton, Angela Farmer

Programme Progress Update

Programme Scorecard for month of June and PwC Monthly Report and half-year review

Key points for discussion:

1. Overall programme status: Amber
2. The programme is part of the overall approach to MTFP
3. Resourcing remains a challenge particularly in the Service Alignment workstream, however work continues to understand where these pressures are greatest and solutions being put in place now.

Ask of Scrutiny:

- To review and note the scorecard

Alyn Jones/Alastair Higton

	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 (As of: 31/05/2022)	This Period (As of: 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 32

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 Progress Update

PwC Monthly Report for June, and half-year review

Author:
PwC

Key points for discussion:

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 Scrutiny:

To review the contents of the report and where additional or different activity can improve delivery

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.

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
Programme and project management ways of working	<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.
Benefits and LGR savings	<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 from May	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.

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 of 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.

Programme Progress Update

LGR Joint Scrutiny Committee Draft Forward Plan

Author:
Alastair Higton

Key points:

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

Dates have been confirmed with Workstreams and validated by the PMO and Monitoring Officer.

Outstanding queries relating to Assets Optimisation and Finance are being worked through at pace, and a full workplan, with dates, will be uploaded onto the programme management system shortly, and reported to the Committee at the next meeting.

Ask of Scrutiny:

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

LGR Programme Level Risks - update

Lead Officer: Alyn Jones, LGR Programme Director

Author: Angela Farmer, Risk Manager for LGR Programme

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

Cabinet Member: Cllr Val Keitch

Division and Local Member: All

1. Summary

- 1.1. There are many definitions of risk. In most cases it is the threat to the delivery of objectives that form the definition.

Therefore, to have risk management in place is about good governance and by having good governance in place, the Council will 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 Joint Scrutiny Committee are asked to note the current 17 LGR programme risks
- 2.2. Members of the Joint Scrutiny Committee are asked to review and scrutinise the programme level risks to:
1. Identify any of the risks that the committee believe further consideration to mitigate the risk are needed
 2. Identify any risks or subject areas which the committee would like the programme risk manager to investigate as a consideration of a potential programme level risk

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 August 2022 there were 18 programme level risks and these are set out below:

Workstream	Programme Level risks
People	1. Loss of staff from County and District Councils

	<p>deemed essential to programme delivery</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 4. The risk that there is insufficient capacity to manage the people side of change
CCP	<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	<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)
PSG/PMO	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Uncontrolled change to the scope of the LGR programme 2. Inter-dependencies between the workstreams not managed effectively 3. The risk that non-delivery or late delivery of key LGR products that other workstreams are dependent on 4. The risk that the LGR programme negatively impacts service provision and improvement activities of Children's Services and Adult Social Care. 5. The risk of overspend of the £16.5m costs

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

4. Implications

- 4.1.** A risk is the potential for something to occur that can have an impact on what you are trying to deliver. The programme level risks identified represent risks that the programme need to be aware and actively mitigate in order to ensure that all products are delivered.

5. Background papers

- 5.1.** The LGR Risk Management Framework

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

This page is intentionally left blank

LGR Joint Scrutiny Committee

19th September 2022

Angela Farmer

Key points for discussion:

1. An overview of the definition of risk
2. An overview of how risks are managed through the programme
3. An overview of the current 18 programme level risks
4. A discussion on these risks including
 1. The current risks on the register
 2. Any particular risk that the Committee wish to look at in detail
 3. Any area/product the Committee wish the Programme to consider as a potential risk

Risk definition

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

Review and monitor

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

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

•

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 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
 2. Broken down by workstream

LGR Risks - August 2022

Programme Level Risks:

Overview of total number of risks:

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

Workstream Risks:

Overview of total number of risks:

Workstream	Total number of risks
People	26
CCP	13
SAI	67
Finance	22
Assets	36
Governance	24
Total:	188

Programme Level Risks - Workstream: Finance

Date: August 2022

Page 52

Ref	Risk description	Impact on the programme (effect(Inherent score	Controls/Actions	Residual score	Comments
10	There is a risk of a significant budget gap for new Somerset Council in 2023/24 when districts and County budgets combine, significantly impacting the financial stability of the new Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inability to set a balanced budget Reductions in service budget and levels 	22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finance and asset protocol across 5 councils S24 Notice from DHLUC effective May 2022 Budget monitoring processes in the 5 councils Establishment control processes (People) Development of 22/23 baseline budget for new Council, to provide basis for the development of MTFP for new Somerset Council and 23/24 budget (22	
15	Failure of workstreams/projects to achieve their expected financial benefits as described in business case	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of achievements of promised overall programme benefits Programme does not meet stakeholder expectations Inability to set a balanced budget 	20	<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 in post Tranche 1 products agreed Work on Tranche 2 products started 	19	
24	There is a risk that legacy councils may make spend commitments that adversely affect implementation and benefits delivery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Threat to opening financial position of the council. Impact on achievement of the £18.5m financial benefit. Potential for harm to relationships between councils 	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DHLUC s24 notice Adoption of the Finance and Asset protocol by all 5 councils Guidance produced 	8	
26	The risk that the back-office ERP (Enterprise Resource Planning) system not sufficiently implemented to support the new authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inability to pay invoices, raise invoices, and monitor spending during the year 	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation plan that delivers in excess of the minimum viable product Continued close management of implementation partner against published programme Clear governance and oversight Independent governance oversight role by SOCITM Reports to formal steering group 	18	

Programme Level Risks - Workstream: Service Alignment

Date: August 2022

Ref	Risk description	Impact on the programme (effect)	Inherent score	Controls/Actions	Residual score	Comments
228	Lack of a decision around contracts that are reaching the end of their life between now and April 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduction in service levels 	22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	14	
13	Unforeseen emergency or business continuity interruption or rising tide situation that requires staff to be directed from the day job into incident response.	<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 	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create and maintain a Business Continuity Plan (BCP) for the LGR Programme (signed off by Programme Board) including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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, Desktop test of BCP. (Resource constraints have delayed completion of this piece of work however more staff have been approved for PMO) 	15	
22	The risk that delivery of ICS implementation is not effectively joined-up with LGR implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Failure to deliver programme to agreed time, cost and quality. Failure to deliver expected benefits. Missed transformation opportunities 	14	<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 	14	

Programme Level Risks - Workstream: People

Date: August 2022

Ref	Risk description	Impact on the programme (effect)	Inherent score	Controls/Actions	Residual score	Comments
12	Loss of staff from County and District Councils deemed essential to the programme delivery	<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 	22	<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- 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 	20	
11	The risk that there are insufficient people resources to implement LGR programme and deliver the approved business case	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 Unmanageable workloads on staff 	22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Early definition of resource requirements (capability and capacity) as part of gateway Validation of 1 with PwC as QA partner incorporating lessons learned from previous LGR programmes Resource shortfalls to be raised to five CEOs to address Interim labour arrangements to be defined as a fall back plan. Dedicated LGR Programme Manager (in post from Jan '22) PwC as quality assurance partner in place from Dec '21. 17 February 2022 agreement to fund additional PMO, project specific and subject matter expertise to the programme. 	14	
25	The risk that BAU activity within the Councils is impacted by stretched staff resources balancing LGR and BAU work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recruitment protocol Staff engagement at local level BAU process at local level to ensure any additional work is scrutinised before agreeing to continue Monitoring key performance indicators for any drop off in service provision/performance 	14	

Ref	Risk description	Impact on the programme (effect)	Inherent score	Controls/Actions	Residual score	Comments
309	The risk that there is insufficient capacity to manage the people side of change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where programme outcomes and benefits results are dependent on collective, proficient adoption of new ways of working 	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change management approach, quality framework and tools established and in use 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 Validation of approach and priorities with PwC and our Unitary partners Working closely with comms and People workstream Plans in place to identify and collaborate with wider change assets across all organisations Mobilisation of tactical change management resource to work alongside and support existing network of change management across all organisations Engagement with programme and WS leads to unite thinking and drive profile of people side of change as core competence of programme Evidence based approach to defining extent and impact of T1 products to define level of need and target resource where needed most Application of data and insight from across WS to build programme change plan and EIA support Embedding change management within current assurance practice and reporting Nominated lead for People change 	19	

Ref	Risk description	Impact on the programme (effect)	Inherent score	Controls/Actions	Residual score	Comments
19	Design/products to create new unitary council will not have the community as the central focus in the design of the new operating model	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organisational culture is not community focused Insufficient partnership working Poor outcomes for communities Failure to deliver planned business case benefits 	19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Programme and workstream checkpoint review criteria Ensure LGR Advisory Board remains effective, inclusive, transparent and accessible (PSG) Embodiment of community focus as a critical requirement of operating model development through workshops, research and engagement (CCP) Ensure TOM development reflects emerging customer strategy and principles (CCP) Engagement with all workstreams to secure agreement/recognition that communities focus goes beyond safe and legal (CCP) Ensure interdependencies are identified and managed through iterative discussion and collaboration (CCP) Specifically, engage with People workstream to support as ethos and culture of communities and customers first (CCP/People) Involve customers and communities in the design of products and services (CCP) Learn from customer experience and feedback (CCP) Develop sound business case to underpin sufficient resourcing to deliver communities focused objectives (CCP/Finance) 	18	

Programme Level Risks - Workstream: Customers, Communities and Partnerships

Date: August 2022

Ref	Risk description	Impact on the programme (effect)	Inherent score	Controls/Actions	Residual score	Comments
14	Loss of opportunity to align public and VCSE services to new operating model and outcomes as defined in the Business Case	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced financial and non-financial benefits Poor relationship between partners and new authority Transformational opportunity lost, delayed or reduced Negative impact on cross-cutting outcomes for communities Reputational damage for new council 	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete partner and stakeholder mapping exercise (CCP) Targeted engagement with all strategic partners (CCP) Effective ongoing communications with all stakeholders about LGR programme and its objectives (Comms) Effective LCN's Services thinking about the relationship with the public and VCSE in design and delivery (SA) Ensure LGR Advisory Board remains inclusive, transparent and accessible (CCP) Stakeholder management plan(s) for critical products and across workplans (CCP) External communications on purpose and benefits of the LGR programme (Comms) Senior officer engagement with VCSE and partners (CCP) Use of customer panel to hear voice of the public and users (CCP) 	19	

Ref	Risk description	Impact on the programme (effect)	Inherent score	Controls/Actions	Residual score	Comments
27	Uncontrolled change to the scope of the LGR programme	<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 authorityImpact on capacity of teams to manage and deliver the programme: rework, wasted effort and reduction in shared understanding of programme priorities and required activity	19	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Programme Implementation Manual outlining decision-making tolerances and purpose of change controlCurrent Programme governance arrangements: PMO, Programme Steering Group and Programme Board to identifyChange control process in placeStrong communication within the programme within the programme promoting adherence to guidance around change control, benefits realisation and riskQuality assurance of workstream reporting	14	
239	Inter-dependencies between workstreams not managed effectively	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Inability to deliver cross-cutting products successfully and therefore benefits not realised	19	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Programme tranches developedA process/approach for management of dependencies to ensure impacts of change (time/cosy/quality) are easily understood at both workstream and programme level.PMO providing assurance against delivery of programme capabilitiesDependency management tool in central list (sharepoint)T1 products dependencies to be assessed are T1 sign off (Date: ongoing)Management of dependencies and interdependencies are part of monthly assurance meetings between PMO and workstream (Date: ongoing)	13	
23	The risk that non-delivery or late delivery of key LGR products that other workstreams are dependant on	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Missed opportunitiesSiloed workingFailure to deliver key productsDelays in workstreams and ultimately the programmeRe-engineering of solutions/rework required	22	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Reliable critical path is available, with regular opportunities to monitor and course-correct when necessaryRegular opportunities for project managers to review with workstream an sub-workstream leadsReview of scorecardsRobust programme and project planningModelling interdependencies incorporated into work plans and must havesAdequate resourcing of programme staff with appropriate capabilities and capacity to deliver workplanUtilise lessons learned from other programmeDedicated LGR programme managers in postRobust scrutiny of programme through Implementation Board, LGR Scrutiny	19	

Ref	Risk description	Impact on the programme (effect)	Inherent score	Controls/Actions	Residual score	Comments
21	The risk that the LGR programme negatively impacts service provision and improvement activities of Children’s services and Adult Social care	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Performance of service for vulnerable adults negatively impacted• Poor external perception of quality of services• Potential Government intervention	19	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Strong communication within the programme• Adherence to project guidelines around Change Control, Benefits realisation and risk.• Horizon scanning• . Cross-cutting involvement of senior managers across workstreams in particular Service Alignment and Improvement• Quarterly reporting to Programme Board• PMO engagement and participation with Integrated Care System Governance• Modelling of interdependencies between programmes, reflected in respective plans• Active consideration within the emerging Target Operating Model• Consideration of a review of Governance of CSC and ASC• Ongoing comms with the service• Experience gained from other councils going through LGR taken into consideration in approach	13	
111	The risk of overspend of £16.5m costs	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Higher than anticipated LGR programme costs and redundancy payments2. Reduction to reserves and longer payback on the Business Case	20	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The approved commitments are being challenged if the funding has not be fully committed to ensure the bid is still required, if it is not or can be reduced this will make more funds available for the programme.2. Work is underway to revisit the redundancy figures	20	A new risk added following agreement by PSG on 15 th August

Next steps

The Committee are asked to:

1. Identify any particular risks that they would like to focus on at future meetings
2. Identify any particular area/issue/concern that aren't on the register currently that they would like to explore as a consideration for programme level risk
3. Anything further the Committee would like to consider in respect of Programme Level Risks

LGR Joint Scrutiny 19th August 2022

Appendix One Overview of programme level risks

Programme Level Risks - workstream: Finance

Date: July 2022

Page 62

Ref	Risk description	Impact on the programme (effect(Inherent score	Controls/Actions	Residual score	Comments
10	There is a risk of a significant budget gap for new Somerset Council in 2023/24 when districts and County budgets combine, significantly impacting the financial stability of the new Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inability to set a balanced budget Reductions in service budget and levels 	22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finance and asset protocol across 5 councils S24 Notice from DHLUC effective May 2022 Budget monitoring processes in the 5 councils Establishment control processes (People) Development of 22/23 baseline budget for new Council, to provide basis for the development of MTFP for new Somerset Council and 23/24 budget (22	
15	Failure of workstreams/projects to achieve their expected financial benefits as described in business case	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of achievements of promised overall programme benefits Programme does not meet stakeholder expectations Inability to set a balanced budget 	20	<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 in post Tranche 1 products agreed Work on Tranche 2 products started 	19	
24	There is a risk that legacy councils may make spend commitments that adversely affect implementation and benefits delivery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Threat to opening financial position of the council. Impact on achievement of the £18.5m financial benefit. Potential for harm to relationships between councils 	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DHLUC s24 notice Adoption of the Finance and Asset protocol by all 5 councils Guidance produced 	8	
26	The risk that the back-office ERP (Enterprise Resource Planning) system not sufficiently implemented to support the new authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inability to pay invoices, raise invoices, and monitor spending during the year 	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation plan that delivers in excess of the minimum viable product Continued close management of implementation partner against published programme Clear governance and oversight Independent governance oversight role by SOCITM Reports to formal steering group 	18	

Programme Level Risks - workstream: Service Alignment

Date: July 2022

Ref	Risk description	Impact on the programme (effect)	Inherent score	Controls/Actions	Residual score	Comments
228	Lack of a decision around contracts that are reaching the end of their life between now and April 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduction in service levels 	22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	14	
13	Unforeseen emergency or business continuity interruption or rising tide situation that requires staff to be directed from the day job into incident response.	<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 	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create and maintain a Business Continuity Plan (BCP) for the LGR Programme (signed off by Programme Board) including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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, Desktop test of BCP. (Resource constraints have delayed completion of this piece of work however more staff have been approved for PMO) 	15	
22	The risk that delivery of ICS implementation is not effectively joined-up with LGR implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Failure to deliver programme to agreed time, cost and quality. Failure to deliver expected benefits. Missed transformation opportunities 	14	<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 	14	

Programme Level Risks - workstream: People

Date: July 2022

Ref	Risk description	Impact on the programme (effect)	Inherent score	Controls/Actions	Residual score	Comments
12	Loss of staff from County and District Councils deemed essential to the programme delivery	<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 	22	<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- 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 	20	
11	The risk that there are insufficient people resources to implement LGR programme and deliver the approved business case	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 Unmanageable workloads on staff 	22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Early definition of resource requirements (capability and capacity) as part of gateway Validation of 1 with PwC as QA partner incorporating lessons learned from previous LGR programmes Resource shortfalls to be raised to five CEOs to address Interim labour arrangements to be defined as a fall back plan. Dedicated LGR Programme Manager (in post from Jan '22) PwC as quality assurance partner in place from Dec '21. 17 February 2022 agreement to fund additional PMO, project specific and subject matter expertise to the programme. 	14	
25	The risk that BAU activity within the Councils is impacted by stretched staff resources balancing LGR and BAU work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recruitment protocol Staff engagement at local level BAU process at local level to ensure any additional work is scrutinised before agreeing to continue Monitoring key performance indicators for any drop off in service provision/performance 	22	

Ref	Risk description	Impact on the programme (effect)	Inherent score	Controls/Actions	Residual score	Comments
309	The risk that there is insufficient capacity to manage the people side of change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where programme outcomes and benefits results are dependent on collective, proficient adoption of new ways of working 	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change management approach, quality framework and tools established and in use 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 Validation of approach and priorities with PwC and our Unitary partners Working closely with comms and People workstream Plans in place to identify and collaborate with wider change assets across all organisations Mobilisation of tactical change management resource to work alongside and support existing network of change management across all organisations Engagement with programme and WS leads to unite thinking and drive profile of people side of change as core competence of programme Evidence based approach to defining extent and impact of T1 products to define level of need and target resource where needed most Application of data and insight from across WS to build programme change plan and EIA support Embedding change management within current assurance practice and reporting Nominated lead for People change 	19	

Ref	Risk description	Impact on the programme (effect)	Inherent score	Controls/Actions	Residual score	Comments
14	Loss of opportunity to align public and VCSE services to new operating model and outcomes as defined in the Business Case	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Reduced financial and non-financial benefitsPoor relationship between partners and new authorityTransformational opportunity lost, delayed or reducedNegative impact on cross-cutting outcomes for communitiesReputational damage for new council	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Complete partner and stakeholder mapping exercise (CCP)Targeted engagement with all strategic partners (CCP)Effective ongoing communications with all stakeholders about LGR programme and its objectives (Comms)Effective LCN'sServices thinking about the relationship with the public and VCSE in design and delivery (SA)Ensure LGR Advisory Board remains inclusive, transparent and accessible (CCP)Stakeholder management plan(s) for critical products and across workplans (CCP)External communications on purpose and benefits of the LGR programme (Comms)Senior officer engagement with VCSE and partners (CCP)Use of customer panel to hear voice of the public and users (CCP)	19	
19	Design/products to create new unitary council will not have the community as the central focus in the design of the new operating model	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Organisational culture is not community focusedInsufficient partnership workingPoor outcomes for communitiesFailure to deliver planned business case benefits	19	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Programme and workstream checkpoint review criteriaEnsure LGR Advisory Board remains effective, inclusive, transparent and accessible (PSG)Embodoy community focus as a critical requirement of operating model development through workshops, research and engagement (CCP)Ensure TOM development reflects emerging customer strategy and principles (CCP)Engagement with all workstreams to secure agreement/recognition that communities focus goes beyond safe and legal (CCP)Ensure interdependencies are identified and managed through iterative discussion and collaboration (CCP)Specifically, engage with People workstream to support as ethos and culture of communities and customers first (CCP/People)Involve customers and communities in the design of products and services (CCP)Learn from customer experience and feedback (CCP)Develop sound business case to underpin sufficient resourcing to deliver communities	18	

Ref	Risk description	Impact on the programme (effect)	Inherent score	Controls/Actions	Residual score	Comments
27	Uncontrolled change to the scope of the LGR programme	<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 authorityImpact on capacity of teams to manage and deliver the programme: rework, wasted effort and reduction in shared understanding of programme priorities and required activity	19	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Programme Implementation Manual outlining decision-making tolerances and purpose of change controlCurrent Programme governance arrangements: PMO, Programme Steering Group and Programme Board to identifyChange control process in placeStrong communication within the programme within the programme promoting adherence to guidance around change control, benefits realisation and riskQuality assurance of workstream reporting	14	
39	Inter-dependencies between workstreams not managed effectively	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Inability to deliver cross-cutting products successfully and therefore benefits not realised	19	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Programme tranches developedA process/approach for management of dependencies to ensure impacts of change (time/cosy/quality) are easily understood at both workstream and programme level.PMO providing assurance against delivery of programme capabilitiesDependency management tool in central list (sharepoint)T1 products dependencies to be assessed are T1 sign off (Date: ongoing)Management of dependencies and interdependencies are part of monthly assurance meetings between PMO and workstream (Date: ongoing)	13	
23	The risk that non-delivery or late delivery of key LGR products that other workstreams are dependant on	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Missed opportunitiesSiloed workingFailure to deliver key productsDelays in workstreams and ultimately the programmeRe-engineering of solutions/rework required	22	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Reliable critical path is available, with regular opportunities to monitor and course-correct when necessaryRegular opportunities for project managers to review with workstream an sub-workstream leadsReview of scorecardsRobust programme and project planningModelling interdependencies incorporated into work plans and must havesAdequate resourcing of programme staff with appropriate capabilities and capacity to deliver workplanUtilise lessons learned from other prrgammesDedicated LGR programme managers in post	22	

Ref	Risk description	Impact on the programme (effect)	Inherent score	Controls/Actions	Residual score	Comments
21	The risk that the LGR programme negatively impacts service provision and improvement activities of Children’s services and Adult Social care	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Performance of service for vulnerable adults negatively impacted• Poor external perception of quality of services• Potential Government intervention	19	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Strong communication within the programme• Adherence to project guidelines around Change Control, Benefits realisation and risk.• Horizon scanning• . Cross-cutting involvement of senior managers across workstreams in particular Service Alignment and Improvement• Quarterly reporting to Programme Board• PMO engagement and participation with Integrated Care System Governance• Modelling of interdependencies between programmes, reflected in respective plans• Active consideration within the emerging Target Operating Model	14	
11	The risk of overspend of £16.5m costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Higher than anticipated LGR programme costs and redundancy payments• Reduction to reserves and longer payback on the Business Case	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The approved commitments are being challenged if the funding has not be fully committed to ensure the bid is still required, if it is not or can be reduced this will make more funds available for the programme.• Work is underway to revisit the redundancy figures	20	This is a new risk added to the register August 2022

Together we are delivering your

New Somerset Council

Communities, Customers & Partnerships Workstream

Local Community Networks [LCN's]

19th August 2022

Local Community Networks [LCN's]

19th August 2022

Authors:
Jan Stafford
Sara Skirton

Key points for discussion:

- Milestones and phasing of LCN development and implementation
- Approach to engagement & consultation
- Timetable for delivery for LCN's

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** – informing and influencing 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
- LCNs match fund contributions from City, Town and Parish Councils.

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 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 – 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 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
- 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
- Support from an Member LCN working 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 influence /devolution

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 4th October
- Support by Members and Officers to raise profile of consultation with key stakeholders
- Conversation with the Pilots

LGR IMPLEMENTATION BOARD

SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES

29 July 2022
(Published on 09 August 2022)

Item No.	Title
1	Appointment of the Local Government Reorganisation Implementation Board Vice-Chair
	<p>OUTCOME</p> <p>The LGR Implementation Board agreed to appoint Cllr Duncan McGinty as the Vice-Chair of Local Government Reorganisation Board</p>
5	Summary terms of reference & role of Implementation Board
	<p>OUTCOME</p> <p>Following consideration of the officer report, appendices, PowerPoint presentation and discussion the LGR Implementation Board noted the Terms of Reference for the LGR Implementation Board, and agreed to recommend to the County Council Executive that the LGR Implementation Board meet every 6 weeks or as determined by the Chair of the LGR Implementation Board.</p>
6	Programme Update
	<p>OUTCOME</p> <p>Following consideration of the officer report, appendices, PowerPoint presentation and discussion, the LGR Implementation Board noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 17 current risks on the register. • Identification of further risks that the board wish the programme to consider. • Identification of the frequency of future reports to the Board. <p>And asked that The LGR Joint Scrutiny Committee review the Risk Register.</p>
7	Review of Programme Strategic Objectives
	<p>OUTCOME</p> <p>Following consideration of the officer report, appendices, PowerPoint</p>

Item No.	Title
	<p>presentation and discussion, the LGR Implementation Board endorsed that the Chair of the Board, in consultation with The LGR Implementation Board and Programme team:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> review the wording of the Strategic Objectives to be fit for purpose, clear and high level. Support the deliverables and Business Plan objectives, and note objective 3, “Decarbonisation” requires firming up to reflect climate and ecological emergency declarations. <p>Support the proposal to Executive to amend the Implementation Plan</p>
8	Local Community Networks: update and items for Board review
	<p>OUTCOME</p> <p>Following consideration of the officer report, appendices, PowerPoint presentation and discussion, the LGR Implementation Board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Endorsed the emerging Phases to creation of LCN’s. Endorsed the proposed approach to engagement & consultation. Approved for the setting up an LCN Working Group and for the working Group to report its findings to the LGR Joint Scrutiny Committee and the Board.
9	LGR Advisory Board - proposal to reinstate
	<p>OUTCOME</p> <p>Following consideration of the officer report, appendices, PowerPoint presentation and discussion, the LGR Implementation Board agreed:</p> <p>2.1 That an LGR Advisory Forum, comprised of representative partner organisations and Chaired by the Executive Lead Member for LGR, be formed to fulfil the terms of reference previously agreed for the LGR Advisory Board,</p> <p>And that;</p> <p>2.2. The Partner and public representation should be facilitated through separate events, supported by the LGR Advisory Forum. As follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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

Item No.	Title
	<p>and LGR Implementation Board for consideration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.
10	Consequential Parliamentary Order
	<p>OUTCOME Following consideration of the officer report, appendices, PowerPoint presentation and discussion, the LGR Implementation Board supported and recommended to the County Council's Executive:</p> <p>i) That the matters set out in Appendix 1 of the report, 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.</p> <p>ii) That 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 of the report 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.</p>
11	LGR Implementation Board - Meeting Dates & Membership
	<p>OUTCOME Following consideration of the officer report, appendices, PowerPoint presentation and discussion, the LGR Implementation Board:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Noted the membership of the LGR Implementation Board. Agreed that the LGR Implementation Board meeting dates, in consultation with the Chair of the LGR Implementation Board, Programme Director and Monitoring Officer, be revised.

This page is intentionally left blank

Joint Scrutiny Committee draft forward plan (dates tbc)

- Partnership Strategy
- Branding for the new Council
- LCN Boundaries & Governance
- Medium Term Financial Plan (includes a range of activities and reports)
- New terms and conditions plans
- Service Standards
- Target Operating Model
- Strategic Objectives for the new Council
- Unitary Council Governance
- Proposed Day 1 structure for the new council
- Asset Management Plan and Policy Framework
- Devolution policy and approach
- People Strategy
- Customer Strategy
- Digital Strategy
- Business Continuity and Emergency Planning arrangements
- Internal Audit Plan, Audit Charter and Risk Strategy
- New Policies, charging schedules and instalment policies for Community Infrastructure Levy
- Voluntary Sector Budgets

This page is intentionally left blank