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         DorsetAreaJC@dorsetcc.gov.uk
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- The reports with this agenda are available at www.dorsetareacouncils.co.uk
- We can provide this agenda and the reports as audio tape, CD, large print, Braille, or alternative languages on request.
- Public Participation
  Guidance on public participation at the Dorset Area Joint Committee is available on request from DorsetAreaJC@dorsetcc.gov.uk.

Members of the public can ask questions and make statements at the meeting. The closing date for questions is 10.00am on 10 November 2017, and statements by midday the day before the meeting.
1. **Apologies for Absence**  
   To receive any apologies for absence.

2. **Code of Conduct**  
   Councillors are required to comply with the requirements of the Localism Act 2011 regarding disclosable pecuniary interests.

3. **Minutes**  
   To confirm and sign the minutes of the meeting held on 20 September and 16 October 2017.

4. **Public Participation**  
   To receive any public questions or statements on the business of the Joint Committee.

5. **Local Government Reorganisation Update**  
   To consider a verbal update from the Chief Executive Sponsor of the Central Programme Team on the current status of the Future Dorset proposal submitted to Government in February 2017.

6. **Independent Advice on a Process to appoint a Chief Executive in the Event of Local Government Reorganisation**  
   To consider a report by the Monitoring Officer.

7. **Local Government Reorganisation Service Disaggregation Principles**  
   To consider a report by the Dorset Councils’ Chief Executives.

8. **Local Government Reorganisation Programme Governance and Resourcing**  
   To consider a report by the Dorset Councils’ Chief Executives.

9. **Risk Management Methodology**  
   To consider a report by the Dorset Councils’ Chief Executives.

10. **Work Programme and Forward Plan**  
    To consider the work programme and forward plan for the Joint Committee.
Dorset Area Joint Committee

Minutes of the meeting held at South Walks House, South Walks Road, Dorchester, Dorset on Wednesday, 20 September 2017

Present:
Rebecca Knox (Chairman)
Shane Bartlett, Jeff Cant, Graham Carr-Jones, Hilary Cox, Spencer Flower, Matt Hall,
David Harris, Jill Haynes, Colin Huckle, Sherry Jespersen, Byron Quayle, Barry Quinn,
Gary Suttle, Alan Thacker and Simon Tong

Officer Attending: David McIntosh (Chief Executive East Dorset District and Christchurch Borough Council), Matt Prosser (Chief Executive West Dorset District, Weymouth & Portland Borough and North Dorset District Council), Debbie Ward (Chief Executive - Dorset County Council), Darran Gunter (Programme Director LGR), Stuart Caundle (Monitoring Officer), Bridget Downton (General Manager - Purbeck District Council) and Lee Gallagher (Democratic Services Manager - Dorset County Council).

Election of Chairman
1 On considering the election of the Chairman of the Joint Committee, Cllr Graham Carr-Jones proposed Cllr Rebecca Knox, which was seconded by Cllr Jeff Cant. On being put to the vote Cllr Rebecca Knox was duly elected as the Chairman.

Resolved
That Cllr Rebecca Knox be elected as Chairman of the Joint Committee for 2017/18.

Election of Vice-Chairman
2 On considering the election of the Vice-Chairman of the Joint Committee, Cllr Alan Thacker proposed Cllr Anthony Alford, which was seconded by Cllr Sherry Jespersen. On being put to the vote Cllr Anthony Alford was duly elected as the Vice-Chairman.

Resolved
That Cllr Anthony Alford be elected as Vice-Chairman of the Joint Committee for 2017/18.

Apologies for Absence
3 Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Tony Alford (West Dorset District Council), Cllr Ros Kayes (Dorset County Council) and Cllr Bill Pipe (Dorset County Council). Cllr Alan Thacker attended for Cllr Alford, Cllr David Harris attended for Cllr Kayes, and Cllr Hilary Cox attended for Cllr Pipe.

Code of Conduct
4 There were no declarations by members of disclosable pecuniary interests under the Code of Conduct.

Public Participation
5 There were no public questions received at the meeting in accordance with Standing Order 21(1).

There was one public statement received at the meeting in accordance with Standing Order 21(2) from the Dorset Association of Parish and Town Councils regarding the Dorset Area Joint Committee. The statement is attached to these minutes as an annexure.
Refining Terms of Reference of the Dorset Area Joint Committee

Councillors considered a report by the Assistant Chief Executive of the Dorset Councils Partnership, as the Acting Monitoring Officer of the Joint Committee, on the terms of reference of the Joint Committee within the remit set by all of the six partner councils, and the quorum arrangements for future meetings.

Members considered modest refinements to reflect the nature of discussions and priority areas, which was discussed at an informal workshop on 14 August 2017.

In addition to the terms of reference, the quorum of the Joint Committee was discussed which would see 50% of the membership of the Committee plus one member (9), but consideration was given to whether all councils must be represented within the quorum. The need for the quorum to include at least one representative from each council was explained as a logical arrangement by Cllr Flower. However, some other views were shared which recognised the importance of the Committee to ensure that all members attended, and that there were named substitutes for occasions when this was not possible.

Resolved

1. That the refined terms of reference attached at appendix 1 of the Monitoring Officer’s report be approved.
2. That the working practice for the purpose of the Joint Committee’s quorum (Option 1 – 50% membership plus 1) be approved.

Local Government Reorganisation Submission Update

The Joint Committee received a verbal update on the current status of the Future Dorset proposal submitted to Government in February 2017 by the Chief Executive Sponsor of the Future Dorset Programme Board.

It was acknowledged that it was a legal duty of Government to respond to the submission, but there was no defined timescale for this to happen and councils were therefore awaiting an announcement. In addition, it was noted that the Leaders and Chief Executives in support of Future Dorset proposal were due to meet with the Secretary of State and his representatives on 27 September 2017 in Westminster. The timeline continued to be updated, and the impact of the delayed announcement was being assessed, together with Future Dorset workstreams continuing to concentrate on some areas of disaggregation and legal implications.

Noted

Outcomes from Collaborative Working Workshops

The Joint Committee received a verbal update from the Chairman about the outcomes of the Collaborative Working Workshops held on 14 August and 20 September 2017 attended by representatives of the Joint Committee.

Cllr Knox drew attention to the positive start to joint working by the workshops and highlighted that, in addition to the terms of reference, there were three main areas of focus identified where progress could be made early in the life of the Joint Committee, as follows:

- Shared Services
- Multi-discipline Teams
- Community Partners Engagement

In addition, it was recognised that there were other longer term, and more complex, priorities such Affordable Housing, economic development including the work of the Local Enterprise Partnership, and One Public Estate.
Together with the priority areas identified so far, it was also felt that the wider membership of partner councils should be welcomed to take part in the workstreams which would drive the priority areas, build on the spirit of collaboration, encourage participation, and would ensure that the skills of individuals were used. This could be done in a variety of ways, or could be more specific as required, depending on the subject matter and focus of a particular workstream or workshop. More consideration of the offer to the wider membership of councils would be given due consideration outside of the meeting.

It was also noted that the role of town and parish councils, including the Dorset Association of Town and Parish Councils, would have an important role in contributing to workstreams. Cllr Knox confirmed that this was captured as part of the wider communications and engagement approach.

**Resolved**

1. That the initial and future priority areas of focus, as detailed above, be supported.
2. That the degree of involvement of the wider membership of partner councils be considered.

**Proposed Methodology for Collaborative Working Across the Dorset Area Joint Committee**

The Joint Committee considered a report and presentation by the Programme Director – Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) regarding the future collaborative working methodology between partner councils of the Joint Committee.

The presentation explained the new methodology which needed to be agile and scalable depending on the scale of the Joint Committee’s ambition, to be able to bring together all involved in collaborations to cover all eventualities, and to incorporate existing collaboration such as the Dorset Finance Officers Group and Monitoring Officers Group.

A six stage process, as an amalgam of change management best practice was summarised. Members welcomed the good relationships so far and the start position of the Joint Committee, to move towards areas of collaboration, engagement with staff and communities, sharing of baseline information, and to understand and shape future delivery. Reference was also made to the potential for a commercial partner to assist with baselining. The steps through the development of business cases in complex areas, together with the need to assess all available options, and include stakeholders and staff, through to implementation planning and delivery were outlined.

Although there was no programme team there was some support through the Programme Director as part of his LGR role, and other commitment such as communications officers working collectively outside of their normal day jobs.

In relation to LGR it was explained that the delay of any decision, if it was to proceed, could see a focus on a transitional and transactional introduction of a new Council, and transformation of the organisation would follow due to the impact on timescale to deliver by March 2019.

With regard to the workstreams, support was given to the need to progress the first three priorities as outlined in minute 8 above.

It was suggested that although it would be part of the workstreams, the aspiration to work more innovatively should be more visible. It was agreed that this would be built into the methodology, as well as the need to draw attention to the exciting aspects of each of the priority areas.
A concern was raised about the need for good joint scrutiny of the Joint Committee and the workstreams to provide necessary checks and balances.

It was also suggested that consideration should be given to the timescaling of the individual priority areas, which would begin to build a picture of the size and scope of the workstreams, and would provide the opportunity to consider in terms of short, medium and long term realistic ambition and scaling. The Committee supported the need to look at timescales and to not impose areas that were not achievable.

**Resolved**

1. That the proposed programme structure and methodology be noted.
2. That direction of the Joint Committee in relation to the early establishment of workstreams to progress joint working (as outlined in paragraph 2.7 of the Programme Director’s report) be approved, subject to the comments made in the minute above and in minute 8.

**Communication and Engagement Strategy and Plan**

The Joint Committee considered a report by the Programme Director – Local Government Reorganisation on the proposed Communication and Engagement Strategy and Plan of the Joint Committee to support the development of collaborative relationships and sharing of the future plans and delivery of the future joint working relationships.

Members welcomed the development of the strategy and plan which needed to mirror the Joint Committee's work plan and provide consistent messaging to all partners and staff with templates for communications and core briefings which would be signed off by the Chairman at the end of each meeting. The responsibility of communications teams to act as a collective body across all partner councils was supported.

In relation to digital communication, it was suggested that the increased use of Skype across partner councils could be used to enhance working outside of formal meetings and contribute to the development of digital access. It was noted that a practical system check would be useful, but this was a very small element of the wider Strategy.

**Resolved**

1. That the proposed methodology and approaches to the development of the communication and engagement strategy and plan be approved.
2. That the media protocols be agreed.
3. That the actions proposed in the short term communication and engagement plan be agreed.

**Forward work plan for the Dorset Area Joint Committee**

The Joint Committee considered a proposed Forward Work Plan of work which focused on an initial three month period in order to establish a longer term programme of work.

It was noted that a further informal workshop would be needed following the direction provided throughout the meeting. The next formal meeting was agreed as 16 October 2017 and the meeting thereafter would be confirmed shortly on 14 or 15 November 2017.

In addition to the progressive work being driven by the Joint Committee it was suggested that the work plan include high level tracking of performance delivery across partners which would help to provide assurance of ‘business as usual’ and would raise awareness of services provided by each partner council. It was agreed that this would be investigated and included in the work plan.
Resolved
1. That the initial Forward Work Plan of the Joint Committee be approved taking into account the priority areas highlighted throughout the meeting, and the addition of high level tracking of partner service delivery.
2. That an informal workshop be arranged for the next meeting on 16 October.
3. That the date of the next formal meeting be confirmed on 14 or 15 November 2017.
4. That high level tracking of performance delivery across partners be included in the work plan.

Meeting Duration: 12.00 pm - 1.00 pm
This page is intentionally left blank
Dorset Area Joint Committee

Minutes of the meeting held at South Walks House, South Walks Road, Dorchester, Dorset on Monday, 16 October 2017

Present:
Rebecca Knox (Chairman)
Anthony Alford, Shane Bartlett, Jeff Cant, Graham Carr-Jones, Spencer Flower, Matt Hall, Jill Haynes, Colin Huckle, Sherry Jespersen, Ros Kayes, Bill Pipe, Byron Quayle, Barry Quinn, Gary Suttle and Simon Tong

Officer Attending: Stuart Caundle (Monitoring Officer), Steve Mackenzie (Chief Executive), David McIntosh (Chief Executive East Dorset District and Christchurch Borough Council), Matt Prosser (Chief Executive West Dorset District, Weymouth & Portland Borough and North Dorset District Council), Debbie Ward (Chief Executive), Ceri Lewis (Communications and Public Relations Manager - Christchurch and East Dorset Councils) and Lee Gallagher (Democratic Services Manager).

Code of Conduct
12 There were no declarations by members of disclosable pecuniary interests under the Code of Conduct.

Apologies for Absence
13 No apologies for absence were received.

Minutes
14 The minutes of the meeting held on 20 September 2017 were received.

Matters Arising
Minute 9 - Proposed Methodology for Collaborative Working Across the Dorset Area Joint Committee
A concern was expressed regarding the resolution of the item to clarify that the proposed structure and methodology was not ‘approved’ at the meeting. It was clarified that the proposal in the previous report was to ‘consider and discuss the proposed programme structure and methodology’. It was subsequently agreed that the wording of the minute would be updated outside of the meeting and the minutes would be resubmitted to the next meeting to be signed as an accurate record.

Resolved
That the minutes be amended and resubmitted to be signed at the next meeting on 15 November 2017.

Public Participation
15 Public Speaking
There were no public questions received at the meeting in accordance with Standing Order 21(1).

There were no public statements received at the meeting in accordance with Standing Order 21(2).

Local Government Reorganisation Update
16 It was noted that the Chief Executive of Dorset Councils Partnership, as the Chief Executive Sponsor of the Future Dorset Programme Board, updated the Committee on the current status of the Future Dorset proposal during an informal workshop held
prior to the meeting of the Joint Committee.

**Noted**

**Programme Resourcing Plan**

17 The Joint Committee considered a report on the resourcing requirements, roles and relationships to support the work of the Joint Committee and potential Local Government Reorganisation (LGR).

A range of views were expressed regarding the staff and resourcing required to deliver the ambitions of the Joint Committee. With a view to addressing the scale of workstreams, and to provide flexibility and direction on future resourcing, the Joint Committee broadly discussed the appointment of an Interim Chief Executive or equivalent, staffing arrangements, budget implications, and timing of decisions.

Views were expressed regarding the need for more detail about the resource to support the Joint Committee, together with more attention to be paid to the structure outlined at appendix two of the report. Throughout the discussion a number of members urged the Joint Committee to defer the consideration of the recommendations in the report until the next meeting when more information could be presented.

A number of views were shared which supported the need to consider the appointment of an Interim Chief Executive or equivalent with overall control of the Joint Committee. The Joint Committee also discussed the staffing structure including the role of Programme Director (which was resourced by DCC and DCP) and reporting of roles within the structure.

With regard to the budget implications of the resourcing plan and staffing, and although costs would be apportioned based on population methodology, requests were made for more detail before commitments could be made. Comments were also received regarding the need to understand associated risks, especially given that no decision had yet been reached by the Secretary of State in relation to LGR.

Further attention was drawn to the level of funding to be used to provide for staffing, and a discussion was held about the merits or otherwise of utilising in house or external staff (from the public and private sectors) to support the Joint Committee to deliver radical transformation. Views were shared about the importance of having staff with the right experience, and alternative opinions supported in-house staff being able and willing to play an active role in shaping the new arrangements. Concern about the cost of staff positions was also discussed, specifically how expensive some roles would be, whereas support was given from some members for the need to pay for the right skills.

The delay in the Secretary of State’s decision was sighted as a major factor in driving the need to make progress especially if a new Council was formed from March 2019.

The priority area of consideration at this point was identified as the need to recruit Workstream Coordinators as the staff who would be leading the workstreams, but it was felt that more information was required in respect of what was manageable given that three priority workstreams had already been identified and there would be a number of others. It was questioned whether two would be enough. The need for effective recruitment was seen as key to the delivery of the workstreams, and any further delay would not see appointments made until 2018 at the earliest.

The importance of effective communications, through a Communications and Engagement Manager were highlighted, although some alternative views were also shared.
In addition to considering the recommendations within the report, it was proposed that the appointment of Workstream Coordinators be progressed at a maximum value of £250k, and a further report be presented at the next meeting of the arrangements for an Interim Chief Executive or equivalent. On being put to the vote the amended recommendations were agreed by 9 votes in favour and 7 against.

**Resolved**
1. That a Programme Manager and a Communication & Engagement Manager be recruited to support the work of the Joint Committee.
2. That the recruitment processes for a larger team in readiness to support any work arising from any LGR decision be commenced, and specifically that the recruitment of Workstream Coordinators, to a maximum value of £250k be agreed.
3. That a further report on the arrangements for the appointment, or otherwise, of an Interim Chief Executive or equivalent be considered at the next meeting of the Joint Committee on 15 November 2017.

**Communications and Engagement Plan Update**

The Communications and Public Relations Manager for Christchurch and East Dorset Councils provided an overview of Communications Strategy and Delivery Plan progress since the last meeting on 20 September 2017, which included press releases, core communications by each council to staff in various forms, and the use of twitter to increase public engagement.

The interim approach moving forward would see communications officers attending meetings on a rota basis as a partnership arrangement between all councils. The extensive work undertaken so far and the resource required in the future were acknowledged.

A need for effective and proactive communications and core briefings was welcomed, together with the need for appropriate messages about improved service delivery to be used for different audiences, especially for Town and Parish Councils. Enhancing public engagement and efforts to improve the understanding of the Joint Committee were also supported.

The joint approach of dealing with communications across all partner councils, including those councils that were not in favour of Local Government Reorganisation, was constructively challenged. Confirmation was provided that all communications officers would work in collaboration and all councils would play a full and active role.

The Joint Committee was reminded that there was an individual responsibility of all members to feed into communications and engagement work as a conduit on behalf of each partner council and for the public.

**Resolved**
1. The Committee thanked officers for their hard work in developing and delivering communications support to date.
2. Progress of the development and implementation of the Communication Plan was noted.

**Work Programme and Forward Plan**

The Joint Committee considered the work programme and forward plan for future meetings and the following items were identified:

- Council Tax Harmonisation
- Financial Disaggregation
- Electoral Boundary Review
- The process for the appointment of interim or equivalent Chief Executive and
other Statutory Posts (the arrangements for Interim Chief Executive were identified earlier in the meeting to be reported to 15 November 2017)

- Risk Management Process
- Working with Town and Parish Councils
- Working with Community and Voluntary Sector Partners

It was also reported that workshops would be held in the coming months by Dorset County Council which would be open to all district and borough members to be able to share information about services. The first would relate to the Accountable Care System and the Dorset Care Record, and a second would address Prevention at Scale. All workshops would be held in venues in the East and West of Dorset to enable members of all councils to attend and participate.

**Resolved**

That the work programme and forward plan be updated as outlined in the minute above.

Meeting Duration: 2.15 pm - 3.25 pm
### Dorset Area Joint Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Date of Meeting</strong></th>
<th>15 November 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Officers</strong></td>
<td>Dorset Area Monitoring Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject of Report</strong></td>
<td>Independent Advice on a Process to appoint a Chief Executive in the Event of LGR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Executive Summary** | One of the first issues that will need to be considered by an Implementation Executive, when considering how to take forward plans for a new council, will be the appointment of a Chief Executive; initially deciding when to do it and how to do it.  

Its consideration must begin at some point and the Joint Committee’s terms of reference include the authority to address this issue. The purpose of this report is therefore to introduce the issue and rehearse questions about when and how to address it. The report introduces some of the questions and options that will need to be considered when addressing this issue, and asks the Joint Committee to engage with a team from the LGA who will provide independent political and professional advice to assist the Joint Committee to consider a way forward.  

In advance of a new Council beginning to provide services from April 2019; there is significant and important work to do in forming the new organisation, including arrangements for its services, its culture and its organisational structure. This work will require clear and consistent leadership from both a political and officer perspective. Once an Implementation Executive (IE) is established, which is likely to be in late March 2018, an officer team to lead the transition work is likely to be required in the Structural Change Order and must be led by a nominated Lead Officer.  

Unless started early, the process to appoint such an officer may lead to a delay of many months before an appointee is able to take up the role. As there is a joint committee in place that can act as a precursor to any IE, an opportunity exists to begin the process before April 2018. This could be limited to making an appointment for the IE lead officer role; or could lead to an appointment who would go on to be Chief Executive of the new Council. If an IE lead officer is appointed, the appointment of a Chief Executive will have to be addressed later. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendices</th>
<th>1. Commissioning document for the LGA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Background Papers</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Originator and Contact</td>
<td>Stuart Caundle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant Chief Executive (and Monitoring Officer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dorset Councils Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone: 01305 484040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:SCaundle@dorset.gov.uk">SCaundle@dorset.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation

That Members;

1. Agree to receive a presentation from a team from the Local Government Association on the approach to be taken to recruit a Chief Executive for a new unitary council and any interim appointment that may be required.

2. Budgetary Implications

2.1 There are no immediate financial implications arising from the recommendation. The services of the LGA in assisting the process are being supplied without cost. Depending upon choices made by the Joint Committee, direct costs may be incurred later in carrying out recruitment processes; but these cannot be quantified at present.

3. Background

3.1 At its meeting on 20 September 2017, the Joint Committee refined its terms of reference. These largely focus on the essential work to create a unitary local authority in the Dorset area, in the event of the Secretary of State agreeing to the submission to reorganise local government in Dorset. This includes agreeing the approach for appointment of a Chief Executive.

3.2 At its meeting on 16 October, the Joint Committee asked for a report to be submitted to this meeting on the arrangements for the appointment of an Interim Chief Executive, or equivalent, if local government reorganisation is agreed by the Secretary of State.

3.3 Once the required Structural Change Order has been approved by Parliament, which is expected in the spring of 2018, the work of the Joint Committee in preparing for local government reorganisation will be taken on by the Implementation Executive. The IE will have the statutory responsibility to make preparations for the new unitary council to be ready for April 2019 and this will include the appointment of a Chief Executive. The Joint Committee can determine the process and approach for recommendation to the IE, but it cannot make the final appointment. The Joint Committee’s powers extend to appointing a Chief Executive designate, whose appointment would then have to be ratified by the IE. There is a question as to whether the time between the December meeting of this committee and the inception of the IE in April 2018 would render this impractical. This is a matter on which Members will receive advice.

3.4 Depending upon when they believe the appointment of a Chief Executive should be made, the Joint Committee will need to consider whether it is necessary to make an interim appointment to provide leadership of the work to develop the new Council. This question will need to be considered alongside the separate report on the recommended programme structure. The proposed officer structure set out in that report is to cover the period before a Chief Executive is in place. Once the Chief
Executive has been appointed, it is likely the IE will want to review the programme structure with the person appointed.

3.5 Prior to the summer and before the establishment of the Joint Committee, the Future Dorset Leaders’ Group received a paper from Monitoring Officers. The paper sought authority to commission an independent resource to provide political and professional advice to Members on the future appointment of a Chief Executive, should the Secretary of State make a positive minded to decision. Subsequently, Monitoring Officers have liaised with the LGA as the body best placed to advise seamlessly on both the political and professional aspects of this issue. Latterly, the Monitoring Officers group has included representatives from all Dorset authorities.

3.6 As a result of those discussions, the LGA has assembled a team comprising senior politicians with experience of leading through LGR as well as professional officers. The brief that has been provided to them by Monitoring Officers is attached at Appendix 1. Should the Joint Committee agree to the recommendation in this report, it is proposed that the LGA team will conduct a session with Members of the Committee immediately prior to the Formal meeting on 13th December. The Joint Committee will then be invited to determine a range of questions set out in an accompanying report which relate to the future appointment of a Chief Executive and possibly an interim lead officer. It is likely that following the LGA presentation, it will be necessary to obtain specialist HR and employment law advice to ensure that whatever process is determine is conducted lawfully and takes account of risks.

3.7 It is almost certain that prior to April 2019, it will be necessary to appoint the Senior Leadership Team of the new council as well as the Monitoring Officer and S.151 Officer. These appointments are not dealt with in this report and will be the subject of later reports, probably to the IE.
Appendix

Specification of Advice and Services to be provided by the LGA

In advance of the new Council beginning to provide services from April 2019; there is significant and important work to do in forming the new organisation, including arrangements for its services, its culture and its organisational structure. This work will require clear and consistent leadership from both a political and officer perspective. Once an Implementation Executive (IE) is established in 2018, an officer team to lead the transition work for the new Unitary is likely to be a requirement of the Order and should be led by the equivalent of a Chief Executive. Unless started earlier, the process to appoint such an officer may lead to a delay of many months before an appointee is able to take up the role. With a joint committee in place, capable of acting as a precursor to the IE (in the event of a minded to decision), an opportunity exists to begin the process before the statutory orders are made. This could be limited to making an appointment just for the IE lead officer role; or to making an appointment who would go on the be Chief Executive of the new Council. The issue of clarity and consistency of leadership would feature in any decision about which approach to take.

The LGA, has therefore been asked to assist the Dorset Area Joint Committee by providing: 1) Advice on the options available for the appointment of future Chief Executives; including when and how to appoint, and 2) To conduct or oversee any process to appoint a Chief Executive or IE Lead Officer for the Dorset Unitary Authority.

It is anticipated that advice on when and how to appoint a Chief Executive would include consideration of the following; although need not be limited to those issues.

**When to appoint?**

1. With the Implementation Executive not coming into existence until Spring 2018; this is the earliest date that a Chief Executive could be appointed to lead the new organisation.
2. From date of appointment until 1st April 2019, the appointees would not be Chief Executive of the new council, but the lead officer for the IE: transitioning to Chief Executive of the new Council on 1st April [depending on the approach to the appointment].
3. If an external candidate was appointed; there is a question [discussed in the following section] as to whether that appointment would only take effect on 1st April 2019. If that was the case, an internal appointment to act as lead officers for the IE until 31st March 2019 would be required.
4. In the lead officer role, the appointee would work with the IE to shape the new organisation, oversee preparation of the first budget and take responsibility for leading the appointment of the senior team [assuming there was no desire to delay this until after April 2019].
5. Chief Executives of the existing authorities would, in any event, remain in role and be responsible for their organisations and for service delivery until 31st March 2019.
6. In advance of the Structural Change Order, the Joint Committee could:-
   a. Have a process to recruit a Chief Executive ready to put in front of the IE or SA in Spring 2018; and/or
   b. Have an IE Lead Officer, appointed in advance; with the intention of asking the IE to ratify the appointment in Spring 2018.

**Question:** How early would the Joint Committee want to identify the chief executive for the new authority?
How to appoint?

1. The appointment process could be internal and have an application process ring fenced to existing Chief Executives [either all those from outgoing councils or those identified following a mapping exercise].
2. Alternatively, the application process could be open to the market; or could be conducted in some other way recommended by professional advisers.
3. If a decision were made to open recruitment to external competition, the Joint Committee would have to consider if it was advisable to commence the new posts prior to April 2019, and if so, when. Consideration would need to be given to the nature of the role during the transitional phase and the interaction with the existing authorities and existing CEX’s.
4. Decisions about the approach to recruitment will have to be signed off by the Joint Committee. If this decision were left to the IE, a recruitment process might be delayed for some months after Spring 2018.

Question: Which approach to the appointment should be taken?

The Assistance Provided
The LGA will provide assistance via a meeting or series of meetings and associated conversations (individually and collectively) using a combination of the following:

- A senior Conservative politician from the LGA leadership – Cllr David Simmonds from LB Hillingdon is Conservative Group leader at the LGA is neutral in terms of the choices but has experience of a large unitary council and what is needed in that context;
- A politician from a large unitary such as Cornwall, Wiltshire (or from outside the region if required) who went through the previous LGR process of forming a new unitary comprising elements of the former county and districts and able to bring their experience of that process – what worked well and potential pitfalls to avoid;
- A senior professional from the LGA workforce team – Adam Barker our senior adviser is vastly experienced in CE selection processes and is able to offer technical advice on the process.

The LGA will make a formal presentation to the Joint Committee in order to shape the discussion of the options to proceed. The Joint Committee (should they so decide) will make such decisions as their terms of reference permit for the progress of appointments of Chief Executive or IE Lead Officer.

Depending on the nature of those decisions, the LGA will then conduct the processes necessary to deliver the appointments, or will assist the Joint Committee to commission a consultant to deliver the appointments. This will be done in liaison with the Dorset Monitoring Officers’ Group.
Dorset Area Joint Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Meeting</th>
<th>15 November 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officers</td>
<td>Dorset Area Chief Executives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject of Report</td>
<td>Local Government Reorganisation Service Disaggregation Principles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Executive Summary**

The submission to the Secretary of State involves Christchurch being in a different unitary council to the rest of the two tier county area. As a result the services, funding, assets, liabilities, contracts and staff of Dorset County Council need to be split if the Secretary of State agrees to the formation of two unitary councils in Dorset. This exercise is referred to as the disaggregation of Dorset County Council.

This disaggregation needs to be completed as quickly as possible, with a target date of June 2018, so that work on building the budgets of the two unitary councils can commence and be largely completed by the autumn of 2018. There is a substantial amount of work to be completed within the required timetable. It is proposed to commission this piece of work from in-house staff as soon as the Secretary of State issues a “minded to” decision.

The disaggregation work needs to be completed in consultation and agreement with representatives of the other proposed unitary council in Dorset. The report suggests a task and finish group of members of the joint Committee is created to oversee this work to provide drive and focus for its completion and to ensure members have a detailed understanding of the work as it progresses.

The report details the amount of the work required and the guiding principles for the work, which should minimise any areas of dispute once the disaggregation process has been completed. The principles and proposed approach for the work have been developed by Chief Finance Officers from all nine Dorset Councils, in consultation with Service Directors from the upper tier councils.

A similar approach to the Christchurch and East Dorset Partnership is not considered necessary. The only area of disaggregation for this partnership is with regard to the staff of...
the partnership. The requirements of TUPE will, of course, be followed for this partnership.

| Budget Implications | The work undertaken by Local Partnerships envisaged the costs of creating two unitary councils would amount to approximately £25m. The majority of this cost (£22.5m) would be incurred immediately after the new unitary councils came into existence and would be funded via Capitalisation Directions issued by the Secretary of State. The balance of £2.5m represented Local Partnerships’ assessment of the programme management costs to be incurred before April 2019. The report to Councils in January 2017 envisaged these costs would be shared by Councils pro-rata to population.

The disaggregation work will be led by the experienced staff of the Dorset County Council. It is likely there will need to be some back-filling of key staff, especially in the Finance Department, to ensure essential work continues. The costs of this have yet to be assessed. A further report will be brought to the Joint Committee on this issue in due course. |

| Recommendations | That the Joint Committee agrees:
1. The disaggregation principles detailed in the report;
2. The creation of a task and finish group of Joint Committee members to oversee the disaggregation work;
3. A further report be brought to the Joint Committee when the budgetary implications of the disaggregation process have been estimated. |

| Appendices | None |

| Background Papers | None |

| Report Originator and Contact | Steve Mackenzie, Chief Executive, Purbeck District Council
Telephone: 01929 557235
E-mail: stevemackenzie@purbeck-dc.gov.uk |
1. Introduction

1.1 A key component of creating two new unitary councils on the footprint included in the submission to the Secretary of State is to move the delivery of services in Christchurch from Dorset County Council into a different authority to the rest of the County Council’s services. This is what is termed ‘disaggregation’. This exercise must be completed in order to be able to set the budget for both new authorities ahead of a potential go-live in April 2019 as it will determine the service costs, budgets and funding for these relevant services. Once the disaggregation has been agreed as a fair and equitable split, by the respective Implementation Executive and Shadow Authority, they will be able to determine their budget setting priorities and create lawful budgets for the new authorities.

1.2 The purpose of this document is to provide a set of principles to the scope and approach to carrying out the disaggregation analysis and agreeing an equitable split. It will provide the ground-rules to enable the relevant data collection and analysis to be carried out efficiently, accurately and completely. It does not relate to future service design.

2. High Level Principles

2.1 There are a number of core principles that must be agreed and adhered to in order to ensure that the work is carried out effectively, accurately and on time. The mechanisms to carry out disaggregation will be agreed at the next stage and will be service specific.

2.2 The high level principles are:

- The transfer of services from one authority to another will not disadvantage individual people receiving services/care. This is the overriding principle and will be a key determinant on how disaggregation will be applied.
- Specific commitment to individuals will be on a case by case basis, and as such decisions will be on a sound legal basis.
- The authorities remain committed to delivering statutory services and improving outcomes.
- Partners and stakeholders involved in service delivery will be engaged to ensure a smooth transition.
- Not all services will be disaggregated. Some aspects of disaggregation may not be necessary if they are already structured as a shared service or existing partnership.
- The data required for disaggregation will be shared and discussions will be open and transparent, acknowledging that decisions will be reached on a pragmatic basis (not seeking perfect solutions) and will be evidence-based.
- Where appropriate existing contracts will novate on vesting day, then reviewed individually to determine the appropriate point for renewal, unless otherwise agreed.
- The criteria for calculating and agreeing the split will be agreed at a service level; with an appropriate level of analysis; avoiding unnecessary detail and
complexity; with an understanding of the level of financial risk, and an understanding costs borne by other partners e.g. NHS:

- Data must be used sensibly and consistently, utilising existing data, trend analysis and historic data where appropriate.
- If there is an obvious means of apportionment e.g. location, this should be followed where possible.
- TUPE principles should apply, e.g. apportionment of staff transfers.
- Matching principles e.g. assets and liabilities should apply.
- Assets include resource such as foster carers.
- Apply the principle of ordinary residence lawfully for Adults services, original parental residence for Children’s services. Identify individuals and their costs.
- Care costs will be calculated per individual adult or child, based on direct costs and infrastructure cost – meeting the need cost.
- Agree which authority is responsible for each child/person.

- An analysis of data migration and IT systems will be carried out to determine the most effective means of transferring service and customer data.
- Disaggregation will be agreed on a cost basis as well as budget basis. The disaggregation will not resolve budget shortfalls.

3. **In scope:**

3.1 Disaggregation will be of Dorset County Council’s upper tier services in the Christchurch Borough Council area, in terms of service delivery, customer data, funding, expenditure, assets, liabilities, contracts, shared services, partnerships and staff.

4. **Out of scope:**

4.1 The termination of Christchurch and East Dorset Partnership is out of scope because this will not need to follow a disaggregation process. Staff TUPE arrangements will be the key issue that will need to be determined and these will be based on legal advice and a subsequent strategy.

4.2 The service delivery model of the new unitary councils will not be considered as part of the disaggregation process. The budget setting process of the new councils will take place after the agreement of disaggregation.

5. **Approach to the work**

5.1 This significant workstream is a shared responsibility between service directors and chief finance officers to agree the basis for calculations. External validation of the process and calculations will be sought.

5.2 The impact of new legislation will also be factored into the disaggregation calculations, for example SEN age limit change, Care Act impact on self-funders, etc.
5.3 For the termination of the Christchurch and East Dorset Partnership, the budget, services and funding are already separate, so the scope will be mainly staff and data. This work can start early, and in parallel to the main disaggregation of county council services in Christchurch.

5.4 For each service in scope, the methodology and details will be agreed with the service leads and finance officers and will include the cost of service provision, service level agreements, policies, customer data and staffing levels.

5.5 The upper tier disaggregation work will be overseen by a working group made up of a Chief Executive, a project manager, a strategic finance lead from Dorset County Council, a strategic finance lead from Bournemouth and Poole, and Executive Directors from Dorset County Council and Bournemouth and Poole. These individuals will be consistent throughout the duration of the work. They will monitor progress service by service and provide a clear escalation route for queries and issues. These will be dealt with as they arise to avoid unnecessary iterations and delays and to apply learning as the work develops.

5.6 It is also proposed to create a task and finish group of members drawn from the Joint Committee to oversee the disaggregation work. This will help to provide drive and focus for the work and will result in members having a detailed understanding of the work.

6. Structure of the Work Programme

6.1 The work will be divided into directorates (Environment & Economy/Place, Adults, Children’s, and Corporate Services). Each directorate group will include a Dorset County Council service director and accountant, a Bournemouth & Poole service director and accountant, as well as the relevant service manager for each service covered.

6.2 Each service will agree the disaggregation of the service including cost, budget, staff, assets, liabilities, income, policies, service level agreements, data and any other service specific items. Each service review will produce a proposed split which will be approved by the oversight group.

6.3 Corporate Services will be analysed after the other services are complete, as the split will depend on the breakdown of the front line services in terms of the proportion of support services required.

6.4 The disaggregation of the finance balance sheet, budget, funding and grants will take place in parallel to the service disaggregation. It will start using the 2017/18 budget, and switch to the 2018/19 budget when the figures are available.

6.5 The project manager will maintain the schedule of services to be analysed, and ensure they are completed on time, reporting progress to the oversight group and highlighting any delays, or issues that need addressing.

6.6 The structure for the work is demonstrated in the chart below:
6.7 The tables below set out the elements to be analysed, firstly the financial and budget data, and secondly the service lists.
## Financial Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Council Tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>RSG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Business Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>NHB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets</td>
<td>Physical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets</td>
<td>Debtors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets</td>
<td>Cash and Investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves and Balances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Backed Capital Funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liabilities</td>
<td>Pension Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liabilities</td>
<td>external debt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liabilities</td>
<td>underlying need to borrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liabilities</td>
<td>PFI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Liabilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Shared Services and Partnerships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>Public Health Dorset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social services, including care for the elderly and community care</td>
<td>Tricuro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aspire Adoption Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Help</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, including special educational needs, adult education, pre-school</td>
<td>Skills and Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dorset Combined Youth Offending Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Service/Plan/Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art &amp; Recreation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Births, deaths and marriage registration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal protection and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community development, voluntary sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic development, inc Tourism,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regeneration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concessionary Travel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment, sustainability, climate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minerals &amp; Waste Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museums &amp; Galleries</td>
<td>Joint Archives Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking – on street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Transport Planning</td>
<td>Local Transport Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads and Traffic Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Safety, inc School Crossing Patrols</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading Standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Strategy and Waste Disposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Tax</td>
<td>Stour Valley &amp; Poole Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coroners</td>
<td>Joint Coroners Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At its meeting in September the Joint Committee agreed initial priorities for collaborative working. In October the Joint Committee agreed to recruit a programme manager, communications manager and two workstream co-ordinators to support its work programme.

The purpose of this report is to seek agreement to the governance structure for the programme of work leading to the creation of a new unitary council if the Secretary of State issues a “minded to decision”. A decision is expected in the near future and the report recognises that the creation of a new council providing efficient and effective services by April 2019 is challenging because of the lack of time.

The report seeks to confirm the governance structure being led by the Joint Committee as the Programme Sponsor, under which would be a Programme Board of the Chief Executives of the six authorities represented on the Joint Committee and the Programme Director. The Board would be chaired by one of the Chief Executives who would be the Senior Responsible Officer for the Programme and would be directly accountable to the Joint Committee. The report proposes the appointment of a Programme Director to coordinate the various projects within the programme of work. The programme structure is shown pictorially in Appendix 1.

The report recognises that further staff will be needed to deliver the programme. However, the extent of research work to be undertaken by a central team on behalf of the two Joint Committees needs to be clearer before an anticipated staff structure for the programme can be finalised. A further report
will be brought to the Joint Committee to seek approval to additional staff in due course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The work undertaken by Local Partnerships envisaged the costs of creating two unitary councils would amount to approximately £25m. The majority of this cost (£22.5m) would be incurred shortly after the new unitary councils come into existence and would be funded via Capitalisation Directions issued by the Secretary of State. The balance of £2.5m represented Local Partnerships’ assessment of the programme management costs to be incurred before April 2019. The report to Councils in January 2017 envisaged these costs would be shared by Councils pro-rata to population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As the programme has developed it has become clearer that some of the programme management costs will be incurred by a central team on the research and investigations which benefit both possible unitary councils. However, the majority of the programme management costs are more likely to be incurred in support of the decisions to be taken by one Joint Committee or the other. It is recommended that the costs incurred to support the Dorset Area joint Committee are shared pro-rata to population by the Councils represented on the Joint Committee. Using the populations of the relevant authorities as the basis for sharing costs is also being used for sharing the costs of the Future Dorset programme (across the six councils which signed up to the submission) and the central work for both potential unitary councils (across all nine councils).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At its last meeting the Joint Committee agreed to fund various posts up to a cost of £250,000 out of the total programme management budget for both unitary councils of £2.5m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is estimated that the costs of a Programme Director will amount to £120,000 per annum. Assuming a start date of 1 January 2018, the costs of the Director prior to April 2019 will amount to £150,000. The balance of an 18 month contract, of £30,000 would fall on the new unitary council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It may be difficult to appoint a member of staff with the appropriate skills, to commence work at the start of the new calendar year. In this case the appointment may be made via the interim market or from a consultancy active in the market. The costs associated with such an appointment are estimated to be approximately £240,000 for the 18 month contract, with approximately £60,000 being expected to be after 1 April 2019 and hence met by the new unitary council.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Recommendations**

That the Joint Committee agrees:

1. The proposed programme management governance structure set out in Appendix 1;
2. The appointment of a full-time Programme Director, on an 18 month fixed term contract, subject to a “minded to” decision by the Secretary of State;
3. The creation of an appointment panel of six members of the Joint Committee for the appointment of the Programme Director;
4. A further report is brought to the Joint Committee seeking approval to a staff structure to support the LGR programme in due course;
5. The agreed programme costs to April 2019 are shared between the existing councils pro-rata to population.

**Appendices**

1. LGR Programme Management Governance Structure
2. Programme Director Context Statement

**Background Papers**

None

**Report Originator and Contact**

Steve Mackenzie  
Chief Executive, Purbeck District Council  
Telephone: 01929 557235  
E-mail: stevemackenzie@purbeck-dc.gov.uk
Background

1.1 At its meeting on 20 September 2017, the Joint Committee refined its terms of reference. These largely focus on the essential work to create a unitary local authority in the Dorset area, in the event of the Secretary of State agreeing to the submission to reorganise local government in Dorset. The terms of reference also provide for the Joint Committee to oversee a programme of work to improve collaboration across Dorset, in the case of there not being a positive decision from the Secretary of State.

1.2 In September the Joint Committee also agreed its proposed programme of collaborative working. Whilst recognising there were several longer term priorities, the Joint Committee agreed to focus on the following three priorities, where the Joint Committee considers progress could be made relatively quickly. These are:

- Engagement with community partners, including Town and Parish Councils;
- Shared services; and
- Multi-discipline teams.

1.3 The extent of the work to support each of these priorities is currently being worked up. Draft terms of reference will be brought back to the Joint Committee for approval in due course.

1.4 At its meeting on 16 October, the Joint Committee agreed to recruit some essential staff to commence work on its priorities. Human Resource Managers across the area have started to work up the appropriate job descriptions and recruitment approach to enable appropriate staff to be recruited.

1.4 The Joint Committee’s role if the Secretary of State agrees to the reorganisation of local government in Dorset will be to oversee the start of a complex programme of work. Once the required Structural Change Order has been approved by Parliament, which is expected in the spring of 2018, the work of the Joint Committee in preparing for local government reorganisation will be taken on by the Implementation Executive. The Joint Committee has been set-up so that it can convert into the Implementation Executive, with relatively minor changes.

1.5 Whilst the overall governance for the programme to create a new unitary local authority in the Dorset area has been established, via the Joint Committee, there is little definition to the officer governance structure for the required work. This needs to be agreed now so that it is ready for implementation if the Secretary of State agrees to the proposed reorganisation of local government.

2 Programme Governance

2.1 The creation of a new unitary local authority, following a decision by the Secretary of State will be a complex programme of work which will need to be delivered within a very challenging timescale. To ensure the required programme of work is delivered a standard programme management structure is set out below.
2.2 The highest level of governance of any programme management structure is the Programme Sponsor. The Joint Committee is the Programme Sponsor, with the following roles:

- Championing the programme and providing the necessary drive and commitment;
- Agreeing the strategic objectives and direction for the programme;
- Making investment and resourcing decisions; and
- Monitoring progress and confirming delivery.

2.3 The Programme Sponsor should have an executive function beneath it, with delegated authority to manage the approved resources and the work programme. This executive function should act as a Programme Board. The Programme Board is responsible for driving the programme forward and delivering the required outcomes. The Programme Board should be made up of the four Chief Executives of the existing councils in the Dorset area all of whom are able to marshal the resources of their organisations. One of the Chief Executives should chair the Programme Board and be the Senior Responsible Officer. The Senior Responsible Officer is responsible to the Joint Committee for the delivery of the programme. Each member of the Programme Board is accountable to the Senior Responsible Officer for the delivery of parts of the programme. The Programme Board is responsible for:

- Ensuring the programme is delivered within the agreed parameters of cost, time and quality;
- Resolving strategic and directional conflicts between the various projects within the programme; and
- Defining the risk profiles for the programme and the various projects.

2.4 The Joint Committee and the Programme Board will rely on a team to ensure efficient and effective delivery of the various project which will make up the programme. The team should be led by a full-time Programme Director, who should be a key member of the Programme Board. The Programme Director should be a full-time post for a programme of this complexity because this post is responsible for ensuring the programme meets its objectives. The detail of the role involves:

- Planning the programme and monitoring progress;
- Identifying and resolving risks and issues;
- Managing the budget on behalf of the Senior Responsible Officer, including monitoring costs against the approved budgets;
- Maintaining the overall integrity and coherence of the programme;
- Effective monitoring and coordination of the projects within the programme and their interdependencies;
- Facilitating the appointment of individuals to the project teams; and
- Ensuring timely communication with stakeholders.

2.5 The Dorset area programme was lent a part-time Programme Director to facilitate the initial work of the Joint Committee. As the work of the programme is likely to escalate in the coming weeks, in the anticipation of a decision from the Secretary of
State, the Programme Director has returned to his substantive post, in helping the County Council to transform some of its services. It is therefore essential for the programme to replace this resource on a full time basis.

2.6 At its meeting on 16 October, the Joint Committee agreed to the creation of task and finish groups to take forward pieces of work where members have a specific interest, such as the workstream which will look at engagement with community partners. Task and finish groups of members will also be useful in helping to guide some of the technical work which needs to be completed, such as council tax harmonisation and disaggregation.

2.7 At its meeting in October, the Joint Committee also asked for a report to be submitted to its next meeting, on 15 November, on the arrangements for the appointment of an Interim Chief Executive, or equivalent, if local government reorganisation is agreed by the Secretary of State. The proposed officer structure set out above is to cover the period before the Interim Chief Executive is in place. Once this position has been filled, it is likely the Implementation Executive will want to review the programme structure with the Interim Chief Executive.

3 Resourcing the Programme

3.1 At its meeting on 16 October, the Joint Committee agreed to the recruitment to various posts within the programme team. These include a programme manager, a communications manager and two workstream coordinators. The report identified a number of other roles to which the Joint Committee is likely to need to recruit at some stage.

3.2 Prior to the establishment of the Joint Committee in the Dorset area and the Joint Committee covering Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole, workstreams for the legal and finance to create two unitary councils had been commissioned. More latterly, the need for some joint work on HR and ICT had been identified. This work was being undertaken on a pan-Dorset basis. At a recent meeting of Chief Executives, it was agreed that the pan-Dorset work should be limited to common research, liaison and support and finalising the content of the various Parliamentary Orders. This recognises the need for the two Joint Committees to drive all of the decisions that affect their respective unitary councils.

3.3 Further work now needs to be done to identify the extent of the research that can be undertaken jointly and for a clear distinction to be drawn between this common research and the work to support the decisions of each of the Joint Committees. Until this is completed it is difficult to be prescriptive about the amount of resource needed to support the various components of the programme to create the Dorset area unitary. Further detailed reports on the required resources will be brought to the Joint Committee in due course. In the meantime, it is possible to define the broad areas for the detailed work, as follows:

- Creating the new council;
- Delivering senior staff structures and functionality for April 2019
- Designing and building the new local authority.
3.4 The work of the Joint Committee in each of these areas is outlined in the following sections.

4 Creating the new council

4.1 Subject to a minded-to decision being made by the Secretary of State, the initial work of the Joint Committee will focus on the decisions required to deliver a new council. These include:

- The disaggregation of the County Council’s staff and services in Christchurch. This work will need to be completed in agreement with the Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Joint Committee by the early summer of 2018 to feed into the 2019/20 budget preparation process of both unitary councils;
- The disaggregation of the staff and services of the Christchurch Borough Council and East Dorset District Council Partnership. Again this work will need to be completed in agreement with the Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Joint Committee by the early summer of 2018 to feed into the 2019/20 budget preparation process of both unitary councils;
- Agreeing a strategy for the harmonisation of council tax across the new local authority area which is politically acceptable at both a national and local level and which balances the service needs of the community with the required revenue resources of the new council;
- Agreeing its input to the Structural Change Order, to be agreed by Parliament, which will dissolve the preceding authorities and replace them with two new unitary councils in Dorset. There is an opportunity to work with the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) on the content of the Parliamentary Order, which needs to be drafted by January 2018 (assuming a decision by the Secretary of State soon). DCLG has been asked to provide a list of the issues the Joint Committee will need to take a view on, for inclusion in the Order;
- The completion of a possible review by the Boundary Commission to ascertain the number of Councillors on the new Council, taking account of their criteria of electoral equality, community interest and effective local government.

5 Delivering senior staff structures and functionality

5.1 The Structural Change Order will provide for the creation of the new council on 1st April 2019. The Joint Committee/Implementation Executive will need to take decisions to ensure the new council is able to function effectively from that date. These decisions will include:

- Establishing senior officer structures and roles;
- Selecting and appointing senior and statutory officers;
- Agreeing harmonised staff terms and conditions;
- Setting revenue and capital budgets for the new council for 2019/20;

6 Designing and building the new local authority

6.1 The Joint Committee/Implementation Executive will need to take decisions about the design and delivery of efficient and effective services for the communities the new
council will serve. The creation of a new council provides a unique opportunity to transform services by reflecting new ways of working in the organisational structure, culture and values and their interaction with technology and customers. Decisions will also need to be taken on the way in which services are provided, for example which services will be provided through direct provision, in partnership or contracted out.

6.2 The aim of this work will be to ensure high quality services are provided which are sustainable in the long term.
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To be determined by the BCPJC
CONTEXT STATEMENT

Job Title: Programme Director – Local Government Reorganisation
Location: Dorset
Salary: Circa £120k

Background

Dorset has been pursuing an agenda of Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) since late 2015, and submitted a proposal to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, called Future Dorset, in February 2017. Full details of this proposal can be found on our website at www.futuredorset.co.uk

Dorset councils are now looking to appoint an exceptional Programme Director with a track record of delivery to work with the Chief Executives, Leaders and elected Members to transform local government in Dorset and create an exemplary new unitary council.

Details of the role and requirements are contained in the Job Description and Person Specification. The post is linked to the generic job description and person specification for Assistant and Service Directors with the addition of the following specific responsibilities.

Main Job Purpose

1. To establish, lead and manage a Dorset Area Transformation Programme including but not necessarily limited to Local Government Reorganisation to:
   i. Put in place a new unitary Dorset Council to replace the existing Dorset County Council, the three councils comprising the Dorset Councils Partnership, East Dorset and Purbeck District councils: (the Dorset Councils).
   ii. Realise the wider benefits of transformation presented by LGR as set out in the PwC Case for Change and wider Future Dorset submission
   iii. Contribute to the establishment of the new unitary council to replace Bournemouth Borough Council, Christchurch Borough Council and the Borough of Poole, ensuring that the Dorset Councils contribute to and are represented throughout that process.

2. To act as the lead officer and principal adviser on Local Government Reorganisation to the Dorset Joint Committee, Chief Executives of
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Dorset Councils Partnership, Dorset County Council, East Dorset District Council, Purbeck District Council and their elected members.

3. To advise Chief Executives and members on an appropriate programme of activity and the resources needed to bring together existing transformation programmes, deliver a new unitary Dorset Council by its vesting date on 1 April 2019, and the wider transformation envisaged in the Future Dorset submission.

4. To identify common themes, synergies and opportunities for convergence so that Local Government Reorganisation and wider transformation can be effectively achieved.

5. To work with the Programme Director for the emerging Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole unitary council where our programmes overlap and councils agree that we should work together on elements of a common programme.

Accountability

6. The Programme Director is employed by Dorset County Council but accountable jointly to the Chief Executives of Dorset County Council (including as host employer) and to the Chief Executives of Dorset Councils Partnership, East Dorset District Council and Purbeck District Councils. The Programme Director will be directly accountable to the Senior Responsible Owner (SRO), who will be drawn from the Dorset Area Chief Executives Group.

Relationships

7. The Programme Director will act and operate corporately across the Dorset Councils, building relationships of trust and breaking down organisational barriers to further the transition to a single Dorset Council.

8. In addition to an accountability to Chief Executives the Programme Director will work with the Leaders of the Dorset Area Councils and other elected members, in particular working with the elected members on any joint committee, oversight board, implementation executive or similar body formed to oversee the transition to a new unitary Dorset Council.

9. The Programme Director will work with the Corporate Leadership Teams of the Dorset Councils and other senior managers contributing to the convergence of existing programmes and the transition to a new unitary Dorset Council.

10. Through matrix management and with the support of the Chief Executives the Programme Director will be given the legitimacy to
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direct council staff and resources in order to deliver Local Government Reorganisation and wider transformation.

11. The Programme Director will need to develop the formal and informal team needed to deliver the objectives and to inspire, energise and motivate a wide range of stakeholders to support this process

Other Information

12. Knowledge and significant experience of managing major projects is essential, as is a sound understanding of the way in which Local Authorities work, together with experience of leading wide scale change and innovation.

13. The proven ability to bring innovation and best practice to the Unitary and also the energy to motivate individuals and teams through the change process will be an essential requirement.

Responsibilities

A detailed workplan will be agreed with the SRO but the programme director is responsible for:

• Planning and designing the programme and proactively monitoring its progress, resolving issues and initiating appropriate corrective action
• Supporting the programme’s governance arrangements
• Ensuring effective quality assurance and the overall integrity of the programme, focusing inwardly on the internal consistency of the programme, and outwardly on its coherence with infrastructure planning, interfaces with other programmes and corporate, technical and specialist standards
• Managing the programme’s budget on behalf of the SRO, monitoring expenditure and costs against delivered and realised benefits as the programme progresses
• Facilitating the appointment of individuals to project teams
• Ensuring the delivery of new products or services is to the appropriate level of quality, on time and within budget, in accordance with the programme plan and programme governance arrangements
• Ensuring there is allocation of common resources and skills within the programme’s individual projects
• Leading third party contributions to the programme
• Leading positive, proactive communications with all stakeholders
• Managing the dependencies and the interfaces between projects to deliver an integrated, transformational programme of change
• Managing risks to the programme’s successful outcome and implementing robust and innovative solutions
• Working with the business change manager or equivalent on the transition to the new business as usual position
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- Initiating extra activities and other management interventions wherever gaps in the programme are identified or issues arise
- Reporting the progress of the programme at regular intervals to the SRO
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## Executive Summary

A proactive and effective risk management process will ensure that the Committee is well placed to demonstrate that objective and informed decisions are taken and that the Committee is ultimately in a strong position to successfully face and address the challenges ahead.

This report sets out the risk management process cycle, and recommends a process to be adopted both for the change process and moving forward as a strategic tool for a holistic view of risk across the region.

## Budget Implications

No direct implications. However, a sound risk management practice will help to ensure that financial risks are managed in accordance with a defined risk appetite.

## Recommendations

That the Joint Committee agrees to:

- Adopt the risk management methodology set out in the report;
- Hold a risk workshop to define the Committee’s risk appetite and identify the key risks. This could be facilitated by the County Council’s Governance and Assurance Team;
- Receive regular progress reports on High and Worsening risks;
- Establish a Sharepoint based risk register, enabling collaborative update and ownership;
- Consider the benefits of maximising risk management resource across the partner authorities to provide a holistic overview of strategic risk.

## Appendices

- Appendix A – Current Dorset LGR Risk Register - High
- Appendix B – Possible Risks for a Dorset Area Risk Register
1. Introduction

1.1 A proactive and effective risk management process will ensure that the Committee is well placed to demonstrate that objective and informed decisions are taken and that the Committee is ultimately in a strong position to successfully face and address the challenges ahead. A risk management process should be seen as an enabler to change, not a barrier.

1.2 Risk to delivery of a new unitary authority is envisaged to be managed at three levels:

- **Dorset wide** – Some strategic risks will cross over both proposed unitary areas (for example, the impact of Brexit on parliamentary time). A risk register already exists for these top level risks, managed through the central programme previously known as Future Dorset and is presented periodically to the Dorset Leaders and Chief Executives. The high risks are summarised in Appendix A.

- **Dorset Area** – Those risks specifically associated with delivering a Dorset Area unitary authority. This forms the main part of the proposals within this report. Again, there will be some commonalities of risk across both areas, so some sharing of these would be beneficial. These will consist of both programme level and workstream specific risks.

- **Individual Authorities** – Outgoing authorities will have their own risks associated with the lead up to reorganisation (for example, the impact of LGR readiness on existing savings programmes). These would be reflected within individual authorities’ risk registers.

2. Risk Appetite

2.1 Risk appetite can be defined as “the level of risk that an organisation is prepared to accept to meet its strategic objectives”. An awareness of risk appetite is an essential part of the decision-making process, in ensuring that appropriate risks are escalated, understood and ultimately managed to an acceptable level. It is therefore recommended that the Committee determines its risk appetite at an early stage.

2.2 Whilst the appetite levels of individual authorities may differ, some work was undertaken a number of years ago by the Dorset Risk Management Forum (which included representation from the County Council, Bournemouth and Poole Unitaries, Districts and Boroughs and the Emergency Services) to define a number of risk categories that would enable risk to be consistently considered across the region. Although these risk matrices may have evolved in individual authorities since this time, the Committee may wish to consider mapping risk appetite against the following categories:
- **Financial risk** – This defines the financial implications of the risk;
- **Strategic priorities and opportunities** – This notes the extent that the risk could impact on achieving positive outcomes;
- **Health and safety** – This identifies the extent that the risk could cause serious injury/fatality/ill health;
- **Reputational** – This highlights whether the risk would impact on reputation, and whether this impact would be sustained or short-term;
- **Service delivery** – This category within the matrix looks at the extent that the risk would impact on the ability to deliver the critical functions and those affected by any failure. This helps to ensure that appropriate business continuity planning is prioritised and ready to respond to limit impact on the delivery of critical services.

2.3 For illustrative purposes, the County Council's current risk appetite matrix (which continues to adopt these five categories) is set out below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Financial</th>
<th>Strategic Priorities and Opportunities</th>
<th>Health &amp; Safety</th>
<th>Reputational</th>
<th>Service Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIGH</strong></td>
<td>i.e. a greater than 20% chance of: Financial impact &gt; £500,000</td>
<td>Major impact (positive or negative) on a strategic priority</td>
<td>Fatality or major injury/illness (long term incapacity / disability)</td>
<td>Sustained/long term negative media attention</td>
<td>Unable to deliver critical services (levels one and two)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEDIUM</strong></td>
<td>i.e. a greater than 20% chance of: Financial impact between £300,000 and £500,000</td>
<td>Moderate impact (positive or negative) on a strategic priority</td>
<td>Moderate injury or illness</td>
<td>Short to medium term negative impact on public memory (affecting more than one ward)</td>
<td>Unable to deliver critical services (level three)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOW</strong></td>
<td>Financial impact less than £300,000</td>
<td>Minor / negligible impact (positive or negative) on a strategic priority</td>
<td>Injury or illness requiring minimal intervention or treatment</td>
<td>Short to medium term negative impact on public memory (affecting one ward) / minor complaints or rumours</td>
<td>Minor disruption to service delivery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4 Ordinarily the Committee would wish to assure itself that any risks identified as High have appropriate mitigation in place, or proposed, to reduce the level of risk down to an acceptable level. On occasion it may choose to accept this risk (for instance, where mitigation options are limited or not cost effective, or the resulting positive outcomes of the decisions outweigh the threats).
3. Risk process

3.1 A sound risk managed organisation generally follows the process set out in the diagram below:

![Risk Management Cycle Diagram]

3.2 Risk Identification - What are the key risks that threaten achievement? The Committee may wish to hold a workshop of key officers/members to explore the risks further. This could build on risk identification processes that have already been undertaken as part of the early stages of Dorset Devolution and developing into the Future Dorset. Examples of the risks that may merit further consideration are set out in Appendix A.

3.3 Risk Assessment - What do we currently have in place to control or manage this risk? Based on the controls operated, what do we see as our current level of risk (using the risk appetite defined in 2 above)?

3.4 Risk Prioritisation - Once all risks have been scored, these should be prioritised to identify those requiring the most urgent attention. High risk activity should be subject to a greater level of scrutiny, to ensure assurance can be given that potential exposures are controlled to an acceptable level.

3.5 Risk Management - Clearly the aim of the process is to actively manage risks down to an acceptable level. In determining the various options that are available to deal with the identified risk(s), early consideration should be given to the cost / benefit of implementing the identified solution(s). A lead should be identified for each risk, generally being the officer/member with the greatest ability to actively influence the outcome.

3.6 Risk Monitoring – Monitoring the performance of risk is an essential part of the risk management cycle. This will ensure that the effectiveness of controls can be reviewed, whether the level of risk has changed and whether there are any new risks that should be added to the risk register. It is therefore important to set the escalation process for risk within the Committee's governance processes. A suggestion may be to empower risk leads (or their workstreams) to manage risks within appetite levels (i.e. medium and
low risks), with anything detailed as High or worsening escalated for regular review by this Committee (and/or its designated Programme Board). As a risk register should be a living document, it is suggested that Sharepoint is utilised to enable all authorities to access, view and update risks as appropriate (as is the case for the overarching LGR Risk Register).

4. Building for the Future

4.1 The focus of this report concentrates on using risk management as part of the programme management change process (specifically local government reorganisation, but could equally be applied to any further formalised collaborative arrangements mobilised across the region).

4.2 There is an opportunity to understand available risk specialism / resources available across the authorities, and maximise the impact such resource can have to keep the joint committee sighted on strategic risk across the whole region. This could include establishing a joint risk management strategy with a collaborative risk register. At the very least, it would be beneficial to share corporate risk registers to enable a holistic overview of the strategic risk that threaten the achievement of desired outcomes for Dorset.

Marc Eyre
Senior Assurance Manager (Governance, Risk and Special Projects)
Dorset County Council
## Appendix A – Current Dorset LGR Risk Register (High Risks)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If a minded to decision is not made by mid September, there will not be enough time to deliver the critical path activities in time for April 2019 go live.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lack of dedicated capacity to deliver the programme results in delays or inadequate work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention of key staff may be difficult during period of uncertainty and transition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The business case is already considered by some to be out of date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient time/resource to prepare/draft SCO to original DCLG December deadline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTH - agreeing political strategy may cause delay.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B – Possible Risks for a Dorset Area Risk Register

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIC</th>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
<th>CUSTOMER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Establishing the most effective management team;</td>
<td>• Managing cultural change;</td>
<td>• Drop in service levels during transition;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leadership of change;</td>
<td>• Clarity over assets / liabilities;</td>
<td>• Disruption to savings agenda within outgoing authorities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Professional capability/capacity to deliver the full programme of change;</td>
<td>• Clarity over staffing needs (numbers/skill sets) required;</td>
<td>• Communication with the public / partners during transition;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Establishing early decision making processes for new Councils;</td>
<td>• Staff and union engagement / communication / support;</td>
<td>• Reorganisation is not used as an opportunity to challenge / innovate re how we deliver smarter services to the public;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consolidating aims / priorities of authorities;</td>
<td>• Inconsistent / conflicting HR policies;</td>
<td>• Transfer of staff base has a negative impact on local economies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understanding full statutory responsibilities of merging authorities;</td>
<td>• Ensuring due diligence during restructuring / staff transfer process;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Unclear governance arrangements;</td>
<td>• Determining suitable property;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Managing expectations, with regards to “double devolution”/localised decision making;</td>
<td>• Disaggregation of management / staffing / budgets structures across Shared Service arrangements;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Agreeing corporate vision / identity / branding;</td>
<td>• Ensuring any outgoing authorities commission / contract services based on an understanding of the changes that LGR or other collaborative approaches will present (i.e. negative cost impact of decommissioning);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Impact on existing projects and partnerships (DWP; Tricuro etc);</td>
<td>• System integration and data sharing;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Unrealistic ambition as to what can be achieved through LGR (finance and functionally);</td>
<td>• Operational system needs for “day one”;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Achieving the benefits sought/agreed with partners / business case</td>
<td>• Loss of organisational knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Executive Summary

Appendix 1 of this report provides the existing workplan of the Joint Committee.

The workplan is a live document and will be updated to reflect the future work agreed by the Committee following any meetings or informal workshops.

## Budget Implications

These are no direct financial consequences from this report.

## Recommendation

The Joint Committee notes the forward plan and makes any changes as required.

## Appendices

- **Forward Plan**
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### Date of Meeting

15 November 2017

### Subject of Report

**Forward work plan for the Dorset Area Joint Committee**

### Executive Summary

- Appendix 1 of this report provides the existing workplan of the Joint Committee.
- The workplan is a live document and will be updated to reflect the future work agreed by the Committee following any meetings or informal workshops.

### Budget Implications

These are no direct financial consequences from this report.

### Recommendation

The Joint Committee notes the forward plan and makes any changes as required.

### Appendices

- Forward Plan

### Report Originator and Contact

- **Name:** Lee Gallagher, Clerk to the Joint Committee
- **Tel:** 01305 224191
- **Email:** l.d.gallagher@dorsetcc.gov.uk
### Appendix 1 – Forward Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Dorset Area Joint Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Cllr Rebecca Knox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Officers</td>
<td>Matt Prosser, Debbie Ward, Steve Mackenzie, David McIntosh, Darran Gunter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Officer</td>
<td>Tbc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Regular Items**
- Apologies
- Minutes from previous meeting
- Forward Plan

**DATE OF MEETING** | 15 November 2017, 2.30pm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Senior Officer(s) supporting</th>
<th>Additional support</th>
<th>Outcome (Decision / consultation / update / annual review)</th>
<th>Delivery method (e.g. Presentation / report)</th>
<th>Decision maker (if applicable)</th>
<th>Prior consultees</th>
<th>To be submitted to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Prepare draft papers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Submit draft papers to Dorset Area CXs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Formal circulation of papers to lead officers for sign off</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Deadline for approval of papers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Publication of agenda and papers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appointment of Chief Executive or equivalent and other Statutory posts**
- Monitoring Officer
- Chief Executives
- Decision regarding the appointment process, or alternative as appropriate
- Report
- Committee
- N/A
- N/A

**Disaggregation principles and policies**
- Chairman
- Chief Executives
- Section 151 Officers & Monitoring Officers
- Decision on progressing activities
- Report
- Committee
- TBC
- N/A

**Programme and Resourcing Plan**
- Chairman
- Chief Executives
- Update since last meeting on recruitment processes
- Report
- Committee
- N/A
- N/A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Senior Officer(s) supporting</th>
<th>Additional support</th>
<th>Outcome (Decision / consultation / update / annual review)</th>
<th>Delivery method (e.g. Presentation / report)</th>
<th>Decision maker (if applicable)</th>
<th>Prior consultees</th>
<th>To be submitted to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared Services – scope and outline work programme</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outline for next phases of collaborative work priorities</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with Town and Parish Councils</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with Community and Voluntary Sector Partners</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress update on collaborative priorities – detail TBC</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td>Decision on progressing activities</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dependent on ‘Minded’ Decision**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Progress against programme including relevant workstream reports</th>
<th>Chairman</th>
<th>Chief Executives</th>
<th>Section 151 Officers &amp; Monitoring Officers</th>
<th>TBC</th>
<th>TBC</th>
<th>TBC</th>
<th>TBC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>