



Headline Business Case - Proposed Joint Working

Sedgemoor District Council

South Somerset District Council

Version 8.0

12/02/16

Contents

1. Mandate

2. Executive Summary

BACKGROUND / RESEARCH

3. National Context

4. Local Context

5. Council's Finances

6. Approach taken

7. Communications and consultation - Appendix A. Communications Plan

8. Scope

9. Transition Costs

10. Employment models - Appendix B. Pros and Cons of the Models

11. Terms and conditions - Appendix C. Comparative Terms and Conditions

12. Assets

13. ICT

14. Procurement

PROPOSALS

15. Senior Management

16. Cost and Savings Sharing Principles

17. Income Generation

18. Summary Figures

19. Resilience

20. Stronger Voice

21. Governance

22. Equality issues

23. Risks

24. Conclusion

25. Appendices

1. Mandate

The mandate for joint working as agreed by both Sedgemoor District Council and South Somerset District Council has been agreed as follows:

- To establish a programme to bring together the workforce of the two authorities to increase the Joint Councils resilience and influence across the South West and nationally.
- The Joint workforce to be delivered through a single organisational structure which delivers optimum savings and maximises income generation.
- The financial results of the programme to be illustrated in an outline business case and to be completed by 14th February 2016.

2. Executive Summary

The Mandate approved for this business case was approved by both Council and sets the objectives for the work undertaken to date. Sections 3 and 4 provide details for both the national and local context in which this Joint Headline business Case is drafted.

The financial context for the business case is provided in section 5 and illustrates that both councils need to make savings over the next five years, £4.1 million and £1.9 million for South Somerset and Sedgemoor respectively. The business case clearly illustrates that savings can be achieved, primarily from staff, with limited potential, in the short term, from procurement and ICT.

The business case concludes a headline savings figure of £2.5 million. This figure does not include transition costs. Ultimately transition costs would vary greatly depending on the type of partnership pursued, employment model chosen, decisions on harmonisation of salaries and terms and conditions and the timeframe over which the transition is made.

During the development of the business case a number of options have been considered, from full integration of structures to a more organic approach in the form of a strategic alliance. In deciding which route to follow members should give due regard to the potential to achieve the aims of the partnership, i.e. savings, resilience and stronger voice and the environment in which the transition would take place. Later sections in the Business Case provide more detail in this regard.

In conclusion the this headline business case does not claim to contain all the answers but does demonstrate that through closer working in some form of partnership significant savings can be made whilst at the same time increasing resilience and potentially the two councils influence on the national and regional stages. This must be done while protecting the interests of local residents and businesses and any proposals herein have been arrived at with the clear aim of maintaining and / or improving service standards to our customers.

BACKGROUND / RESEARCH

3. National Context

Nationally, local authorities are seeking to address substantial financial challenges, increase resilience and gain better influence for their residents. Local government already has a track record of innovation, delivering efficiencies and serving communities as well as facing challenges brings opportunities for doing things differently. Joint working is not new; sharing services can enable councils to 'do more with less' by reducing duplication of effort and becoming more efficient. The Local Government Act 1972 gives the authority for councils to share services and this has led to a wide array of shared service models right across the country. Indeed, it is virtually unheard of for any council to provide all of its services in isolation.

There are many examples where shared arrangements work well and of course those where it has been more challenging. Those councils that have moved to joint working have saved 10-20% by joining the top management tiers while retaining sufficient strategic and operational capacity to deliver services. There are clearly cases of duplication in running two operational structures doing much the same work and benefits arise from developing one consolidated structure. Further savings have been achieved from subsequent transformation of service delivery and procurement savings due to greater economies of scale.

Messages from central government indicate that they consider local government as an unprotected sector in forthcoming budget decisions meaning that statutory services such as housing, health and social care and waste could be compromised. There are also indications that, unless councils have embraced all opportunities to optimise on efficiencies such as joint working, that future support from government could be limited. During the development of this business case the announcements on the Comprehensive Spending Review further changed the financial picture, risks and benefits. The main points were:

- The removal of all Revenue Support Grant by 2019/20.
- Local authorities to retain 100% of business rates.
- Devolution of some costs in particular Housing Benefits administration.
- A review of the New Homes Bonus (NHB) – to be carried out in 2016 with a possible 4 year income stream rather than the current 6 to save £800 million.
- Local government to be allowed to spend capital receipts on reform programmes.
- Councils will be allowed to cut business rates to boost growth and elected mayors allowed to raise them under certain circumstances.
- A social care precept may be introduced by local authorities who are responsible for social care. The precept will work by giving local authorities the flexibility to raise council tax in their area by up to 2% above the existing threshold for spend on adult social care.
- The Spending Review invests £1.8 billion in digital technology and transformation projects across the public sector over the next 4 years.

On the wider stage, a strategic alliance with another authority brings a stronger voice and influence. Areas where this increased influence is likely to be beneficial are Devolution, the Local Enterprise Partnership and any discussions with central government on local issues.

Devolution is intended to be a fiscally-neutral redistribution of power from national to local government around focused topic areas such as prosperity, health and social care and infrastructure (roads etc). Sheffield City Region, Cornwall Council, West Yorkshire Combined Authority and Greater Manchester Combined Authority have already secured Devolution Deals. Over 30 new bids were submitted to the Treasury in September 2015, including one from Devon and Somerset. Shared council services as described in this business case could bring greater influence to bear on Sedgemoor and South Somerset issues within this arena.

There are 39 Local Enterprise Partnerships across the country which brings together business leaders, educational establishments and representatives from local government together. The main focus is on economic growth, prosperity and job creation and the management of Growth Deal and some European funding opportunities. It is believed that Joint Authorities, with a stronger voice, may have greater influence with LEP bringing advantages to the geographical area they serve.

National research and learning on shared services.

The Local Government Association has produced a 2015 compendium of shared services and resources which is available on their website. In summary, they state that there are at least 416 councils across England are engaged in 383 shared service arrangements resulting £462m of efficiency savings.¹ Some councils share certain services, some share senior management, some share all staff and others have entered into joint venture relationships with other public sector bodies and the private sector. Each of these models has different advantages or disadvantages and learning from these experiences has been beneficial to the development of this business case.

Examples where councils share services and management include:

- Adur and Worthing. Established in 2008 and now transforming via 'New ways of working' project
- Bromsgrove and Redditch
- Christchurch and East Dorset. Expected savings over £1m/ yr
- High Peak and Staffordshire Moorlands
- Mid Suffolk and Babergh (currently only 1st to 4th tier but now moving forwards on all staffing)
- South Hams and West Devon.
- South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse.
- Taunton Deane and West Somerset.
- West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland and East Dorset.

¹ See the Shared Services pages on the LGA website. <http://www.local.gov.uk/shared-services-map>

Other models are:

- Breckland and South Holland who share chief executive and senior officers
- Forest Health and St Edmundsbury. Have a single West Suffolk staff team (saving £3.5m annually) and aligned portfolio holders working across geographical boundaries.
- Hoople, which is a joint company owned by Herefordshire Council and Wye Valley NHS Trust offering HR, finance and IT to both public sector and private organisations
- Nottingham City Council and Leicester County Council – share HR, payroll and finance. Expected savings are more than £1m

The LGA guide to Shared services and management: a guide for councils² states that sharing can bring other benefits apart from savings such as:

- Increased investment in more advanced ICT systems using pooled resources
- Adoption of best practices across service delivery partnerships to improve performance
- Opportunities to transform services to meet the needs of users
- Opportunities to implement new ways of working
- More interesting, varied or specialised work for staff – aiding recruitment and retention

An LGA evaluation of five shared services³ (2012) suggested that the initial reduction in staffing at the beginning of the sharing process brings quick savings as duplication is removed and structures merged. Set up and implementation costs were modest with most achieving payback in year two. In the five case studies there was no material decline in customer or staff satisfaction levels. Following the initial joining, further savings result from improved business practices. The report also states that shared services are likely to be more attractive than outsourcing as councils retain more control over quality and service standards.

The LGA has also produced an evaluation tool⁴ to help local authorities understand and track the benefits of sharing front and back office services. This tool is designed to help councils prepare their business cases and move towards a decision on which direction to take.

Other anecdotal learning from visits to shared councils suggests that joint working is most successful when:

²http://www.local.gov.uk/c/document_library/get_file?uuid=0be2bc69-3c33-4fda-a54f-efa7e93d66e1&groupId=10180

³ Hoople Ltd, Herts; LGS in Cambridge; Devon and Somerset Fire and Rescue Authority; Value of White Horse and South Oxfordshire and Procurement Lincolnshire

⁴http://www.local.gov.uk/c/document_library/get_file?uuid=f8946c6d-1978-456e-82ba-23cfe5458095&groupId=10180

- Both partners are seen as equals and the final structure does not indicate a 'take-over' has occurred rather than a merger.
- There is a shared vision that is realistic and achievable at a senior political level where both councils benefit
- There is trust between senior politicians who work together effectively
- There are similarities in the geographical areas covered by the councils
- Any cultural differences between the councils are recognised and harnessed
- There is clear and well-understood governance.
- ***Establishing the senior team at an early stage helps drive through the business case.***

This national learning has, of course, identified a few councils where shared councils arrangements have either stalled or been reversed. Some of the reasons for this include perceptions that the savings were not needed at that stage, or difficulties agreeing direction.

Richmondshire and Hambleton councils joined management teams and services but have since partially disconnected themselves apparently due to lack of clarity about the split of officer time across each authority. This learning feeds into the risks and challenges which are explored later in this business case.

Cornwall Council led a consortium which agreed a 10 year outsourcing contract providing a strategic partnership between the agencies delivering health, transport, communications and public safety services. In December 2015, the High Court agreed that Cornwall Council could terminate the contract as BT Cornwall was in material breach of the agreement and had failed to deliver services to service levels set out in the agreement. The Judge was critical of the arrangements put in place to underpin the outsourcing because it was imprecise and difficult to understand. In addition the service levels and performance indicators did not incentivise BT Cornwall to improve performance.

Overlaid on this national context is the local perspective and environment which is explored in the next section of this business plan.

4. Local Context

Councils in Somerset share, with other councils nationally, growing concerns about the need to make savings, maintain resilience and increase influence. Currently, across Somerset there is already much partnership work. This ranges from a shared staffing model in West Somerset Council and Taunton Deane Borough Council right through to small scale sharing of individual posts or small operational areas. Some services are already shared by all councils in Somerset such as waste collection and disposal and internal audit.

In October 2015, Sedgemoor (SDC) and South Somerset (SSDC) Full Councils agreed to mandate a project to explore the potential to deliver joint management and shared services arrangements and requested that a headline business case be brought back to the respective councils by February 2016. The local context behind these decisions was based on the national picture for local authorities, the understanding of the need for greater resilience and opportunities to make savings while maintaining the services delivered to our residents.

The opportunities and challenges that Devolution brings are yet to be formalised across Devon and Somerset. At the time of writing (Feb 2016) the arrangements for Somerset district and county councils are fluid, which could, ultimately, supercede or affect the ways in which partnerships and working arrangements are currently undertaken.

For clarity, when the term 'sharing' or 'joint council' is used in this business case it does not change the sovereign nature of either South Somerset or Sedgemoor district councils. Instead, sharing proposals seek to develop one officer team that will work across both geographical areas. By joining up management and service delivery both councils should benefit from financial savings and strengthened resilience which would help to prepare both councils for the expected challenges ahead.

In addition, it is recognised that in order to achieve the greatest potential and investment for our residents and businesses Somerset councils need to achieve a stronger voice both regionally and nationally. Over recent years Government has increasingly encouraged regional groupings like the Heart of the South West Local Enterprise Partnership and there is a strong indication that this will continue. There is also the fear that if local councils do not embrace these moves and clearly demonstrate a commitment to work more closely to drive out efficiencies, that future funding streams could be adversely impacted upon.

What current shared services exist in Somerset?

Matching the national picture of shared services there are a variety of shared arrangements in Somerset. Some examples include:

- a. Taunton Deane and West Somerset. The business case presented to both councils on 12th November 2013 indicated ongoing annual savings for the councils of £1.89m (£1.58m for TDBC and £0.31m for WSC). This required a once-off investment to cover staff termination costs, IT investment and programme costs of £2.7m.

A Scrutiny report in March 2015 indicated that the savings targets have been broadly achieved and that service performance targets have shown no real downward trends. The shared staffing team is now undergoing a transformation programme with further savings and resilience expected to be the outcomes from the process.

The timescale was swift. The Chief Executive was in post by October 2013, tiers 2 and 3 were in place by January 2014, tiers 4 and 5 by August 2014 and all staff were part of the *One Team* by February 2015. In March 2015, a review of terms and conditions commenced closely followed by the start of a service transformation project.

The process had an assurance review from Local Partnerships and utilised external support from *Iese* (Improvement & Efficiency Social Enterprise) an organisation focusing on public sector organisations to enable them deliver better outcomes at lower cost.

- b. Mendip District Council (MDC) are currently proposing to change the way that their services are delivered. They are working with South Oxfordshire, Vale of White Horse, Hart and Havant councils to procure jointly a wide range of joint council services. These include some that are already out-sourced along with a range of additional services that are currently delivered in house by MDC. They aim to identify a preferred bidder in February 2016 and transfer services from August 2016 onwards.
- c. SW One. This is a joint venture between Taunton Deane, Somerset County Council, Police and IBM which will expire in 2017. While innovative in approach when adopted in 2007, there has been a legal dispute, staff have returned to the employment of their original councils and partners are considering alternative options for the future.
- d. Somerset Waste Partnership (all Somerset Councils). Established in 2007, this innovative partnership has gone from strength to strength. There is a shared staff structure, pooled budgets but decisions affecting partner council budgets are made in the partner councils. The governance arrangements have been a major part in this success.
- e. South West Audit Partnership (all Somerset Councils in a total of 14 councils, in 6 counties). Set up in 2005, SWAP is a publically owned company, limited by guarantee. This has provided financial savings, greater resilience and sharing of best practice across authorities.
- f. Homefinder Somerset is a partnership of Somerset local authorities and housing associations working together to make the process of finding a home simple and transparent. Software systems and policies are shared, achieving savings and offering an improved service for the customer.

- g. Much sharing of certain posts and services between districts and between districts and County (e.g. s151 officer is shared between SCC and Mendip District Council, building control partnership etc.).

In addition to this, there are a number of strategic areas where councils work together effectively some examples being the Health and Wellbeing Board, the Somerset Rivers Authority, Drainage Boards, the Local Enterprise Partnership Community Safety Partnership to name just a few.

Finally, there are local arrangements where both Sedgemoor and South Somerset have arrangements including:

- SSDC share civil contingencies/health and safety officer and insurance with East Devon District Council
- SSDC contract out the running of two swimming pools in Yeovil and Wincanton
- SSDC work with a number of parish and town councils in the running of the crematorium
- SSDC outsource out of hours contact (with Deane Care) and Careline contact (with Sedgemoor).
- SSDC have delegated street cleansing of Chard Town Centre to the Town Council.
- SDC share office accommodation with a range of partners at Bridgwater House
- SDC work with the Town Council in running the cemeteries.
- SDC work with towns and Parishes in the provision of dog bins
- SDC work with towns and Parishes in the provision of public conveniences
- SDC provide services such as Careline and CCTV to other Organisations
- SDC provide many services under SLA to Homes in Sedgemoor
- SDC have successfully transferred its theatres, halls and arts centres to third parties to continue to operate
- SDC funds third parties to provide swimming pools in the district

Lessons learned from Somerset sharing initiatives

The TDBC / WSC Scrutiny report picks up the following learning points. Firstly, the elements that went well were:

- Openness and consistency of approach regarding the process
- Good governance arrangements which gave challenge to the process
- Having dedicated project resource to deliver the business case after agreement
- Communication and using a variety of methods at key stages of the process (but see also below)
- External challenge via an assurance review provided confidence in the proposals

The elements that were considered learning points were:

- Communications should be mainstreamed throughout the process. It was felt that there could never be too much information given to staff and members.

- ICT requirements should be prioritised, expectations need to be managed and a timetable produced about what will be available by when.
- People affected must be treated as individuals, especially when delivering such a process at pace.
- Recognition of the resource and time implications from staff, managers, project team and members if the change is to be delivered effectively.

Financial challenges SSDC and SDC

Both councils are in a relatively strong financial position and are free from immediate critical financial pressures compared to other councils. This creates an opportune time to explore working together, while there is still the organisational capacity to make the changes.

However, we need to plan for the medium term. More detail on the individual budget challenges facing both authorities will be found in the financial chapter of this business case.

Operational and resilience challenges

The ongoing savings targets are putting increasing pressure on services in both councils. Reduced staffing levels are likely to put delivery at risk and impacts on resilience. Currently both councils are experiencing difficulty in recruiting staff and training, development and promotion prospects are reduced. A larger organisation would have the ability to overcome some of these barriers. Both councils have already seen the reduction of key skills with the loss of experienced officers and a larger organisation will bring new skills to deliver projects and services desired by both sets of members and our communities.

What are the risks of doing nothing?

As stated above, both councils accept that they are currently in a relatively strong position. Alongside this joint headline case, both councils are preparing a similar headline business case for remaining as independent staffing teams. More detail can be found within those documents. It is possible for SDC and SSDC to remain as independent units but it would appear inevitable that the Governments direction of travel would suggest larger units of local government. When considering the comparative business cases, members are reminded that efficiency savings can be made, whether the two councils enter into a partnership or not. What should be considered are the additional benefits that can be achieved through a partnership, if approved.

In the case of South Somerset, it is forecast that the council will need to make over £3.9 million of savings by 2020-21. With transformation, income generation, reduced management structures and efficiencies the council is likely to find that total. However there is still some uncertainty over the longer term that will depend on other changes such as the retention of business rates, review of New Homes Bonus, and other budget pressures that are not yet known.

In the case of Sedgemoor the situation is very similar with an estimated saving of £2 million needed over the period to 2020-21. Again local plans can mitigate this but there is a risk that

this will impact on services and will not be sustainable in the longer term. The assumptions used to reach these projections are outlined in the finance section of this plan.

Remaining independent gives stability, but the outcome of the Devolution bid may change the parameters.

On the wider stage, a strategic alliance with another authority brings a stronger voice and influence.

More detail on the risks of sharing and not sharing are outlined in the later risks section of this report.

Some facts about the two districts

	South Somerset	Sedgemoor
Population	164,569	119,057
Average annual population increase for last five years	1,199	1,384
Population Density	1.7	2.0
Average Household size	2.3	2.3
% population of Working Age	58.74%	59.93%
% over 65	23.69%	22.11%
Life Expectancy at Birth		
Males	80.3	79.9
Females	84.3	83.8
LSOAs in the most deprived 20% nationally	7	11
% people living in 20% most deprived areas of England	6.49%	14.00%
Household income per week	£422.30	£444.90
% without access to car or van	14.7%	16.5%
% of working age population claiming job seekers allowance	0.7%	1.1%
Proportion of people qualified to level 4 or above (equivalent to degree)	25.1%	22.1%
5 year survival rate of new enterprises	45.9%	44.2%
5-Year Survival Rate of new Enterprises % per 10,000 population	13.67	14.28

Many formal partnerships exist involving all Somerset districts and these are valued highly. In addition, there are many informal sharing or support arrangements between Somerset authorities and it is essential that these should continue into the future. Any sharing agreements between Sedgemoor and South Somerset would not compromise these arrangements.

5. Councils' Finances

The need to make savings is one of the key drivers in exploring joint working between the two councils. Neither council is in crisis financially and has some capacity to close the funding gaps. The solo business cases which sit alongside this one provide greater detail on how each partner can address its own challenges.

This chapter provides further details on both South Somerset and Sedgemoor's current financial position.

The Local Government Settlement was announced on the 17th December 2015 outlining the individual figures for each authority. While both councils knew that the Revenue Support Grant was being phased out this has been brought forward resulting in the funding gap for each council increasing in the short term.

	South Somerset	Sedgemoor
	£	£
Net budget 2016-17	17,291,300	16,702,853
RSG 2016-17	1,675,550	1,581,043
Reduction in RSG over last 3 years	3,261,400	2,371,358
Funding Gap 2016-17	-	-
Budget gap for next 4 years	4.1 million	1.9 million
Savings to balance budget 2016-17	1,700,000	270,000
Used Now -		
Use of New Homes Bonus £	3,000,000	875,000
Use of New Homes Bonus %	64%	20%
As % of annual gross spend	10%	1.5%
Required to offset lost RSG		
% savings from salaries, exc. top 3 tiers		
10%	900,000	583,000
12%	1,080,000	700,000
15%	1,350,000	860,000

6. Approach Taken

In order to bring together as much meaningful data as possible, a range of research was undertaken by the respective partners. Some of this predated the decisions by each partner to develop the business case. A presentation was made to members from both councils on 10th December at which Matt Prosser, Chief Executive for North Dorset District Council, West Dorset District Council and Weymouth and Portland Borough Council presented and provided further detail on the Dorset tri-partner partnership has developed, some of the issues that had arisen and how these had been dealt with.

A range of desk top research has been undertaken including review of business cases compiled by existing partnering councils. This allowed for a timely development of the structure of the Business Case and also allowed for learning both from what had gone well and equally what hadn't. Business cases reviewed included Babergh and Mid-Suffolk, South Hams and East Devon, North Dorset, West Dorset and Weymouth & Portland and Taunton Deane/West Somerset. Desktop reviews of this kind enabled some informed estimation of the level of savings which can be achieved, timescales required, opportunities and barriers to success and the risks that need to be planned for.

The project team have also been able to reflect and learn from local experiences in the joining up of single services like the audit partnership, waste and building control and take account of some of the challenges they presented and how they could be overcome.

The Business Case has also been informed by the national and local context, geography, operational delivery and finances.

All of the above have been presented to and debated by the Joint Leaders' Advisory Group (JLAG) in the development of the final document presented. This group comprising group leaders from each of the partners provided a working governance structure through which the officer project group and independent Leaders' groups could report. This group was also supported by a representative from the Local Government Association to provide challenge and advice where needed.

Independent professional human resource expertise was procured to provide detailed advice on a range of personnel issues and the potential employment models.

7. Communications & Consultation

Throughout the development of this Business Case every effort has been made to ensure staff and members have been as fully engaged and information has been made freely available at the earliest opportunity. This has included working with each of the Unions as appropriate. A full communications plan was jointly developed at the start of the project and is available as a background document. This is provided in Appendix A

8. Scope

In order to ensure the business case reflects a true and fair picture of the opportunities arising from joint working it is important to make sure the scope reflects what can be achieved by way of joint working and not what is deliverable as individual operational entities. Clearly savings can be made through either scenario but this business case is constructed to identify those benefits that are “partnership critical”.

Clearly in scope

- Senior management structure, first 3 tiers
 - Role & purpose of Statutory Officers
- Staff savings from joint working – throughout the organisational structures
- Procurement savings
- Savings from rationalisation / sharing ICT systems
- Initial views on which services appear ‘quick wins’ for future sharing

Out of scope

The following service areas have been flagged as out of scope either because they are specific to one or other of the partners or because it is believed that it needs to be delayed due to complexity.

- The issue of sovereignty – there is no intention to combine the political structures of each partner council. The proposals will preserve the democratic sovereignty of each council which will continue to represent its local communities in the way it sees fit and in line with its own policies and leadership obligations.
- The net cost of facilities run by one of the partners locally e.g. pools, theatres etc. Working together is unlikely to affect the direct costs of running these facilities. However, the corporate management of these facilities may have an impact on the senior management structure and indeed the “back office” functions. This would be reflected in the allocation of costs to the relevant partner.
- Housing, the landlord-function and Housing Revenue Account (HRA) – Sedgemoor District Council has retained ownership of its housing stock which is now managed by Homes in Sedgemoor, while South Somerset transferred its stock in 1999. The proposals within this business case do not seek to make savings from the HRA in Sedgemoor. Any savings arising from local decisions within SDC will be dealt with separately as a non-partnership critical issue. N.B. General Fund Housing services such as operational and strategic housing etc. will be in scope and the corporate management of HRA may have an impact on the senior management structure and allocation of costs to each partner.

- Direct Labour Organisations – both councils run direct labour workforces providing services such as street cleaning, cleaning of public conveniences (SDC) and grass cutting and horticulture. For the purposes of this business case the work force staff will be considered out of scope and not modelled into any savings i.e. any savings assumed from % reductions to the salary bill. Management of those services for posts above supervisor will be considered in scope and savings applied as appropriate to the tier of the organisation they sit.
- Staff funded by EDF (Sedgemoor only) – SDC currently has 10.38 FTE staff funded directly by way of the section 106 agreements with EDFe. These specific posts will be out of scope. However this work will need to inform the senior management structure.
- Existing partnerships – as reference in the local context section of this plan both councils are already working within a range of partnerships to a greater or lesser extent.
- These partnerships will be outside the scope of this business case. Any ongoing negotiations to achieve savings from these existing arrangements will run in parallel and deemed non-partnership critical.
- Building assets and administrative offices – there are no plans to review these at this stage although should the partnership progress there may be opportunities to rationalise some of the properties in the future. Should this result directly from the establishment of joint working arrangements the revenue sharing arrangements would be agreed on facts at that time. Due to the geography of the two councils this is not expected to materialise in the short to medium term. Where assets are disposed of unilaterally by either partner the resultant financial benefit would be enjoyed by that partner.
- SSDC Area working staff, although managers and Assistant Director's will be in-scope as part of their wider corporate management role.

The bullet points above provide the building blocks and parameters to inform the financial modelling within this business case and will shape any cost or saving sharing principles agreed, see section 8 Cost and Saving Sharing Principles.

Where areas of activity are entirely out of scope there will be no impact on the business case made. Where each partner may wish to vary the extent to which it “buys into” the service this will inform the basis on which savings, and any related costs, are apportioned. This methodology is designed to ensure there is no cross subsidisation between the partners.

9. Transition Costs

In order to bring two Councils together, at an operational level, there will clearly be the need to make some up-front investment to bring about that change. This up-front investment will comprise a number of expenditure streams as outlined below.

- a. Officer termination / severance costs
- b. Structure realignment costs (any adjustments to salaries or terms and conditions)
- c. ICT enhancements / changes
- d. Programme / transition costs (including additional travel)
- e. Training

While it is not possible to accurately estimate some of these costs some preliminary work has been undertaken to make provision to offset against savings in the first two years. In the very early stages of the transition members should be aware that due to the timing of events costs are very likely to outweigh savings resulting in a net cost.

Severance / Termination – an assessment of the potential termination costs has been made based on figures from each council. This assessment has assumed a 12% reduction in staff numbers and taken average figures to estimate the likely severance costs. This results in the following:

SSDC - £1.63 million

SDC - £1.7 million

Total - £3.33 million

Note these figures are based on average data at SDC and SSDC's has taken into account a range of assumptions. Experience would suggest that staff with longer service, and with access to their pensions, are more likely to volunteer. As such the figures above are no doubt prudent and members are advised that they could be materially higher. If we accept that the Governments amendments regarding severance pay will be in place well before any redundancies occur the maximum liability for SSDC will be £3.7 million and SDC £2.6 million.

Structural realignment costs – A provisional figure of £250,000 has been assumed to provide for salary harmonisation and the potential uplift in salaries as a result of job evaluation of some posts. There may also be costs arising from the harmonisation of non-salary terms and conditions. Note these are unlikely to be one off costs in the main.

ICT – Covered in the ICT section.

Programme / Transition – A provisional figure of £250,000 has been assumed for programme management over a three year period. With regard to travel, a prudent estimate

of the potential costs purely in relation to middle / senior management has been made. Assuming one round trip per week this could cost circa £23,000 per year, £46,000 for 2. As this excludes any other staff it would not be unreasonable to provide for up to £50,000 in year one with the potential for reductions as the new working arrangements bed in.

Note: consideration also needs to be given to the “opportunity cost” of staff travelling between the two councils. This may or may not be deemed to be within the “working day”.

In the absence of any government support in the form of grant these costs would need to be funded from existing reserves and it is anticipated that the great majority would need to be drawn from the New Homes Bonus.

Based on the sum total of the above a prudent estimate of transition costs could be in the region of £3.9 million.

Cost Category	£
Severance	3,330,000
Structural Realignment	250,000
ICT	Not provided for
Programme Management	250,000
Travel	50,000
Training	75,000
TOTAL	3,955,000

10. Employment models

As part of the research undertaken to inform this business independent Human Resource, (H.R.), advice was secured through the Local Government Association. This advice was extensive and detailed and is summarised below.

In November 2015 advice and support was requested on a number of issues associated with achieving the objective of successful joint working between the two Councils. These are dealt with in the following order:

- What employment models are available?
- What are the pros and cons or risks and opportunities associated with each?
- What employment law issues will need to be considered?
- Consideration of challenges of combining or rationalising pay scales and terms and conditions
- Approaches to filling posts in post transition structures, ring fencing etc
- Likely transition or severance costs to be considered
- Approaches to savings and cost sharing

Consultation with recognised trade unions and staff was also an issue where further advice was sought. This is covered as relevant in the different sections below.

Establishing a Local Authority Trading Company raises a number of HR and employment issues and these are dealt with below.

Employment Models

There are a number of relevant employment models available to the Councils as follows:

- Model 1. A shared senior management team all employed by one of the partner Councils – other staff employed by their existing Council and any shared posts funded jointly through an agreed formula (eg on a 50:50 basis)
- Model 2. A shared senior management team together with other staff continuing to be employed by both partners on the basis of their existing employment – again with agreement on apportioning the cost of shared posts
- Model 3. One of the Councils becoming the employer for all employees, the transfer of employment being subject to TUPE regulations
- Model 4. Shared Service arrangements. Many Councils have entered into a variety of shared service arrangements for different services or groups of services. Where these have stayed in house (as opposed to outsourced to the private sector) employees can either be transferred to one of the council partners or remain with their original council employer as described above. Outsourcing, however, usually involves TUPE transfer to a private sector partner or into a Local Authority Trading Company (LATC) set up for the purpose
- Employment in a Local Authority Trading Company (LATC). LATCs are bodies that are free to operate as commercial companies but remain wholly owned by the parent local authorities. As such they are a separate employer and council employees

transfer across to them under TUPE. The LATC then has freedoms within the parameters of TUPE to change terms and conditions and also appoint new staff on different terms and conditions including pension arrangements

- The increasing variety of service delivery models in local government as a response to public sector reform and budget pressure means that different employment models co-exist in the same authority which may have, for example, a shared management team, a range of shared services with different partners and ownership of a trading company for other services

Councils which have already or recently adopted a shared Chief Executive or shared Chief Executive and wider senior management team have followed a variety of different paths as they have developed. Therefore, a number of different approaches to employment and people management have emerged within the models listed above.

A full assessment of the pros and cons of each model is provided in **Appendix B**.

Employment Law issues to be considered

Senior Management Restructure issues. A fair procedure must be followed in relation to all post holders affected by the restructure. There are two different employers with two sets of policies for managing change, redundancy and enhancing redundancy payments. A review of these policies suggests that they are broadly similar in terms of process but differ on the calculation of redundancy pay (Sedgemoor multiplies the statutory redundancy calculation by a factor of 3 and S. Somerset by 2.5)

The consultation document on the restructure should set out the process to be followed showing where either Council's procedure has been altered to accommodate the requirements of the other and the specific demands created by a joint exercise. The consultation period should be used to seek comments on the process and if possible obtain agreement with the recognised trade unions on it.

Issues below the Senior Management Restructure.

Employees transferring their employment to a partner council transfer under their current terms and conditions of employment under TUPE. This includes all the principle terms such as pay, leave, hours, location, continuous employment etc though it is possible to vary certain practices (following consultation) such as the date salaries are paid. Far greater detail on TUPE and how it may apply was provided and is available if required.

Trade Union recognition and Industrial Relations issues. Both Councils recognise Unison and GMB. In addition, Sedgemoor recognises Unite although currently it does not have any members in the Council. Under TUPE these recognition rights would continue including the recognition of Unite for any Sedgemoor members unless de-recognition is dealt with pre transfer in accordance with the statutory steps required to do this. Agreement would need to be reached with the local Unison and GMB branches to create new joint consultative and negotiating machinery that reflected one Council as the employer of all staff, e.g. setting up a new "JNC" type body. If the Councils retained separate identities as employers existing joint machinery would require revision to

determine when consultation and negotiation was undertaken at single council level and when it would be appropriate to deal with matters through a single body (e.g. harmonisation).

Local Authority Trading Companies. Establishing such a company and transferring employees into it generates a number of additional employment law and HR issues.

Challenges of combining or rationalising pay scales and terms and conditions
Level of ambition to integrate services and the importance of the job market. If the Intention is simply to share a management team and leave each Council's corporate plans and priorities and services largely independent of each other in the future then there is less pressure to rationalise or harmonise terms and conditions of employment.

If each Council is likely to have non-exclusive shared services (or already has them) with other partners this too might suggest less weight needs to be given to the requirement to harmonise. Careful consideration of these factors at the outset may lead to a decision not to proceed with the complex task of harmonising pay and conditions, or to proceed with harmonisation in only relatively few areas with a limited purpose in mind, for example encouraging shared values or rationalising travel allowances to avoid potentially inequitable discrepancies between officers.

If the intention is to follow a path of increasing service integration and create wherever possible joint corporate plans and priorities then the pressure for harmonisation will be stronger as service delivery is likely to benefit from creating "one workforce" where a significant proportion of staff work in joint roles and flexibility to support the partnership is required at all levels. This appears to be recognised in the Joint Leaders mandate.

Depending on the chosen route the phasing of changes may vary, however lack of harmonisation is likely to increase the challenge of building a new organisation culture.

Likely transition or severance costs to be considered.

The Public Sector Exit Payments Regulations 2016, when published, will need to be considered in relation to this senior management restructure as they are likely to apply to any notice of dismissal issued after 1st April 2016 and cap the total payment to any one officer at £95000.

Illustrative examples of redundancy payments using hypothetical ages and lengths of service using actual salaries and the enhanced redundancy payments applied by each Council are provided below. It has not been possible, without further information such as individual dates of birth and length of service, to provide a full list of individual estimates. These will be required from HR together with any associated pension strain costs that should be provided by the LGPS who will require adequate notice to prepare them. It would be wholly inappropriate to be specific with any estimates at this time which may be deemed as predetermination.

Approaches to savings and cost sharing in the partnership

Approaches to accruing savings between partners and sharing costs vary and are heavily determined by local circumstances. Key aspects to consider are listed below.

Investment. Are there any aspects of developing an effective partnership that require initial investment in order to achieve business benefits and savings in the future and how will the investment costs be apportioned? The potential areas for such investment could include;

- Programme management costs to implement projects related to partnership such as service integration plans, establishing a LATC etc
 - Technical and professional support to scope, plan and implement a joint ICT service and back office systems (including systems to promote agile and remote working capacity which may be increasingly necessary with a growing number of shared posts)
 - Professional and technical support for appraising options, planning and implementing the rationalisation of the two partners' physical assets (which may also have workforce implications)
 - Professional support for planning and implementing joint senior management structures
 - Professional support to develop a model for democratic decision making and the interface between councillors, communities and senior management
- The financial benefits for the partnership and each individual council could include;
- Sharing a Chief Executive and SMT
 - Achieving a joint ICT service and harmonising systems and procurement
 - Central support service efficiencies
 - Service transformation and integration
 - Sharing individual posts
 - Rationalising physical assets

The approach to apportioning projected savings would require resolution. The projected savings from any proposed new arrangement could be apportioned on a 50:50 basis or in relation to sharing specific posts below SMT this could be determined in a business case for each shared post reflecting the individual council priorities, demands, local demographics etc. that impact specifically on the work to be performed.

In implementing the new management structure there is potential for redundancy and pension strain costs; these could be apportioned equally in the event they are incurred.

Initial proposals for sharing costs and savings are provided in section 16 of this report.

Filling posts in a shared senior management team.

In order to create a shared senior management team (SMT) for the two Councils (assumed as a Chief Executive/Corporate Director/Head of Service model) the steps outlined in this section describe the process that would need to be followed once the Councils had decided whether the members of SMT were going to be employed by one

Council or retain their employment status with their current employer whilst working for the other partner. The Outline Timeline indicates that following the appointment of the joint Chief Executive (30th March 2016), the restructure of SMT will take place in two phases starting with Corporate Director appointments, followed by Heads of Service. The steps required are governed by the two Councils' own procedures relating to restructure, change and redundancy plus statutory requirements and case law where applicable. The key Council policies are:

- Sedgemoor Redundancy Policy
- Sedgemoor Promise (2014 update)
- S Somerset Redundancy and Severance Pay Policy and Procedures
- S Somerset Organisational Restructuring and Redeployment Policy

Given two Councils are involved regardless of whether SMT members are to be employed by one Council or two the process to be followed should be one that is seen as fair and reasonable.

In the event of redundancy arising from the restructure each Council should follow its own policy in relation to enhanced redundancy payments in respect of its employees to avoid potential challenge.

Appointment of a joint Chief Executive. South Somerset have a vacancy for this post and the intention is to make a joint appointment with Sedgemoor. This does not appear to trigger any change that could be considered a restructure although the position of the Sedgemoor Chief Executive would need to be considered if he was not appointed. The Councils would need to consider whether to advertise the role within the two Councils only in the first instance or advertise externally as well.

Appointment of Corporate Directors – key steps

- Produce draft job descriptions and person specifications together with proposed pay and terms and conditions of employment
- Determine who is in scope of the restructure for these posts and therefore ring fenced to apply for these positions; this would appear to be the two Strategic Directors at South Somerset and the three Corporate Directors at Sedgemoor. If there are to be 5 Corporate Directors in the new structure, then there appears to be no reduction in numbers. A careful review of the proposed Job Descriptions will be required to check whether any post holders have a right or case to be assimilated into one of the new roles without any selection process.

Appointment of Heads of Service –13 employees (Assistant Directors at S. Somerset and Group Managers at Sedgemoor) would be in scope of the exercise at 3rd tier. The exercise would follow similar steps to those described above for Corporate Director posts with the additional point that at this level a reduction in the number of posts will also take place.

A decision will therefore be required whether to ring fence post by post or whether all those in scope at 3rd tier will be eligible to apply for any of the Heads of Service post and be considered accordingly as long as they demonstrate they meet the essential criteria in the person specification for a particular post (e.g. professional qualification). This can be determined once more detailed structure proposals and job descriptions have been drafted and should be a matter for inclusion in the consultation document.

Note: greater detail regarding the steps in each process is contained in the full advice document.

11. Terms and Conditions

As part of the development of the SSDC/SDC shared working business case a comparison of Terms and Conditions between both authorities has been prepared. While there are no plans at all to change terms and conditions at this stage, this work seeks to understand whether there are any synergies or any major differences between the councils. This will provide early information for any future work that may be brought forward should the shared business case be agreed to bring part or all of the workforces together. The colour coding within the table gives a clear indication where there are any similarities and disparities.

There are many examples of different approaches to aligning terms and conditions in councils that have come together. Some have aligned terms and conditions, some run two sets of terms and conditions alongside each other and others have a mixed approach.

Any future plans to develop shared service teams will need to carry out research on what arrangements have worked well elsewhere before embarking on a project to harmonise terms and conditions. Clearly staff and the unions will need to be engaged in this process at that time.

The final business case will need to make a more detailed assessment of the financial impact of addressing any disparities when bringing the joint workforce together.

Comparison included at Appendix C

12. Assets

As outlined in the scoping chapter of this paper no consideration has been given to the potential to make savings from asset rationalisation. If either partner chooses to dispose of assets specific to local service provision e.g. a theatre then the receipt accruing and consequent saving will accrue to that partner only.

On the basis that each partner is committed to retaining its sovereignty and at least in the medium term would not be willing to close either of the main administrative offices in either Yeovil or Bridgwater there has been no saving assumed from such changes. However if as a result of the partnership additional rental revenue could be achieved as the workforce reduces and space comes available this would be split on an appropriate basis dependent upon the cause.

13. ICT

The South Somerset and Sedgemoor District Council ICT Managers have compared their authorities ICT systems and technologies, assessed differences and estimated costs associated with integrating disparate systems into one for joint working.

Essentially there are two main costs associated with integrating systems namely 1) Consultancy and 2) Training. Consultancy being the bought in expertise to design and migrate the data from one system to another. A key element in the decision making process as to which system would be preferred would involve a number of stake holders including the respective ICT Managers, the service managers that use the systems and the suppliers. This process would be lengthy and the required information would not be available within the required time scale.

Consequently the estimates have been a desktop exercise based on previous experience and without consideration of which system would prevail and can only be considered to be outline budgetary estimates at this stage.

There are numerous systems and technologies that would be addressed in the fullness of time, however in the short term key systems that are either public facing or have higher revenue costs have been identified below:-

Ref	Headline	SSDC System Name	SDC System Name	Estimated Migration Cost ^{*1}	System Match
1	Building Control Case Management and GIS	Uniform	Acolaid	£82,500	No
2	Contact Centre Management	Mitel	Macfarlane	£52,500	No
26	Content Management System	Umbraco	ICM	£100,000	No
3	Customer Relationship Management	Indigo	FrontOffice	£100,000	No
4	EDM Including Some Web Services	Civica EDM W2	Trim	£162,500	No
6	Environmental Protection and Pest Control	APP	APP	£37,500	Yes
8	Finance Management System	Cedar e5	Financials	£148,000	No
9	Food and Safety	APP	APP	£25,000	Yes
12	Housing Standards and Home Aid	APP	APP	£22,500	Yes
13	HR/Payroll System	iTrent	Frontier (Chris21)	£72,500	No
14	Income Management	AIM (Axis Income Management)	Icon (Civica), Financials (Civica)	£163,750	No
17	LLPG	Idox	Symphony	£22,000	No

Ref	Headline	SSDC System Name	SDC System Name	Estimated Migration Cost ^{*1}	System Match
			iManage		
18	Mapping / GIS 1	Idox (Across various services)	MapExtreme	£125,000	No
21	Planning System	Uniform	Acolaid	£139,500	No
22	Revenues, Benefits and Council Tax	iWorld	SDC Revs and Bens	£302,500	No
25	Unified Communications	Lync	Lync	£41,500	Yes
			Total	£1,597,250	

^{*1}Figure includes external assistance with system migration from one to the other and staff retraining costs

Table 1: Estimated Migration Costs of Key or Public Facing Systems.

There will be additional costs to those identified above. One of the major expenditures required will be in the formation of a single ICT Infrastructure, which will be required to provide an effective ICT host and enable partnership/joined up working. Without a holistic ICT Infrastructure in place, effective partnership working will be difficult to deliver. Although detailed work has not been completed in this area, it is estimated, based on the number of current services/employees within each authority, and the current technology in use, an expenditure of around 350K will be required to configure and provide a secure link between each authority.

14. Procurement

Introduction

Procurements are important to both authorities and as such they each have a procurement specialist. Support is provided by legal in both authorities, but at a lesser degree within South Somerset. In South Somerset procurement sits within Finance and in Sedgemoor it sits within Legal and Democratic Services. While both have a different way of dealing with procurements, both ensure the requirements of EU legislation and the transparency code are met. South Somerset currently have a manual record of all contracts in place which service managers are required to add to and update and Sedgemoor District Council uses the Supplying the South West portal to advertise contracts and to publicise existing contracts. Low value contracts are added by services but any procurements that are over £25k are added by the procurement officer. South Somerset plan to join this portal in the New Year, 2016.

Current contract on contract databases

South Somerset currently have 649 contracts listed on their contracts database. Sedgemoor has 80 contracts on the portal database. However Sedgemoor only include contracts with a value of over £5k. If the contract database for South Somerset was to only include contracts over £5k there would be 287 listed.

In terms of value, South Somerset has 87 contracts over £25k; the Sedgemoor threshold for requiring formal tenders. Sedgemoor has 44 current contracts over £25k listed on the portal.

Both councils have clear guidelines set out in their contract procedure rules/contract standing orders which state the thresholds at which officers are required to seek tenders. For South Somerset the tender threshold is contracts over £50k for Sedgemoor this is contracts over £25k (this was previously over £30k but was revised downwards in the last version of CSOs to allow for the requirements of the 2015 EU procurement rules – once the new rules were released they stated £25k or otherwise if your CSOs stated differently as such South Somerset are at liberty to leave theirs at £50k).

Higher value procurements – over £100k specifically

Contracts with a high value (over £100k) are the most likely to achieve economies of scale. Current high value contracts at South Somerset include energy suppliers, building contractors and engineering companies, agency/recruitment, insurance and cleaning contractors. IT contracts also fall within this high value area.

Interestingly Sedgemoor has tendered for most of these items in the last few years and savings have been made in these areas. The table in appendix D contains details of current suppliers for these items and comments regarding potential savings:

Contracts due for renewal at SDC

Telecare monitoring services

Sedgemoor provide telecare services under contract to South Somerset and are due to retender for the equipment in the next few months. SSDC recently completed a competitive tender to provide Telecare services; this was won in open completion by SDC.

Weed spraying services in house for SSDC

Protective equipment

Park maintenance and inspections in house for SSDC

Consumables such as washing and cleaning supplies

These tenders have the capacity to be joint procurements but expenditure is relatively low so savings are potentially equally small.

SSDC Banking Contract.

SSDC has in the last 18 months also tendered its Banking services contract and obtained good savings from the process, not just in cashable savings but process savings as well.

SSDC has deployed the Government Purchasing card GPC, via Visa this has proven to be a very cost effective tool for low value purchasing allowing the removal of petty cash from the organisation. There are currently over 70 cards issued to staff.

Conclusion

There is the potential for tenders coming up for renewal to be carried out jointly. There may be potential for some savings although many of the goods and services are provided by local companies and this may increase costs if suppliers are being asked to travel out of their normal areas. *In any future strategy would need to consider the impact on the local economy if alternative procurement routes were followed.*

IT equipment and photocopiers are areas being considered by the IT services manager – the potential for savings in this area will be more fully explored in the IT section of this plan.

PROPOSALS

15. Senior Management

As part of the review of options for potential partnership working the top three tiers of senior management have been reviewed. Clearly the senior structure could take a number of forms. For the purposes of modelling a shared chief executive has been assumed. Based on the estimates provided, a figure of £314,000 could be achieved by joining the two existing structures.

The initial structure allows for the inevitable work that will be required to deliver the transition while maintaining or improving current service delivery, ensuring resilience and with a view to ensuring both councils' have the ability to maintain and increase its voice regionally and nationally.

The proposals take account of a transition period to embed the full partnership. As such there is a two phase approach to the new management structure.

However at the end of an initial three year period it is estimated that further savings of approximately £250,000 could be achieved.

All figures quoted would be shared across the two partner authorities.

If this Business Case for joint management is agreed it is proposed that phase one of the joint management structure is implemented as soon as is practical.

The structure presented delivers a saving of £314k in phase one (SDC £183k and SSDC £131k), and a further £250K in phase two (SDC £150k and SSDC £100k). While this saving could be greater if the senior management were reduced further the proposed structure takes account of:

- The need for capacity during transition
- The significant impact of the Hinkley C development (SDC only)
- Additional work arising from the devolution agenda
- Aspirations to ensure both councils increase their voice on the regional and national stages.

It is also acknowledged that there will be an additional time commitment for the shared Chief Executive most prominently in the short term as the two organisations build stronger, more resilient and transformed operational structures, hence the further reduction in phase two. *The cost sharing proposals in section 8 reflect the short to medium term identified needs of the respective partners.*

It is proposed the new management structure would work as a fully integrated management team, with the Senior Leadership Team comprising the CEX, Directors, Monitoring Officer and Section 151 Officer. By so doing it is believed that the new combined management structure can:

- Deliver the savings required
- Maintain adequate leadership capacity and focus for priority projects
- Achieve a greater critical mass and capacity
- Ensure business as usual is not adversely impacted upon
- Strengthen the council's impact and voice regionally and nationally
- Support the transformation agenda

Clearly members could choose to reduce senior management further but to do so would impact on the ability to achieve the aspirations set out in the mandate and approved by each council in October 2015.

By bringing the senior management structure together early in the process this will provide the stability and direction to drive through the shared service agenda in the rest of the councils' structures.

16. Cost & Saving Sharing Principles

In developing the Business Case the focus has been on identifying savings that can be delivered as a specific result of the partnering arrangement. It is acknowledged that savings can be made by either partner on their own and these savings are reflected in the respective sole business cases.

Section 8 of this Business Case provides details of those areas that were deemed out of scope for the financial modelling in this case and why.

Early discussions within the officer and members working groups identified key areas of operation from which savings could be drawn. In short these were

- a. Shared Senior and Middle Management
- b. Shared Services
- c. Transformation

Shared Senior and Middle Management – both Council’s structures were reviewed and a revised joint structure developed. This revised structure covered the top three tiers of the organisation and sought to deliver circa £500,000. The bases for sharing these savings are presented as Chief Executive 50/50, Directors SDC 60/ SSDC 40 and third tier SDC 50/SSDC 50. The detailed figures are provided in section 16 of this Business Case and show a saving at this level of £314k per annum in phase one.

The Joint Leaders’ Advisory Group felt that and detailed structural changes beyond the top three tiers of the organisation should be developed by the new third tier once in place. As such the savings therefrom are contained within the wider “Shared Service” savings.

The basis for estimating savings for the all tiers below the third tier was based on desk top research from other partnerships, learning from other joint working arrangements and an assessment of staffing levels within the two partner councils. For the purposes of this Business Case a 12% saving from salaries has been applied. With the time available it was not possible to disaggregate the full budgets and make a meaningful assessment of savings achievable. For the purposes of modelling for this paper, a saving of 12% had been applied which would deliver £1.78m across the two councils, £700k for SDC and £1.08m for SSDC, once fully implemented. This figure does not make reductions from those service areas which have been deemed “out of scope” and as such not materially impacted, in the short term, by any forthcoming partnership arrangement. For the purposes of assessing the relative financial benefit to each partner a % of 50/50 has been modelled.

Note: this split may vary depending on the level of service each partner provides now or chooses to provide in the future.

Savings made as a direct result of one of the partner councils ceasing to deliver a service or facility will accrue entirely to that council.

The same process would apply to costs arising in effecting any changes.

Transformation – the process of transformation i.e. service / process redesign can also generate material savings. A proportion of these savings will come from the ability to reduce staff numbers. As such it is important to avoid double counting. Within this Business Case a figures on an additional 5% have been modelled in for the additional transformation savings over and above the salary savings. This results in a total % saving on salaries of circa 17%.

Details of potential transition costs are provided in section 9 of this report. ***These costs would be split on a basis to be determined.***

17. Income Generation

During the development of the Business Case both councils have confirmed their commitment to generating additional income to offset costs and thus reduce their net budgets. With grant funding reducing and increased pressure on cost reduction and the maintenance of service provision both wish to explore how additional income could be attracted into the councils.

Many local authorities are exploring the opportunities afforded by the establishment of trading companies to enable wider trading across a range of services.

18. Summary Figures

The table below provides a summary of the estimated savings and the transition costs that are anticipated to achieve these. They have been modelled over a five year period to allow for a lead in time to move from one structure to another and reflect the transitional arrangements with regard to travel, training etc. that are likely to occur.

	Year 1 £	Year 2 £	Year 3 £	Year 4 £	Year 5 £
Senior Management Savings	157,000	314,000	439,000	564,000	564,000
Other Staff Savings	445,000	1,335,000	1,780,000	1,780,000	1,780,000
ICT	-	-	-	-	-
Procurement	-	-	-	-	-
Income	50,000	100,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Total Saving / Additional Income	652,000	1,749,000	2,369,000	2,494,000	2,494,000
Transition Costs					
Severance	1,450,000	1,600,000	280,000	-	-
Structural Realignment	100,000	150,000	-	-	-
ICT	-	-	-	-	-
Programme Management	100,000	100,000	50,000	-	-
Travel	50,000	50,000	25,000	-	-
Training	25,000	50,000	-	-	-
Total Costs	1,725,000	1,950,000	355,000	-	-
NET (SAVING)/COST	1,073,000	201,000	(2,014,000)	(2,494,000)	(2,494,000)

The expected savings overall starting from year 4 would be £1.4 million to SSDC and £1.1 million to SDC. The expected costs would be £2.0 million for SDC and £2.0 million for SSDC. The savings of 12% would be made from reducing duplication and reducing the overall cost envelope for the services in scope.

19. Resilience

As reflected in the mandate for this business case increasing the resilience for both sovereign councils is important. Over recent years, as funding and workforces have been reduced local authorities have increasingly struggled to attract staff and provide the same kind of career structures that they once had. In spite of that individual councils are still required to ensure that a range of specialist professional knowledge is available within their staffing structures. This often comes at a cost which could potentially be avoided as councils retain their own officers when in reality they only need a proportion of a full time post.

By increasing the overall size of the joint workforce by combining the two there are inevitably opportunities to:

- Attract applicant for posts in a larger organisation
- Offer greater potential for career progression
- Share specialist posts / expertise
- Learn form and share best practice
- Re-deploy staff in times of priority or crisis.

By creating greater capacity within a shared workforce this has the potential to avoid buying in external cover or expertise at times of vacancy or for specific projects.

Both councils would of course remain as separate sovereign bodies the accounts would remain entirely separate and therefore there is not the potential to cross subsidise and therefore resilience in financial terms is not increased. By coming together however the very opportunity to drive out costs does support a more resilient operational entity as central government funding is further reduced.

20. Stronger Voice

As part of the business case development, Sedgemoor and South Somerset District Councils have been exploring how they might increase national and regional influence by closer working. Having shared management and shared teams does not necessarily bring a stronger voice, however close working together of the Leaders and the Joint Leaders Advisory Group will be helpful in developing a more influential voice and a clear message about a large geographical area of Somerset.

Time and again in recent years both SSDC and SDC have found themselves in the same place on major issues. The flooding response is the most recent. The Leaders have always enjoyed a strong and positive relationship and there is a common desire to work closer together to increase influence and resilience.

While the work on the business case has developed, significant changes have been seen on the national and regional stage. An example is Devolution where it is clear that both authorities need to focus on their input into discussions with Government ministers in the Spring, following by input into the more detailed plans that follow. It will be inevitable that working closely together (for example at themed discussions at JLAG) will bring a more holistic view and a more united front to local and national partners.

For both Authorities the need for a strong presence at any negotiating table is paramount and we intend to capitalise on the increased influence that would come from closer working or a Strategic Alliance. In the past few years we have shown that we are undoubtedly stronger together than we are individually.

21. Governance

Approach taken.

The current position is:

- A mandate has been agreed to establish a programme to bring together the workforce of the two authorities to increase the Joint Councils' resilience and influence across the South West and Nationally. The joint workforce to be delivered through a single organisational structure which delivers optimum savings and maximises income generation. The financial results of the programme to be illustrated in an outline business case and to be completed by 14 February 2016 (this Business Case).
- The Joint Leaders Advisory Group (JLAG) is a member group with delegated authority to continue negotiations. There is also additional support from the Local Government Association and the group is informed by learning from national and local examples.
- Working groups from both councils have the authority to develop the business cases and to compare with the solo business cases within each authority. Individual councils will make their own sovereign decisions on the joint business case.
- Involvement of Monitoring Officers and s151 officers in working group discussions ensures that the key issues are identified and addressed.
- Senior officers from both authorities have been involved in appropriate aspects of the business case development e.g. procurement and ICT.
- A Communications Strategy and Plan has ensured good communication throughout the development of the business cases.
- Involvement of Scrutiny at SSDC has helped to develop positive challenge to the process.
- Independent HR advice (dealt with in section 10) has been secured.
- The Business Case has clear financial apportionment (dealt with in section 16)
- Independent review of the business cases will be considered.
- Development of an Inter-Authority Agreement would be started once members have made their decision.
- Risks have been clearly outlined and quantified (dealt with in section 23)

Process for joint or individual decision making

Monitoring Officers from both councils have ensured that members have the confidence to make a decision in February. JLAG papers have been released throughout the development of the business case.

Monitoring Officers and JLAG have also consider the best and most practical way for making the decision in February with respect to the timings of Full Council in both authorities.

In terms of recommendations within the February Council reports Monitoring Officers and JLAG will consider:

- What further decisions may need to be taken by members?
- What potential governance opportunities might be available to us in the future?

- What delegations might be needed / would be acceptable?
- What documents would be needed apart from the business case?

Should members from both councils agree the joint business case, the following issues will be discussed and developed jointly and brought forward in the implementation plan.

Clear statement on sovereignty for both councils

The initial position is that:

- Members from both organisations are clear that they will remain as sovereign councils.
- A clear statement will be produced as to what this means, articulating that sovereign councils will be able to retain, reduce or enhance services that are priorities. In addition, there will be some services out of scope that will remain 100% (apart from senior management implications) the responsibility of one council.
- Other issues will be addressed and clarified in early discussions.

Governance work following any decision to work together

The ‘Member Deal’. What will it look and feel like for members?

- We will ensure that both sets of members understand that part of the trade-off against the savings from joint arrangements will be a change in their current relationship with staff and services? For example, senior managers will be working across two authorities and it may be necessary to streamline their attendance at council meetings.
- We will make suitable arrangements for both councils, ensuring that both are able to achieve new priorities and what the cost implications would be.
- We will clarify processes for CEO and Director level appointments in the future, for example via a Joint Appointments committee?
- Other governance points on the member/officer relationship in future will be clarified as more detailed discussions proceed.

Further work to be carried out should a decision be made to enter into a joint authority.

We will develop solutions for the following questions:

- How will the governance work in each authority?
- How will members of the sovereign councils retain confidence in the decision making during the implementation phases? Does having a shared Monitoring Officer and S151 compromise this confidence?
- How will conflicts be managed?
- Exit arrangements including outstanding liabilities etc.
- How will the exit arrangements be developed?
 - Where will break clauses be?
 - What would happen to joint managers and staff?
 - What penalties might ensue?

22. Equality issues

Stage 2 Equality Analysis

Impact	Low Impact	Lead Officer	SDC/SSDC
Date of EqA	05/02/16	EqA Review Date	01/04/16
Why are you completing the equality analysis? - Financial Savings			
What are the main purposes of the policy, strategy or service area?			
<p>The mandate for joint working as agreed by both Sedgemoor District Council (SDC) and South Somerset District Council, (SSDC) has been agreed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To establish a programme to bring together the workforce of the two authorities to increase the joint councils resilience and influence across the South West and nationally • The joint workforce to be delivered through a single organisational structure which delivers optimum savings and maximises income generation • The financial results of the programme to be illustrated in an online business case to be completed by 14 February 2016 			
Evidence			
<p>The Headline Business case has identified has identified the following sources of evidence:</p> <p>High level demographic data about the two districts Local evidence relating to Taunton Deane Borough Council and West Somerset Council shared services Local Government Association (LGA) compendium of shared services 2015 LGA Evaluation 2012 Anecdotal learning from site visits to shared councils Local learning from other County partnerships e.g. Somerset Waste Partnership (SWAP), South West Audit Partnership (SWAP) Research from shared councils nationally, including those arrangements that have not been as successful e.g. Richmondshire and Hambleton Employment models Terms and conditions Independent HR expertise who provided advice on a range of personnel issues ICT modelling Procurement review Draft Public Sector Exit Payments Regulations 2016 Risk Register for the Business Case</p>			
Supporting Documentation/Links			
<p>www.local.gov.uk/shared-services-map</p>			
Conclusion and potential impacts			
<p>Please note: In undertaking this Equality Analysis (EqA), the detailed background papers and evidence have not been seen or examined. The conclusions being drawn are based on the Headline Business Case only and the information provided within that document. There may</p>			

be wider impacts but these are unknown, based on the evidence seen.

The Business Case proposes a reduction in staff across the two authorities. This could impact upon particular groups such as women or those with caring responsibilities but until a clear decision is made then it is difficult to summarise in any greater detail.

It is possible that key, experienced and skilled staff will be lost and that could lead to a change in the structure of each organisation. There is the potential that the workforce representation by protected characteristics could alter.

The merged management structure proposals may have a direct effect on the Senior Managers and Directors at both authorities, who will be competing for a smaller number of posts. Responsibilities and accountabilities may change significantly through the management of teams across two organisations and gender representation may become an issue. If a new structure is implemented all staff in all Service areas may well be impacted in terms of the way that their Service area is managed.

The timescale of the implementation of the decision could lead to a period of uncertainty, with low staff morale. This could in theory, affect health and wellbeing, could lead to increased sickness levels and potential loss of staff from the employment of the two councils.

A number of options put forward within the business case could impact on the Terms and Conditions of employment for all staff, with some being disproportionately affected by any changes made. For example:

1. Young people could be being disadvantaged through the selection process as the costs associated with redundancy/early retirement may be less than they would be for older employees
2. The introduction of the Public Sector Exit Payment Regulations 2016, and the impact on older workers or workers with a long period of service
3. All characteristics could be impacted by harmonisation of salaries and job evaluation

As stated above the impacts identified are based on the information and evidence available through the business case. For a more in depth review of impacts against particular characteristics, further consultation will need to be undertaken with staff and Unions.

Moving forward, once a decision is made and subsequently policy and procedural changes start to be initiated, further EqAs will need to be undertaken to demonstrate due regard and compliance with The Equality Act 2010; this will ensure that no one group is affected more than another.

Please comment/explain how you will meet the General Equality Duty (GED)?

As the business case has been developed, staff briefings and awareness sessions have been undertaken and information and Frequently Asked Questions have been shared on internal websites for both authorities.

There have been regular updates to elected Members of each council and a Joint Leadership Team has met regularly to examine all aspects of the proposals.




SSDC have put the proposals before a Scrutiny Task and Finish Group for examination, debate and challenge .

Lead Officer Sign Off







Angela Farmer, Jo Morgan






Date 05/02/16







23. Risks



High  Medium  Low 
 15-25 9-14 1-8

Risk Register

Risk	Consequence	Probability	Impact	Score	Mitigation	Revised Score
Political / Reputational						
Breakdown in relationship /trust between leaders	Conflicting priorities and inability to agree way forward.	3	4	12	Ongoing regular contact, clear and agreed governance.	8 
Breakdown in relationship / trust between leaders and CEX	Chief Executive unable to take the transition forward leading to delays and frustrations.	3	5	15	Clear understanding of the mandate for transition, clear delegations, regular contact, update and review.	10 
Inadequate political support to drive it through	Timeframes likely to slip and targets will not be met.	3	5	15	Regular communication, consultation and engagement	10 
Conflicting member aspirations	Conflicting priorities and inability to agree way forward.	4	4	16	Agreement from outset in approval of the Business Case and programme plan.	8 
Fear of loss of control by each sovereign council	Increased tensions and inability to agree and make decisions	4	4	16	Re-affirmed in the business case and governance structures.	4 
Published savings not	Reputational damage and	3	5	15	Clear agreed estimates. Project	5 

delivered	MTFPs not balanced. Alternative savings will need to be found.				and programme management to ensure delivery.	
Operational						
Existing priorities delayed / impacted upon	Reputational damage / adverse impact on our communities	3	4	12	Ensure resources are made available for the partnership transition and not funded from ongoing service provision in the short term.	8 
Lack of control / poor programme management	Time and or cost overruns. Fall in staff morale. Failure to deliver.	4	5	20	Put necessary programme management in place supported by a realistic transition budget.	15 
Failure to take staff with us – low morale	Loss of key staff, lack of commitment to deliver	4	4	16	Regular updates, engagement and feedback. Positive engagement with the unions at a local and regional level. Ensure processes are fair and transparent.	12 
Distractions dealing with bringing two staff groups together	Reduction in service delivery, staff morale adversely impacted	4	4	16	Ensure resources are made available for the partnership transition and not funded from ongoing service provision in the short term.	12 
Risk losing key staff / skills	Loss of expertise and experience	3	4	12	Clear vision and timeframe. Delivery to target dates. Regular	8 

					communication, consultation and engagement.	
Inadequate resources during transition	Delays, mistakes made, lack of professional advice, lack of up-front investment	4	5	20	Ensure the business plan identifies the main / material resources required and the necessary budgets are approved. Prioritise work programme.	10 
Transformation changes delayed or not realised	Savings not realised, disenchantment across workforce, service performance falls	3	4	12	Approval of timeframe, allocation of resources, regular project and programme reporting and action.	8 
Failure to recognise and address equality issues	Challenge from either public and / or staff. Potential employment claims.	2	4	8	Any proposed changes will be subject for appropriate consultation and equalities assessments.	4 
Financial						
Projected savings over ambitious	Failure to achieve savings and meet targets	3	4	12	Internal and external challenge	8 
Saving double counted	Failure to achieve savings and meet targets. Loss of faith in the business case	3	4	12	Internal and external challenge	4 
Transition costs under estimated	Adverse impact on reserves and / or failure to achieve net	4	4	16	Be as clear as possible at the commencement of the project.	12 

	savings. Inability to invest in the necessary transition.				Ensure the range of transition costs are understood, pensions, terms and conditions, mileage etc. Funding will also be required for short term advice, expertise and strategic delivery.	
Contractual obligations and timeframes prevent joint procurement.	Savings frustrated and therefore not achieved.	4	4	16	Ensure contractual obligations are fully understood across the partnership and the estimated savings reflect the timescales.	12 
IT systems unable to be rationalised, combined early in the roll out.	Reduces ability to combine services and standardise processes. Reduces ability to savings.	4	4	16	Ensure the project plan and timeframes realistically reflect the potential for change and that savings are not over –ambitious.	12 

24. Concluding Comments

This headline business case sets out to provide both Councils with options on the way forward in terms of potential joint working.

The financial case illustrates potential savings, post transition, in the region of £2.5 million, to be shared between the two Authorities.

The joining/sharing of service delivery can be top down and/or bottom up and again it will be for both Councils to determine the right strategic approach, to achieve the desired strategic outcome. The options between bottom up and top down approach also permit the two authorities to pursue a strategic alliance.

It will be for the two Council to determine the right time for the proposed joint working to commence, with such timing being determined by the devolution agenda, optimum IT investment opportunity, cessation of contracts and having the right level of capacity to drive the agenda forward.

25. Appendices

Appendix A

Communications Plan

Date/Time	EVENT /MEETING	Communication Activity	Done by who	Done by when	Other notes/actions
2 & 6 Oct	SSDC member workshop on Joint Working				
15 Oct	SSDC Staff Awareness Session	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notes to be put on InSite Forum & Noticeboards. • Q&A to be shared with SDC. • Comms to attend all SAS and feedback on particular issues they pick up 	MH/MO SN/GM	22 Oct	
20 Oct	SSDC Full Council				Recommendation to go ahead with Joint working and Solo business cases
23 Oct	SDC Full Council				Recommendation to go ahead with Joint working and Solo business cases
29 Oct	SSDC Staff Awareness Session – Joint and Solo BC update	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notes to be put on InSite Forum & Noticeboards. • Q&A to be shared with SDC. • Comms to attend all SAS and feedback on particular issues they pick up 	MH/MO SN/GM	5 Nov	

Date/ Time	EVENT /MEETING	Communication Activity	Done by who	Done by when	Other notes/actions
Nov 2015					
3 Nov	SSDC Union Mtg	Union take their own notes			
3 Nov	SSDC Leader Working Group				
4 Nov	SDC Leader Working Group				
9 Nov	SSDC Staff Awareness Session – Joint and Solo BC update	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notes to be put on InSite Forum & Noticeboards. • Q&A to be shared with SDC. • Comms to attend all SAS and feedback on particular issues they pick up 	MH/MO SN/GM	17 Nov	
18 Nov 1000 hrs	SDC Executive Committee	Joint working not on agenda			
19 Nov 1300 - 1430	SSDC & SDC Joint Officer Group Meeting (Great Bow Wharf (GBW))	Action points taken by and shared within the Group			
19 Nov 1430 - 1700	SSDC & SDC Joint Leaders Advisory Group (GBW)	Notes taken and shared with this Group. Key messages agreed at the JLAG for sharing with staff and members Solo Business Case updates?	Angie Cox Claire, Martin, Mary	ASAP 20 Nov	Clerked by Angie Cox SSDC
19 Nov	SSDC CPT	Update on Business Cases from JLAG meeting	Sally	4 Dec	
	Team Brief (SSDC staff newsletter)	Update on Business Cases from JLAG meeting	Mary	20 Nov	

Date/ Time	EVENT /MEETING	Communication Activity	Done by who	Done by when	Other notes/actions
20 Nov 1400 – 1500	SDC Staff drop in session	Notes to be taken; Q & A recorded and shared with SSDC	Claire	20 Nov	
23 Nov	SSDC Union meeting	Union take their own notes			
24 Nov 1400 - 1600	SDC Leader Working Group	Action points taken	Claire F	25 Nov	
24 Nov 1700 - 1830	Joint meeting with SSDC/SDC Management Teams/Group Managers/Assistant Directors (GBW)	No formal notes taken; informal get together			
25 Nov 1000	SDC Executive Ctte	Not on the agenda			
26 Nov 1530-1630	SSDC and SDC Directors' meeting (GBW)	Action points taken and shared within Group			
26 Nov 1630 - 1830	SSDC & SDC Joint Officer Group Mtg (GBW)	Action points taken and shared within Group.			
26 Nov	SSDC Scrutiny Task and Finish Group meeting	Scrutiny Manager takes notes, shared within this group only			
27 Nov 1400 – 1500	SDC Staff drop in session	Notes to be taken; Q & A recorded and shared with SSDC	Paula	27 Nov	
27 Nov 1600	Update in Bits and Pieces for staff and members	Update (if any) – wording to be shared with SSDC for info	Claire	27 Nov	

Date/ Time	EVENT /MEETING	Communication Activity	Done by who	Done by when	Other notes/actions
December 2015					
1 Dec	SSDC Scrutiny Ctte	Verbal update			
1 Dec	SSDC Leader Working Group				
1 Dec 1030 – 1200	SDC Staff workshop	Notes taken and Q&A shared with SSDC	Allison Paula Claire	4 Dec	
1 Dec 1200	SDC specific meeting with Unions	To go through any concerns that were brought up from staff meeting	Claire Allison		
1 Dec	SSDC Union Meeting	Unions take their own notes			
2 Dec	SDC Executive Ctte				Cancelled
2 Dec 1030 – 1200	Member workshop	Notes taken and Q&A shared with SSDC	Allison Paula Claire	4 Dec	
4 Dec 1400 – 1500	SDC Staff drop in session	Notes to be taken; Q & A recorded and shared with SSDC	Paula	7 Dec	
4 Dec	SSDC Scrutiny Task and Finish Group meeting	Scrutiny Manager takes notes, shared within this group only			
7 Dec 1230 - 1400	SSDC & SDC Joint Officer Group Meeting (GBW)	Action points taken and shared within Group			

Date/ Time	EVENT /MEETING	Communication Activity	Done by who	Done by when	Other notes/actions
7 Dec 1400 - 1630	SSDC & SDC Joint Leaders Advisory Group (GBW)	Notes taken & shared with this Group Key messages agreed at the JLAG for sharing with staff and members - Bits and Pieces/InSite Solo Business Case update	Claire, Martin, Mary	ASAP 11 Dec	Clerked by Angie Cox SSDC
9 Dec	SDC Executive Ctte	Joint working not on the agenda			
10 Dec	SSDC Union Meeting	Unions take their own notes			
10 Dec	SSDC Scrutiny Task and Finish Group meeting	Scrutiny Manager takes notes, shared within this group only			
10 Dec 1400 -1630	SSDC/SDC Members - briefing from Matt Prosser, CEO, West Dorset/Weymouth and Portland/North Dorset	Invitation Johnson Studio, Octagon Theatre, Hendford, Yeovil BA20 1UX Parking: Petters Way Public Car Park, Petters Way, Yeovil BA20 1SH (adjacent to Octagon Theatre) Agenda: Shared Management	EmG/JG		
11 Dec 1400 – 1500	SDC Staff drop in session	Notes to be taken; Q & A recorded and shared with SSDC	Claire	7 Dec	
11 Dec 1600	Update in Bits and Pieces for staff and members	Update (if any) – wording to be shared with SSDC for info	Claire	11 Dec	
14 Dec	SSDC Staff Awareness Session	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update on Business Cases/JLAG meeting Notes to be put on InSite Forum & Noticeboards. 	RP,VS,RS MH/MO	22 Dec	

Date/ Time	EVENT /MEETING	Communication Activity	Done by who	Done by when	Other notes/actions
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q&A to be shared with SDC. • Comms to attend all SAS and feedback on particular issues they pick up 	SN/GM		
14 Dec 1500 – 1730 hrs	3T meeting Ground Floor Meeting Room, Town Hall, Langport		SN		
16 Dec 1430 – 1600	SDC Full Council Meeting	Update report to members (published 8 Dec) Reactive press release prepared in case of media queries (shared with SSDC)	Allison Claire		
17 Dec	SSDC Scrutiny Task and Finish Group meeting	Scrutiny Manager takes notes, shared within this group only			
17 Dec 1630 – 1730	SSDC & SDC Joint Officer Group Mtg (GBW)	Action points taken and shared within Group			
17 Dec	InForm (SSDC Member newsletter)	Update Members	MO		
17 Dec	SSDC Full Council	Verbal update on Business Cases			
21 Dec	SSDC Leader Working Group	Key messages agreed for sharing with staff and members			
21 Dec 1400 – 1530	SDC Leader Working Group	Action points taken	Claire F	22 Dec	
22 Dec 1400 hrs	SDC scheduled Union meeting				

Date/ Time	EVENT /MEETING	Communication Activity	Done by who	Done by when	Other notes/actions
January 2016					
5 Jan 1330 - 1500	SSDC & SDC Joint Officer Group (GBW)	Action points taken and shared within Group			
5 Jan 1500 - 1730	SSDC & SDC Joint Leaders Advisory Group (GBW) MEETING CANCELLED	Notes taken and shared with this Group Key messages agreed at the JLAG for sharing with staff and members – Bits and Pieces/InSite Solo Business Case updates	Claire, Martin, Mary	ASAP 8 Jan	Clerked by Angie Cox SSDC
5 Jan	SSDC Scrutiny	Verbal Update on Business Cases			
7 Jan 1500-1730	Joint meeting of senior members SSDC/SDC	Great Bow Wharf, Langport	Sally Paula		
8 Jan 1400 – 1500	SDC Staff drop in session	Notes to be taken; Q & A recorded and shared with SSDC	Claire	11 Jan	
8 Jan	SSDC Scrutiny Task and Finish Group meeting	Scrutiny Manager takes notes, shared within this group only			
8 Jan 1600	Update in Bits and Pieces for staff and members	Update (if any) – wording to be shared with SSDC for info	Claire	8 Jan	
11 Jan	SSDC Staff Awareness Session	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on Business Cases/JLAG meeting • Notes to be put on InSite Forum & Noticeboards. • Q&A to be shared with SDC. 	RP,VS,RS MH/MO SN/GM	19 Jan	

Date/ Time	EVENT /MEETING	Communication Activity	Done by who	Done by when	Other notes/actions
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comms to attend all SAS and feedback on particular issues they pick up 			
11 Jan	SSDC Union Mtg	Union take their own notes			
11 Jan	SSDC Leader Working Group				
13 Jan 1030 - 1200	SDC Leader Working Group	Action points taken	Claire F	14 Jan	
	Team Brief	Update on Business Cases	MO	29 Jan	
14 Jan 1500 - 1630	SSDC & SDC Joint Leaders Advisory Group Ground floor meeting room, Town Hall, Langport	Notes taken & shared with this Group Key messages agreed at the JLAG for sharing with staff and members - Bits and Pieces/InSite Solo Business Case update	Claire, Martin, Mary	ASAP 11 Dec	Clerked by Angie Cox SSDC
15 Jan 1400 – 1500	SDC Staff drop in session	Notes to be taken; Q & A recorded and shared with SSDC	Claire	15 Jan	
15 Jan	SSDC Scrutiny Task and Finish Group meeting	Scrutiny Manager takes notes, shared within this group only			
19 Jan	SSDC CPT	Notes to be taken and shared with this group	SN	29 Jan	
20 Jan 1000 - 1200	SDC Executive Ctte	Update report to members (published 12 Jan) Reactive press release prepared in case of media queries (shared with SSDC)	Allison Claire		

Date/ Time	EVENT /MEETING	Communication Activity	Done by who	Done by when	Other notes/actions
21 Jan	SSDC Full Council	Verbal update on Business Cases	RP		
21 Jan	InForm	Update Members	MO		
22 Jan 1400 – 1500	SDC Staff drop in session	Notes to be taken; Q & A recorded and shared with SSDC	Claire	25 Jan	
22 Jan	SSDC Scrutiny Task and Finish Group meeting	Scrutiny Manager takes notes, shared within this group only			
22 Jan 1600	Update in Bits and Pieces for staff and members	Update (if any) – wording to be shared with SSDC for info	Claire	22 Jan	
25 Jan 0930 - 1100	SSDC & SDC Joint Officer Group Mtg (GBW)	Action points taken and shared within Group			
28 Jan 1400 - 1630	SSDC & SDC Joint Leaders Advisory Group (GBW)	Action points taken and shared within Group Key messages agreed at the JLAG for sharing with staff and members - Bits and Pieces/InSite	Claire, Martin, Mary	ASAP 29 Jan	Clerked by Angie Cox SSDC
29 Jan 1400 – 1500	SDC Staff drop in session	Notes to be taken; Q & A recorded and shared with SSDC	Claire	29 Jan	
29 Jan	SSDC Scrutiny Task and Finish Group meeting	Scrutiny Manager takes notes, shared within this group only			
Feb 2016					
2 Feb		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update Comms Officers on JLAG meeting Advise staff through InSite 	MH,MO		

Date/ Time	EVENT /MEETING	Communication Activity	Done by who	Done by when	Other notes/actions
2 Feb 1430 - 1600	SSDC & SDC Joint Officer Group Mtg (GBW)	Action points taken and shared within Group			
TBC	SSDC Scrutiny Committee led Workshop for SSDC Members				
2 Feb	SSDC Scrutiny Ctte	Verbal update	RP		
3 Feb 1000 hrs	SDC Executive Ctte	Joint working not on the agenda			
3 Feb 1400 hrs	SDC scheduled Union meeting				
5 Feb	SSDC Scrutiny Task and Finish Group meeting	Scrutiny Manager takes notes, shared within this group only			
5 Feb 1400 – 1500	SDC Staff drop in session	Notes to be taken; Q & A recorded and shared with SSDC	Claire	5 Feb	
5 Feb 1600	Update in Bits and Pieces for staff and members	Update (if any) – wording to be shared with SSDC for info	Claire	5 Feb	
8 Feb 1530 - 1700	SSDC Leader Working Group				
10 Feb 1400 - 1530	SDC Leader Working Group	Action points taken	Claire F	11 Feb	
12 Feb	SSDC Scrutiny Task and Finish Group meeting	Scrutiny Manager takes notes, shared within this group only			

Date/ Time	EVENT /MEETING	Communication Activity	Done by who	Done by when	Other notes/actions
12 Feb 1330 - 1500	SSDC & SDC Joint Officer Group Mtg (GBW)	Action points taken and shared within Group			
12 Feb 1500 - 1730	SSDC & SDC Joint Leaders Advisory Group (GBW)	Notes taken and shared within Group Key messages agreed at the JLAG for sharing with staff and members - Bits and Pieces/InSite	KR VS,RS CF, MH,MO	ASAP 3 Feb	Clerked by Angie Cox SSDC
15 Feb		Prep of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint draft press releases • Member briefings • Staff briefings • Joint Key Messages/Press Statement • Clear 'what happens next' message 	MH, MO CF RP, DmG KR, VS, RS		
16 Feb	SSDC Staff Awareness Session	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on Business Cases/JLAG • Notes to be put on Insite Forum & Noticeboards. • Q&A to be shared with SDC. • Comms to attend all SAS and feedback on particular issues they pick up 	RP,VS,RS MH/MO SN/GM	23 Feb	
16 Feb	SSDC Union Mtg	Union take their own notes			
17 Feb	SSDC and SDC Full Council reports now public	Refine internal & external messages	MH, MO CF		RP, DmG KR, VS, RS To be available for press
19 Feb	SSDC Scrutiny Task and Finish	Scrutiny Manager takes notes, shared within this			

Date/ Time	EVENT /MEETING	Communication Activity	Done by who	Done by when	Other notes/actions
	Group meeting	group only			
24 Feb	SSDC Staff Awareness Session	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on BC Final Reports • Notes to be put on InSite Forum & Noticeboards. • Q&A to be shared with SDC. • Comms to attend all SAS and feedback on particular issues they pick up 	RP,VS,RS MH/MO SN/GM	4 March	
25 Feb	SSDC Full Council				Leaders to be available for comment for Press Interviews etc
26 Feb	SDC Full Council				Leaders to be available for comment for Press Interviews etc
26 Feb		All member briefing to circulate decision/business case	RP,DmG KR, VS, RS		
		All staff email decision/business case	RP,DmG KR, VS,RS		
		Write to MPs decision/business case	KR,RS,VS		
		Write to key partners	KR,RS,VS		
		Press Releases	MH, MO CF		

GLOSSARY:

BC	Business case
JLAG	Joint Leaders Advisory Group

SSDC	South Somerset District Council
RP	Ric Pallister, Leader
RS	Rina Singh, Strategic Director
VS	Vega Sturgess, Strategic Director
EmG	Emily McGuinness, Scrutiny Manager (job share)
JG	Joanna Gale, Scrutiny Manager (job share)
MH	Martin Hacker, Communications Officer
MO	Mary Ostler
SN	Sally Nash, Executive Asst/Leader PA
GM	Ginny May, PA, Strategic Director
CPT	Corporate Performance Team
SAS	Staff Awareness Session
3T	SSDC Management Team and SDC Group Managers

SDC	Sedgemoor District Council
DmG	Duncan McGinty, Leader
KR	Kerry Rickards, Chief Executive
CF	Claire Faun, Corporate Relations Manager

CONTACTS:

South Somerset DC, The Council Offices, Brympton Way, Yeovil, Somerset, BA20 2HT				
Name	Position	Email	Work phone	Mobile
Vega Sturgess	Interim CEO & Strategic Director	vega.sturgess@southsomerset.gov.uk	01935 462200	
Rina Singh	Interim CEO & Strategic Director	rina.singh@southsomerset.gov.uk	01935 462010	
Sally Nash	Executive Assistant and PA to Leader	sally.nash@southsomerset.gov.uk	01935 462101	
Ginny May	PA to Strategic Director	ginny.may@southsomerset.gov.uk	01935 462333	
Martin Hacker	Communications Officer (F/T)	martin.hacker@southsomerset.gov.uk	01935 462130	
Mary Ostler	Communications Officer (P/T)	mary.ostler@southsomerset.gov.uk	01935 462123	

SSDC Councillors:				
Ric Pallister	Leader of Council (LD)	ric.pallister@southsomerset.gov.uk	01935 462102	07708 466 722
Mrs Jo Roundell Greene	Deputy Leader (LD)	jo.roundellgreene@southsomerset.gov.uk	01460 77434	
Tim Inglefield	Leader (Cons)	tim.inglefield@southsomerset.gov.uk	01963 371656	
Dave Bulmer	Leader (Ind)	dave.bulmer@southsomerset.gov.uk	01460 67917	

Sedgemoor DC, Bridgwater House, King Square, Bridgwater, TA6 3AR				
Name	Position	Email	Work phone	Mobile
Kerry Rickards	Chief Executive	kerry.rickards@sedgemoor.gov.uk	01278 435423	
Claire Faun	Corporate Relations Manager	pressoffice@sedgemoor.gov.uk	01278 435320	07815 091748
Allison Griffin	Corporate Director	allison.griffin@sedgemoor.gov.uk	01278	
Paula Barber	CX Support	paula.barber@sedgemoor.gov.uk	01278 435274	
Jo Hutchins	Procurement Officer	Joanna.hutchins@sedgemoor.gov.uk	01278 435217	

Sedgemoor Councillors:				
Cllr Duncan McGinty	Leader	duncan.mcginity@sedgemoor.gov.uk	01278 723208	07802 709943
Cllr Dawn Hill	Deputy Leader	dawn.hill@sedgemoor.gov.uk		
Cllr Mick Lerry	Labour Group Leader	michael.lerry@sedgemoor.gov.uk		
Cllr Lorna Corke	UKIP Group Leader	lorna.corke@sedgemoor.gov.uk		

Pros/Cons/Risks/Opportunities related to the employment models

Model 1; Shared senior management team all employed by one of the partners – other staff employed by their existing Council.

<p>Pros</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential to avoid a lengthy and potentially expensive “harmonisation project” if different T&Cs maintained for all staff • Senior managers on identical T&Cs • Avoids complex TUPE exercise and risks associated with challenges by employees 	<p>Cons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harder to establish “one team” across the workforce • Senior managers having to take into account two sets of T&Cs in managing staff • Senior manager resistance if some T&Cs inferior • Staff supporting both councils doing a similar job but rewarded differently
<p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential cost and complexity of dealing with pension liabilities for those senior managers transferring employer 	<p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harmonising T&Cs across the Council still possible and to an extent required to foster joint working • To grow further service integration as partners require

Model 2; Shared senior management team together with other staff continuing to be employed by both partners on the basis of their existing employment.

<p>Pros</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Straightforward to implement • Consumes less organisational time on HR issues and transfer complexities • Easier to unpick and dissolve the partnership 	<p>Cons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harder to establish “one team” across the workforce and senior manager group • Senior managers having to take into account two sets of T&Cs in managing staff
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------


<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitates easier non-exclusive partnerships with other bodies by each council • Keeps options open as partnership develops • Avoids pension liability issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff supporting both councils doing a similar job but rewarded differently • Harder to establish shared values across the workforce
Risks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnership appearing to lack full commitment by the parties • Breeding silo thinking and processes 	Opportunities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To integrate staff further in the future based on how the partnership develops






Model 3; One of the Councils becoming the employer for all employees, with the employees of the other Council all transferring their contracts of employment under TUPE.






Pros <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One Team – “all in this together” • Expression of full commitment to & confidence in the partnership • Supports a fully shared and integrated HR&OD function • Supports joint workforce planning & development 	Cons <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complex TUPE process required to effect transfer • Continuing organisational time committed to implementing further harmonisation, or living with complexity of two sets of T&Cs • Employee fear and uncertainty about future T&Cs, what they will lose, gain etc • Concerns from members about loss of individual council sovereignty (although this is not be affected by a change in employer status)
Risks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Challenges to the TUPE process • Pension deficit liabilities • Difficult to disentangle if partnership splits 	Opportunities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To build and share common values • To build on the extensive employee communications and engagement required to effect transfer to build a new organisation culture





Comparative Staff Terms and Conditions







Appendix C









Type	Match Rate	Sedgemoor	South Somerset																																	
Annual Leave		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>Under 5 years' service</th> <th>5 years' service</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1 - 21</td> <td>21 + 2 extra statutory days</td> <td>+ 4 = 27</td> </tr> <tr> <td>22 - 28</td> <td>22 + 2 extra statutory days</td> <td>+ 4 = 28</td> </tr> <tr> <td>29 - 39</td> <td>24 + 2 extra statutory days</td> <td>+ 4 = 30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>40 or over</td> <td>27 + 2 extra statutory days</td> <td>+ 3 = 32</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Leave year runs from 1 January to 31 December</p> <p>Carry Over - 5 days maximum (pro rata for anyone working less than 5 days)</p> <p>For staff working less than 5 days a week the annual leave entitlement and Bank Holidays are prorated.</p>	Grade	Under 5 years' service	5 years' service	1 - 21	21 + 2 extra statutory days	+ 4 = 27	22 - 28	22 + 2 extra statutory days	+ 4 = 28	29 - 39	24 + 2 extra statutory days	+ 4 = 30	40 or over	27 + 2 extra statutory days	+ 3 = 32	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>SCP</th> <th>Under 5 years' service</th> <th>5 years' service</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>8 - 28</td> <td>21 + 2 extra statutory days</td> <td>+ 4 = 27</td> </tr> <tr> <td>29 - 39</td> <td>24 + 2 extra statutory days</td> <td>+ 3 = 29</td> </tr> <tr> <td>40 - 62</td> <td>27 + 2 extra statutory days</td> <td>+ 3 = 32</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Assistant Director</td> <td>30 + 2 extra statutory days</td> <td>+ 3 = 35</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Directors</td> <td>33 + 2 extra statutory</td> <td>= 35</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Leave year runs from employee start date</p> <p>Carry Over - 5 days maximum (pro rata for anyone working less than 5 days)</p> <p>For staff working less than 37 hours a week the annual leave entitlement and Bank Holidays are prorated.</p>	SCP	Under 5 years' service	5 years' service	8 - 28	21 + 2 extra statutory days	+ 4 = 27	29 - 39	24 + 2 extra statutory days	+ 3 = 29	40 - 62	27 + 2 extra statutory days	+ 3 = 32	Assistant Director	30 + 2 extra statutory days	+ 3 = 35	Directors	33 + 2 extra statutory	= 35
		Grade	Under 5 years' service	5 years' service																																
1 - 21	21 + 2 extra statutory days	+ 4 = 27																																		
22 - 28	22 + 2 extra statutory days	+ 4 = 28																																		
29 - 39	24 + 2 extra statutory days	+ 4 = 30																																		
40 or over	27 + 2 extra statutory days	+ 3 = 32																																		
SCP	Under 5 years' service	5 years' service																																		
8 - 28	21 + 2 extra statutory days	+ 4 = 27																																		
29 - 39	24 + 2 extra statutory days	+ 3 = 29																																		
40 - 62	27 + 2 extra statutory days	+ 3 = 32																																		
Assistant Director	30 + 2 extra statutory days	+ 3 = 35																																		
Directors	33 + 2 extra statutory	= 35																																		




Unpaid leave		Staff are able to request up to 30 days unpaid leave per year paid for over 12 months. This is a salary sacrifice scheme where employees request the leave by January each year or book for more than 1 leave year at a time.	We have a scheme where staff can request unpaid leave up to 30 days paid for over the year.
Annual leave - Christmas close down		No official Christmas shutdown. Offices closed only on the Bank Holiday days.	Offices close week between Christmas and New Year. Staff use 2 days statutory leave plus are required to make hours up for other day (or use flexi)
Change of work base		Standard statement of particulars state: Your main place of work will be at Sedgemoor District Council However, you may be required to work at any of the Authority's establishments. If the Authority requires you to transfer from your current place of work, full consultation will take place with yourself and any relevant trade unions. Previously have paid up to 2 years of travel expenses.	Changes possible within SSDC area but if enforced change of location Employees will be reimbursed the additional costs arising from a compulsory change in their permanent place of work. This can be claimed at the local Appendix E rate published at the time and after a letter confirming entitlement has been sent to the employee. The additional mileage will be calculated using the AA Routeplanner. The employee must be over £3 per week out of pocket to qualify and the claim period is limited to 4 years from the time of the change of location.
Probationary periods		6 months for all new employees and existing staff moving into new roles. Not applicable to TUPE staff	6 months for all new employees and existing staff moving into new roles. Not applicable to TUPE staff
Notice Period		<u>FROM THE EMPLOYER</u> Period of continuous employment 1 month or more but less than 4 years' = 4 weeks' notice. 4 years or more, but less than 12 years' service. = 1 additional week for each year of continuous employment.	<u>FROM THE EMPLOYER</u> Period of continuous employment 1 month or more but less than 4 years' = 4 weeks' notice. 4 years or more, but less than 12 years' service. = 1 additional week for each year of continuous employment.

		<p>More than 12 years' service = Not less than 12 weeks' notice.</p> <p><u>FROM THE EMPLOYEE</u> Below SCN 35 – 1 month SCP 36+ and above = 2 months</p>	<p>More than 12 years' service = Not less than 12 weeks' notice.</p> <p><u>FROM THE EMPLOYEE</u> Grade 1-5 - 4 weeks Grade 6 + = 8 weeks Directors = 3 months</p>
Sickness Absence Scheme		<p>National scheme used for pay.</p> <p>Self cert for 7 days, Fit note from 8th day onwards.</p> <p>Trigger Point – 4 episodes or a total of 12 days short term sickness absence within 12 months, or a noticeable pattern</p> <p>Long term sick trigger is normally 20 working days (FT), however this is on a case by case basis and is instant if stress related – OH referral at this point.</p>	<p>National scheme used for pay.</p> <p>Self cert for 7 days, Fit note from 8th day onwards.</p> <p>All absences Return to Work Interview</p> <p>Trigger points for formal meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Four separate absences during a 12 month rolling period - Absences resulting in a loss of 10 working days or more during a 12 month rolling period - Any recognised pattern of sickness absence eg. Monday / Friday absences
Annualised hours		<p>Employees in the Clean Surrounds team (grounds) work an informal annualised hours arrangement where they work additional hours in the summer season and 'bank' the hours to take off during the winter season.</p>	<p>Some employees in the Streetscene team (grounds) work a formal annualised hours arrangement where they work additional hours in the summer season and 'bank' the hours to take off during the winter season.</p>
Term Time Contracts		<p>Policy in place to allow term time working. 2 employees currently work on a term time contract.</p>	<p>Available by mutual agreement subject to operational considerations..</p>
JE/Pay protection		<p>NJC green book scheme based on NJC SCPs.</p> <p>Pay protection is currently 2 years – up to 2 grades lower</p>	<p>JE scheme = NJC green book scheme</p> <p>If one grade below then 2 years pay protection.</p>
Pay Bands / Salary Scales		<p>Scale points / salaries as per NJC.</p>	<p>Scale points / salaries as per NJC.</p>





		<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Band A SCN 11-13</td> <td>Band E SCN 24-27</td> <td>Band I SCN 40-43</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Band B SCN 14-16</td> <td>Band F SCN 28-31</td> <td>Band J SCN 44-47</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Band C SCN 17-19</td> <td>Band G SCN 32-35</td> <td>Band K SCN 48-51</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Band D SCN 20-23</td> <td>Band H SCN36-39</td> <td>Band L SCN 52-55</td> </tr> </table> <p>Group Managers = GM1-4, Directors = DIR01-05, Chief Exec = CEX04-06D</p>	Band A SCN 11-13	Band E SCN 24-27	Band I SCN 40-43	Band B SCN 14-16	Band F SCN 28-31	Band J SCN 44-47	Band C SCN 17-19	Band G SCN 32-35	Band K SCN 48-51	Band D SCN 20-23	Band H SCN36-39	Band L SCN 52-55	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Grade 1 SCN 11-12</td> <td>Grade 5 SCN 28-32</td> <td>Grade 9 SCN 48-52</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grade 2 SCN 13-17</td> <td>Grade 6 SCN 33-37</td> <td>Grade 10 SCN 53-57</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grade 3 SCN 18-22</td> <td>Grade 7 SCN 38-42</td> <td>Grade 11 SCN 58-62</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grade 4 SCN 23-27</td> <td>Grade 8 SCN 43-47</td> <td>Grade 12 SCN 63-67</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Grade 13 SCN 68-72</td> <td>Grade 14 SCN 73-77</td> </tr> </table> <p>Assistant Directors = Grade 12 or Grade 14</p> <p>Strategic Directors = SD scale</p>	Grade 1 SCN 11-12	Grade 5 SCN 28-32	Grade 9 SCN 48-52	Grade 2 SCN 13-17	Grade 6 SCN 33-37	Grade 10 SCN 53-57	Grade 3 SCN 18-22	Grade 7 SCN 38-42	Grade 11 SCN 58-62	Grade 4 SCN 23-27	Grade 8 SCN 43-47	Grade 12 SCN 63-67		Grade 13 SCN 68-72	Grade 14 SCN 73-77
Band A SCN 11-13	Band E SCN 24-27	Band I SCN 40-43																												
Band B SCN 14-16	Band F SCN 28-31	Band J SCN 44-47																												
Band C SCN 17-19	Band G SCN 32-35	Band K SCN 48-51																												
Band D SCN 20-23	Band H SCN36-39	Band L SCN 52-55																												
Grade 1 SCN 11-12	Grade 5 SCN 28-32	Grade 9 SCN 48-52																												
Grade 2 SCN 13-17	Grade 6 SCN 33-37	Grade 10 SCN 53-57																												
Grade 3 SCN 18-22	Grade 7 SCN 38-42	Grade 11 SCN 58-62																												
Grade 4 SCN 23-27	Grade 8 SCN 43-47	Grade 12 SCN 63-67																												
	Grade 13 SCN 68-72	Grade 14 SCN 73-77																												
Pay Awards		As per NJC.	As per NJC.																											
Maternity		National scheme used for maternity leave and pay.	National scheme used for maternity leave and pay.																											
Paternity		1 week full pay and 1 week SPP.	1 week full and 1 week SPP																											
Adoption leave		As per maternity leave	As per maternity leave																											







Parental leave		Parental Leave and Time off for Dependants as per legislation	Parental Leave and Time off for Dependants as per legislation																
Shared Parental leave		As per legislation. Enhanced maternity / adoption pay does not transfer to other parent.	As per legislation. Enhanced maternity / adoption pay does not transfer to other parent.																
Flexible working		As per legislation	As per legislation																
Home working		Policy in place. Work must be done on Council laptop and via 2FA log on. Employee's responsibility to provide broadband and any office equipment.	Ad hoc with agreement of line manager.																
Adverse Weather Policy		Working procedure in place. Staff with home working capability may work from home if they can't get to work by prior agreement (assuming no childcare is also required). Staff without home working capability or who are caring for children (i.e. due to school closure) must take annual leave, flexi or unpaid leave.	Working procedure in place. Staff with home working capability may work from home if they can't get to work by prior agreement (assuming no childcare is also required). Staff without home working capability or who are caring for children (i.e. due to school closure) must take annual leave, flexi or unpaid leave. CEO can make a discretionary decision should there become a safety issue with staff travelling.																
Subsistence		<p>Agreed locally, with the maximum rates payable:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="562 970 976 1326"> <tr> <td>Breakfast</td> <td>£5.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lunch</td> <td>£8.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dinner (London)</td> <td>£20.00 (Claimable if journey ends after 8.30pm)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dinner (outside London)</td> <td>£15.00 (Claimable if journey ends after 8.30pm)</td> </tr> </table> <p>Not payable out on site/normal business.</p>	Breakfast	£5.50	Lunch	£8.00	Dinner (London)	£20.00 (Claimable if journey ends after 8.30pm)	Dinner (outside London)	£15.00 (Claimable if journey ends after 8.30pm)	<p>Up to</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1330 970 1879 1238"> <tr> <td>Breakfast</td> <td>£5.42</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lunch</td> <td>£7.64</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tea</td> <td>£2.93 (Claimable after 6.30 pm to after 8 pm)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dinner</td> <td>£10 (Claimable after 8 pm)</td> </tr> </table> <p>Receipts must be provided</p> <p>Out of pocket expenses payable of £4.38 for nights away or</p>	Breakfast	£5.42	Lunch	£7.64	Tea	£2.93 (Claimable after 6.30 pm to after 8 pm)	Dinner	£10 (Claimable after 8 pm)
Breakfast	£5.50																		
Lunch	£8.00																		
Dinner (London)	£20.00 (Claimable if journey ends after 8.30pm)																		
Dinner (outside London)	£15.00 (Claimable if journey ends after 8.30pm)																		
Breakfast	£5.42																		
Lunch	£7.64																		
Tea	£2.93 (Claimable after 6.30 pm to after 8 pm)																		
Dinner	£10 (Claimable after 8 pm)																		






			£17.61 per week
Training – External Qualifications		<p>Employees who attend approved training have paid leave to attend the course.</p> <p>Course fees paid and other agreed expenses.</p> <p>Employees are entitled to paid leave to sit approved exams and leave may be granted for the purpose of final revision. Time equivalent to the exam.</p> <p>No loans for learning available.</p>	<p>Employees who attend approved training have paid leave to attend the course.</p> <p>Loans for Learning – an upfront loan of up to £7000 can be provided to support learning in cases where learning is desirable but not directly related to current role. For example to take a degree in a subject not related to current work. Loans are repayable over 3 years.</p>
Special leave		Compassionate Leave – up to 5 days paid leave (discretion of Manager)	Compassionate Leave – up to 5 days paid leave
Childcare vouchers		Busy Bees	Edenred Vouchers cease with introduction of new Govt. childcare scheme 2016/17
Eyeteests – VDU users only		Eyesight tests reimbursed up to the value of £19.50. If glasses are required specifically for VDU use SDC refund up to £50.	Full cost of eye test with receipt. Up to £50 if glasses required if specifically for VDU use and a VDU user or to upgrade if safety requirement.
First Aid		£17.28 per month for named First Aiders, training paid plus refresher training	£13 per month for named First Aiders. Training provided.
Leisure		No Scheme	None
Long service		Gift up to the value of £250 after 20 years' service.	Long service award 25 years - Gift or gifts to value of £200 or £200 cash but taxable
Occupational Health		Contract with OH Assist	Optima Health




Employee Assistance Programme		Counselling through Somerset Counselling Service	Independent Counsellor						
Professional Subs		SDC will reimburse employees the cost of membership of one professional institute, appropriate to the job role.	SSDC will reimburse employees the cost of membership of one professional institute, appropriate to the job role up to a maximum of £150.						
TOIL		<p>TOIL</p> <p>To qualify, it is for officers attending meetings outside of the flexi system (after 7pm). TOIL is claimed at flat rate regardless of when it's accrued.</p>	<p>TOIL</p> <p>Available in some services where no access to flexi- scheme.</p> <p>Also available for some out of hours working.</p> <p>Taken at flat rate.</p>						
Ad hoc overtime		<p>Overtime</p> <p>Monday to Saturday – Time and a half</p> <p>Sundays and Public and Extra Statutory Holidays – Double time (minimum two hours).</p> <p>(A full working week for full-time employees shall be worked by a part-time employee before these enhancements apply, unless they work a weekend then weekend rates apply).</p> <p>Employees paid at scale point 27 and above will not qualify for these enhancements. Additional time at flat rate is available for these officers.</p>	<p>Overtime</p> <p><u>2.1 Standard Payment Policy (Staff Graded up to SCP 28)</u></p> <p>For approved overtime, worked in excess of 30 minutes in any one day, full-time staff are paid in accordance with the Working Arrangements set out in Part 3, Section 2 of the National Agreement on Pay and Conditions of Service. For each hour of overtime worked, the payment rates are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1346 979 2085 1187"> <tr> <td>On any day Monday to Saturday</td> <td>1.5 times normal hourly rate</td> </tr> <tr> <td>On Sundays, Public & Extra Statutory Holidays</td> <td>2 times normal hourly rate</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>After 6 pm</i></td> <td>1.5 times normal hourly rate</td> </tr> </table> <p><u>2.2 Standard Payment Policy (Staff Graded SCP 29 and above)</u></p> <p>Officers graded SCP 29–33 will be eligible for overtime</p>	On any day Monday to Saturday	1.5 times normal hourly rate	On Sundays, Public & Extra Statutory Holidays	2 times normal hourly rate	<i>After 6 pm</i>	1.5 times normal hourly rate
On any day Monday to Saturday	1.5 times normal hourly rate								
On Sundays, Public & Extra Statutory Holidays	2 times normal hourly rate								
<i>After 6 pm</i>	1.5 times normal hourly rate								






			<p>payments at their 'normal hourly rate' for approved overtime worked in excess of 30 minutes in any day, irrespective of when the overtime is worked, except for Public Holidays, when either double time or x 1 plus day off in lieu will apply.</p> <p>Officers graded SCP 34-44 will not be eligible for overtime except for 'normal hourly rate' to attend planned evening meetings or overtime in connection with district and parish elections and for attending public and parish council meetings approved in advance by a Director.</p> <p>Officers graded SCP 45-47 can only claim overtime after attending 4 evening meetings in a month, after which rates at SCP 33-44 will apply except as stated below.</p> <p>Officers graded SCP 48 and above cannot claim overtime except in the circumstances immediately below.</p> <p>All officers. It is also recognised that additional hours working may be necessary in exceptional circumstances, e.g. call-outs, staff shortages and urgent work. In these instances a Service Manager can authorise the payment of overtime which is to be agreed in advance.</p> <p><u>4. Countryside</u></p> <p>Time off in lieu (equivalent to the number of additional hours worked) will be given for duties carried out outside of normal working hours, including weekends.</p> <p><u>5. Streetscene</u></p> <p>Overtime is payable if more than 37 hours have been worked in any one week (Monday to Sunday). If payable, overtime exceeding 30 minutes in any one day will be paid at a rate of time and a quarter on Monday to Saturday, time and a half on Sunday and double time on a Bank Holiday.</p>
--	--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------








			<p>6. Octagon Theatre</p> <p>Full-time employees work 161 hours per month. Any hours worked beyond this are paid at 1.5 times normal hourly rate. Public and extra Statutory Holidays are paid at 2 times 'normal hourly rate'.</p> <p>Part-time staff will be paid at their 'normal hourly rate' for any additional hours completed until they have worked 161 hours in the month; thereafter they are paid at 1.5 times normal hourly rate, or twice times normal rate for Public and extra Statutory Holidays.</p>
Premium rates – Shift Allowance		20% shift allowance for staff working nights.	None
Premium rates - Standby		<p>An ad hoc payment is paid to anyone responding to a call at a rate of £75.00 + a minimum 2 hrs at plain time.</p> <p>For staff on a rota a full week of £158.24 is paid where there is a reasonable expectation of attendance on site. £79.12 per week is paid where interruptions are expected but attendance on site is not required.</p>	<p>Variable across services.</p> <p>EH Rates Weekend £284.60 Bank Holiday £69.28</p> <p>ICT Rates Day £45.20 Bank Holiday £69.28</p>
Premium rates - Unsocial Hours Payments		N/a	Payable at Octagon between 2.5 % and 7.5%
Premium rates – Public/Bank Holidays		<p><u>Public holidays</u></p> <p>Employees required to work on a public and extra statutory holiday as part of their normal working week shall, in addition to the normal pay for that day, be paid at plain time rate for all hours worked within their normal working hours for that day, in</p>	<p><u>Public Holidays</u></p> <p><u>NJC rates</u> Employees required to work on a public and extra statutory holiday as part of their normal working week shall, in addition to the normal pay for that day, be paid at plain time rate for all hours worked within their normal working hours for that</p>

		<p>addition, at a later date, time off with pay shall be allowed as follows:</p> <p>Time worked less than half the normal working hours on that day Half Day</p> <p>Time worked more than half the normal working hours on that day Full Day</p> <p><u>Shift workers</u> Bank Holidays that fall on a rest day a proportioned amount of the bank holiday will be added to their annual leave.</p>	day, in addition, at a later date, time off with pay
Appraisal system		Appraisal Review underway	Internal annual appraisal scheme.
Market Supplements		Process in place. No market supplements paid at present.	Process in place. One market supplement paid at present.
Relocation for new starters		Policy currently under review.	Payments of up to £6500 can be made subject to certain criteria being met.
Redeployment / Pay protection		As contained within the redundancy policy. 2 years pay protection available up to 2 grades lower. Sedgemoor Promise applies to re-deployments.	If redeployed to one grade below then 2 years pay protection.
Redundancy (Pay)		3 x actual weekly pay	Statutory redundancy x 2.5 x actual weekly pay
Voluntary Redundancy		As contained in redundancy policy. No enhancements for voluntary redundancy. Payback period must be within 2 years for delegated approval.	Statutory redundancy x 2.5 x actual weekly pay

Retirement in the interests of efficiency		As contained in retirement policy. Decided on a case by case basis for employees over 55 where redundancy does not apply, the role has evolved to such an extent that the employee no longer has the required competence, the employee has failing health but doesn't meet ill health retirement criteria.	Statutory redundancy x 1 x actual weekly pay By mutual agreement between parties on a case by case basis where redundancy does not apply, the role has evolved to such an extent that the employee no longer has the required competence, the employee has failing health but doesn't meet ill health retirement criteria.
Retirement		No set retirement date, employees choose when they want to retire. Early retirement under age 60 is at employer discretion	No set retirement date, employees choose when they want to retire. Early retirement under age 60 is at employer discretion Retirement award
Pensions Discretions		As required under Local Government Pension Scheme Regulations 2013. Discretions apply in relation to granting additional pension to a member, making regular or lump sum APCs, pension benefit availability for over 55s who reduce their hour/grade, waiving actuarial reduction on flexible retirement or early retirement, rule of 85, extend 12 month period of separate previous LG service and determining rates of employees contributions.	Employer pension discretions approved by Full Council and made at local level. The discretions to be made by employer are set by regulations. Separate information on SSDC discretions will be provided.
Flexible Retirement		Policy in place for employees aged over 55s. Employer discretion to agree flexi retirement. Costs of actuarial reduction not paid by Council.	Policy in place for employees aged over 55s. Employer discretion to agree flexi retirement. Costs of actuarial reduction not paid by Council.
Flexitime		Runs in a 4-week period a credit balance of 16 hours and a debit balance of -8 hours can be carried forward into the next month. A maximum of 2 days or 4 half days may be taken as flexi leave in any 4-week period up to a maximum of 13 days per	Runs in a 4 week period a credit balance of 11.5 hrs A maximum of 1.5 days can be taken as flexi leave in any 4 day period.

		<p>year.</p> <p>Flexitime hours can only be credited for work undertaken between 7.30am and 7.00pm. Core hours are 10am – 12pm and 2pm – 3pm.</p> <p>Pro-rated for anyone not working five days per week.</p>	<p>Flexi time band hours are 8am to 6.30pm</p> <p>Core time is 9.30 am to 11.30 am and 2.30pm to 4 pm or 1.30pm to 3pm</p> <p>Generally pro rata for part-timers but not wholly the case.</p>																														
Attendance at evening meetings		Meetings that start after 7pm, officers can take TOIL.	After 6.30 pm usually TOIL																														
Cycle Saver Scheme		In line with Government Bike to Work Scheme, employees who use their bicycle to commute to work, can obtain a bicycle through this scheme and pay back a percentage of the cost over 12 months. At the end of the payback period employees may purchase the bicycle based on a professional valuation.	In line with Government Bike to Work Scheme, employees who use their bicycle to commute to work, can obtain a bicycle through this scheme and pay back a percentage of the cost over 12 months. At the end of the payback period employees may purchase the bicycle based on a professional valuation.																														
Travel claims		<p>Car Allowances as at April 2013</p> <p>Essential Users</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="562 900 1207 1326"> <tr> <td>CC</td> <td>451 - 999</td> <td>1000 - 1199</td> <td>1200-1450</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lump sum</td> <td>£846</td> <td>£963</td> <td>£1,239</td> </tr> <tr> <td>/ mile first 8,500</td> <td>36.9p</td> <td>40.9p</td> <td>50.5p</td> </tr> <tr> <td>/ mile after 8,500</td> <td>13.7p</td> <td>14.4</td> <td>16.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="4">Casual</td> </tr> </table>	CC	451 - 999	1000 - 1199	1200-1450	Lump sum	£846	£963	£1,239	/ mile first 8,500	36.9p	40.9p	50.5p	/ mile after 8,500	13.7p	14.4	16.4	Casual				<p>Car allowances at April 2015</p> <p>Essential users (over 1,000 miles per annum threshold)</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1330 916 1749 1342"> <tr> <td>Lump sum</td> <td>£1048.68</td> </tr> <tr> <td>/ mile first 9,996</td> <td>45p</td> </tr> <tr> <td>/ mile after 9,996</td> <td>25p</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">Casual</td> </tr> <tr> <td>/ mile first 9,996</td> <td>52.2p</td> </tr> </table>	Lump sum	£1048.68	/ mile first 9,996	45p	/ mile after 9,996	25p	Casual		/ mile first 9,996	52.2p
CC	451 - 999	1000 - 1199	1200-1450																														
Lump sum	£846	£963	£1,239																														
/ mile first 8,500	36.9p	40.9p	50.5p																														
/ mile after 8,500	13.7p	14.4	16.4																														
Casual																																	
Lump sum	£1048.68																																
/ mile first 9,996	45p																																
/ mile after 9,996	25p																																
Casual																																	
/ mile first 9,996	52.2p																																

		<table border="1"> <tr> <td>/ mile first 8,500</td> <td>46.9p</td> <td>52.2p</td> <td>65p</td> </tr> <tr> <td>/ mile after 8,500</td> <td>13.7p</td> <td>14.4p</td> <td>16.4p</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="4">Training mileage is paid at 36p per mile</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="4">Cycling mileage is paid at 20p per mile</td> </tr> </table>	/ mile first 8,500	46.9p	52.2p	65p	/ mile after 8,500	13.7p	14.4p	16.4p	Training mileage is paid at 36p per mile				Cycling mileage is paid at 20p per mile				<table border="1"> <tr> <td>/ mile after 9,996</td> <td>25p</td> </tr> </table> <p>Courses and seminars up to 150 miles 45p then 25p per mile Professional training (with 3 or more sessions) 25p per mile Cycle mileage 26p per mile Motor cycle lump sum £423 and 24p per mile</p>	/ mile after 9,996	25p
/ mile first 8,500	46.9p	52.2p	65p																		
/ mile after 8,500	13.7p	14.4p	16.4p																		
Training mileage is paid at 36p per mile																					
Cycling mileage is paid at 20p per mile																					
/ mile after 9,996	25p																				
Car loans		The Council may provide a loan to purchase either a second hand or new car at beneficial rates of interest 4.5% to employees who occupy a post designated "Essential User".	Interest free loan up to £10,000 for Essential Users to purchase a vehicle																		
Car Parking		<p>A parking permit can be purchased for the rear of Bridgwater House (at all times), Northgate (between the hours of 9am - 6pm, from Mon – Fri) and Mount Street long stay car park (hours as per Northgate).</p> <p>Essential users and staff (either Full time or Part time) that earn less than SCN 24 = £11 a month</p> <p>Staff that earn SCN 24 or above = £22 a month</p>	Free on-site parking across all sites.																		
Car Leasing and cash alternatives		N/a	None																		
Pool cars		There is a pool car available for staff to book. Priority is given to casual users.	None																		
Pay date		25th of each month, unless it falls on a bank holiday or weekend, then it will be paid the working day before.	20th of each month, unless it falls on a bank holiday or weekend, then it will be paid the working day before.																		

Trade Union Agreements		Facilities agreement in place	Office space and phone provided.
Health Scheme Cash Plan		No scheme	BHSF scheme offered at no cost to SSDC
Refreshments		Canteen on main site – no subsidy.	Canteen on main site – no subsidy.
Salary Sacrifice		Currently only Childcare Vouchers, Cycle to Work and Unpaid leave. Currently under review.	Childcare Vouchers, Cycle to Work scheme.
Leisure Benefits / discounts		Corporate membership discounts offered at 1610, Trimwise, Exchange, Kings Fitness and Leisure and Tone Leisure.	Some local leisure discounts. Discounts at some local offered at local stores.
HR and payroll system		Chris 21. Currently use hfx flexi system (clocking in and out and leave) but contract ends in December 15. Work underway to install HR21 as an additional feature	i Trent supplied by Midland HR
Union Recognition		We currently recognise UNISON and GMB for the purposes of consultation. We have previously also recognised UNITE but currently don't have any members. There is a 6 weekly Union update meeting held with HR, Chief Exec and Leader.	Unison and GMB. 6 weekly updates with CEO & HR Manager