

**Subject: Pioneer Somerset – Update Report**

**Report By: The Leaders of the 6 councils**

**Date: 14<sup>th</sup> November 2008**

## **1.0 Purpose of the Report**

- 1.1 To report to the 6 councils the progress made to date on the development of the Pioneer Somerset Programme, this being a programme of work, supported by RIEP (Regional Improvement and Efficiency Programme), formerly LIFT South West, designed to radically transform and enhance the system of multi-tiered local government across the County.
- 1.2 To report the progress of the programme to date against the original PID (Project Initiation Document) – see Appendix A. The PID was agreed by the 6 councils over the May to June 2008 period.
- 1.3 To agree the way forward for Phase 2 of the project, including proposals for the various work streams, programme management and governance arrangements.

## **2.0 Background**

- 2.1 Pioneer Somerset is a programme of work being undertaken by partner authorities to deliver a range of outcomes as detailed in 2.3 below. The principal local authority partners are:
  - Mendip District Council
  - Sedgemoor District Council
  - Somerset County Council
  - South Somerset District Council
  - Taunton Deane Borough Council
  - West Somerset Council
- 2.2 Members across each of the partner authorities received an initial report in May 2008 seeking approval to move forward with Phase 1 of the programme, which it was estimated would run for approximately one year. The original PID estimated an end to Phase 1 during November 2008. This report updates the 6 councils on progress at the end of the Phase 1 period.
- 2.3 The aim of phase one as previously agreed by each authority was :-
  - *To deliver (by end November 2008) a comprehensive action plan for consideration by the Pioneer Somerset Board and each individual Council.*
  - *The action plan will clearly establish the measures that will need to be undertaken to deliver the agreed vision, supporting principles and outcomes set out in Section 2 of the PID.*
  - *A series of further Project Initiation Documents will be appended to the action plan, with further bids for RIEP (LIFT SW) funding as appropriate*

- 2.4 The following outcomes have been agreed by each authority and are reflected in the original PID. These outcomes are challenging, and set out clearly the benefits to be realised from enhanced two-tier working in Somerset. The 'base year' for these outcomes will be 2006/07, unless specified otherwise.

#### **Outcome 1 – Efficiency**

*To achieve annual revenue savings arising from enhanced two-tier working of £20m, by 2012/13 (Base year: 2007/08).*

#### **Outcome 2 - Customer satisfaction**

*For every principal local authority in Somerset to achieve levels of overall resident satisfaction in the National top quartile, by 2013.*

#### **Outcome 3 – Reputation and Partnership Working**

*To achieve a marked improvement in the perception, reputation and recognition of Somerset and each of its local authorities, including positive direction of travel and use of resources ratings in the new Comprehensive Area Assessment of level 3 or above, by 2013.*

- 2.5 The outcomes outlined above are supported by the following *underlying principles* as developed jointly by the Leaders of the partner authorities in December 2007.

- To work together effectively
- To reduce costs
- To increase value for money
- To establish governance arrangements when working in partnership
- To devolve service delivery to the most local level possible.

### **3.0 Programme Update**

- 3.1 As outlined in the original report, the Pioneer programme of work comprises a number of workstreams, nine in all. Updates for each of these are provided in summary at **Appendix B** and summarised in **Table 1**. This report provides an update on all nine workstreams, explores the interconnectivity between each and proposes how they can be rephased, where appropriate, to ensure effective delivery.

- 3.2 By way of an overview of progress, there is no doubt that the Pioneer Somerset Programme has stimulated a huge amount of joint debate and activity between the 6 councils that would not otherwise have happened. This has enabled the 6 councils to build on the established track record of joint working. However, what is most apparent over the May to November period has been that much of the progress that has been made has been unstructured and has fallen outside of the programme plan outlined in the PID. Progress has been made on the back of initiative shown often by individual members and officers stimulating debate and this should be welcomed. However, the conclusion of the Leaders Group is that the Pioneer Somerset Programme now needs to embrace this unstructured activity, ensure that the benefits are being recognized, tracked, and spread where appropriate across the 6 councils. Therefore a more structured approach to bringing the overall Pioneer Somerset programme back on track is now necessary. This is provided for by the recommendations in this report in support of revised programme governance and

management arrangements and proposals to prioritise actions under the programme. To give more direction to Pioneer Somerset, the Leaders Group would like all six councils to add to the programme's vision reference to an ultimate ambition omitted from the original words in the PID. This is covered by the recommendation at para 3.3 below.

**3.3 *Recommendation 1 - Ambition: to strengthen the vision of Pioneer Somerset through the inclusion of reference to the ultimate ambition of the programme to 'deliver better services for all residents and communities of Somerset'.***

3.4 The result of the approach set out in paragraph 3.2 above therefore is that this report does not at this stage contain a comprehensive action plan as proposed earlier in paragraph 2.3. Also, the workstream PIDs are at an earlier stage of development that had been hoped for by this time.

3.5 The PID documents for each of the Pioneer workstreams as they stand at this stage of their development are attached as Appendix E.

**Table 1**

<b>Work stream</b>	<b>Lead</b>	<b>Key Outcomes From Project PID</b>	<b>Update</b>	<b>Proposed Next Steps</b>
<b>Strategic Leadership (Political)</b>	SSDC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vision for political leadership for Somerset that is aligned with the overall aims of the Pioneer Somerset project.</li> <li>• Options for political leadership put forward</li> <li>• Somerset Summit Board formally constituted and linked to each Council's own constitution</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft PID Aug 08</li> <li>• Baseline established: current political arrangements, costs appraisal</li> <li>• Best practice nationally researched and analysed</li> <li>• Options generated</li> <li>• Options paper presented to CEO/ Leaders 26 Sept 08</li> <li>• Joint Area Committees report approved atSSDC Full Council 30 Oct 08.</li> </ul>	<p>Although specific recommendations have been made within the completed report for this work stream, Outcomes from this workstream are likely to be taken forward incrementally as the programme matures. A significant pilot project establishing joint committees in the South Somerset area is now in place as the first major formal outcome and will be monitored closely to see how it might inform developments in other district areas.</p> <p>Informal activity under this workstream instigated by the Pioneer Somerset programme, ie joint meetings of county / district portfolio-holders will be regularised under the guidance of the Pioneer Somerset Board.</p>
<b>Strategic Leadership (Managerial)</b>	SDC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revised senior management arrangement to be proposed linked to a phased programme of shared service delivery by Nov 2008</li> <li>• Protocol agreed for inter-authority working and joint strategy development</li> <li>• Implementation of any changes in year 3</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft PID has been produced by SDC.</li> <li>• Discussions have been held between Leaders and CEXs within and between the partner authorities on a range of options for alternative structures.</li> <li>• Preferred options have</li> </ul>	<p>Further work to be undertaken when clarity on the shared service workstream achieved. Transition to any reduced and or shared management structures to be considered when more certainty on the programme overall has been reached. There remain significant political barriers to moving forward until the</p>

			<p>been identified.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No wider consultation has been undertaken</li> </ul>	<p>partnership has matured. However partner authorities are fully assessing the need to fill senior posts in the short term and where appropriate holding these open pending further agreement.</p>
<b>Enhanced Strategic Partnership Working</b>	SCC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delivery of integrated and streamlined arrangements for LSPs across Somerset. To be achieved by having a consistent and integrated approach to strategic planning, identifying community needs, prioritization, performance management of shared targets and outcomes and engaging with the community.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft PID completed August 08</li> <li>Desk top research completed – best practice nationally</li> <li>Reviewed statutory guidance, research papers, issue review documents from CLG</li> <li>Work commenced on Strategic Planning and Performance Framework for Somerset.</li> </ul>	<p>To develop proposals in discussion with a wider range of partners. Specific two tier issues to be referred to Pioneer Somerset to consider.</p>
<b>Service Devolution</b>	SSDC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establishment of current position with regard to devolution of District council services</li> <li>Opportunities for service devolution identified and costed</li> <li>Devolvement of services to most appropriate level agreed and implemented</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft PID completed August 08</li> <li>Devolution survey completed and sent out to Town/ Parish councils 18 Sept 08. Deadline for responses 12 Dec 08</li> </ul>	<p>This will depend on the outcomes of the devolution survey which will be reported back to the Pioneer Somerset Board for consideration.</p>
<b>Community Engagement and Empowerment</b>	SCC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Simple and consistent ways for residents and other stakeholders to engage and influence Council services</li> <li>Engagement designed around service users not organisations</li> <li>Improved decision making and scrutiny through better community engagement and empowerment</li> <li>Greater support for the the role of Councillors as community champions</li> <li>Evolution of local joined-up multi-agency</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft PID completed August 08</li> <li>Emphasis has been on discussions about improvements to sub-district arrangements. There have been specific developments in 4 of the 5 district areas including the agreement to establish Joint Area</li> </ul>	<p>As part of the proposed rephasing, to integrate as a cross cutting theme across all workstreams.</p> <p>Specific ‘community engagement’ initiatives such as informal arrangements already agreed with the district councils eg the Taunton Unparished Fund Panel will be monitored and evaluated</p>

		engagement and empowerment arrangements	Committees between the County Council and South Somerset District Council	with a view to see how they might inform developments in other district areas.
<b>Workforce Development</b>	SCC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify current workforce development gaps for each authority and conduct a cross authority Gap</li> <li>Identify workforce development pockets of good practice in each authority and consider how to maximize benefit</li> <li>Develop strategies and protocols that permit a more joined up approach and process to recruitment, progression and succession planning on an inter-organisational basis</li> <li>Develop an inter-organisational recruitment and redeployment protocol</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft PID completed August 08</li> <li>Meeting had been arranged with representatives of each council to discuss the PID and the suggestions put forward. The intention is to develop proposals through consensus</li> </ul>	As indicated the intention is to move forward through consensus. Progress is very much dependent on the level of aspiration that each council wishes to exercise concerning workforce development issues, as well as the impact that the other PIDs will have on the respective workforces.
<b>Customer Access</b>	TDBC	<p><b>Year 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Single customer access strategy in place – incorporating common standards for all customers (Nov 08).</li> <li>Pilot(s) of joined up approaches to customer access in place, to inform strategy development and implementation (Nov 08)</li> </ul> <p><b>Year 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One consistent approach to customer access embedded and being delivered in localities across Somerset.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft PID has been produced by TDBC. No consultation or exploration of this has taken place with other councils</li> </ul>	The Wellington based locally based needs service delivery pilot between SCC and TDBC will be explored to consider the potential for other areas of Somerset.
<b>Sector Led Support</b>	SCC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Embed arrangements for mutual aid, joint development and learning across all principal authorities by year three of the programme - 2011</li> <li>Bring all Somerset Councils up to the same high standards of performance, financial and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft PID completed August 08</li> <li>To date none of the project deliverables have been completed.</li> </ul>	Stage 1 involving the development of an options appraisal methodology will be complete by the end of November

		<p>resource mgt in their corporate governance and service delivery</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enable all partners to benefit from reduced costs, better value for money and improved service delivery.</li> <li>• To move beyond “best practice” to “next practice” and a national benchmark of innovation by 2013</li> </ul>		
<b>Shared Services</b>	MDC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreement of phased programme of shared service delivery (Nov 08)</li> <li>• Agreement of preferred service delivery options as part of Phase 1 (Nov 08)</li> <li>• ‘Quick wins’ identified and implemented (Nov 08)</li> <li>• District-district shared service options implemented (July 2011)</li> <li>• County-district shared service options – started to deliver (July 2011)</li> <li>• On target for efficiency savings outcome (July 2013)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft PID completed</li> <li>• Analysis of current shared services ‘activity’ within the County, and consideration of options.</li> <li>• Prioritisation matrix developed to ‘score’ shared services options.</li> <li>• Agreement that the priorities for shared service delivery are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Streetscene</li> <li>○ Regeneration / Major Applications</li> <li>○ Communications / Consultation</li> <li>○ ED / Tourism / Rural Development</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Housing</li> </ul>	Continue work on developing shared services on prioritised areas.

3.7 In terms of the current spend against the original spend profile predicted within the Pioneer PID, and therefore the funding allocation from RIEP (LIFT SW), this is currently below that predicted. There appear to be two primary reasons for this. Firstly, with the current Programme Manager vacancy, the allocated salary budget is not being utilized. And secondly, the original PID identified a significant sum to be utilised for 'Independent expert facilitation for Members and senior officers events'. To date this has not been fully used. The proposals in this paper will help to bring the spend profile back on track over the short / medium term.

### **3.8 Recommendation 2 – Workstreams:**

- *to note the progress of the workstreams, as identified in Table 1 and Appendix B,*
- *to note the further work necessary to progress the next steps*
- *to agree that the next phase of the programme should focus on the delivery of the agreed outcomes (para 2.4 above) and be taken forward in accordance with recommendation 6 for the re-phasing of the workstreams.*

## **4.0 Achievements to Date**

4.1 When considering the update as outlined in the **Table 1** above it is also important to capture the achievements that have been made to date, and these are summarised as follows:

- The 'sign off' of the Programme by all partner Councils. Despite the disruption of the previous twelve months all Council's responded positively to the aspirations of Pioneer Somerset and agreed the PID, not only in terms of its aspirations but also in committing significant resources from within each organisation. This is borne out by the organisational structure that has been put in place at a senior management level to support the programme.
- Regular Chief Executive, Leader, Deputy Leader and Director Meetings. Since the approval of the PID both senior managers and Councillors have met regularly to move forward and develop the detail of the PID.
- The innovative Somerset Summit saw the coming together of all Councillors, County and District, across the County for a joint conference on Pioneer Somerset. From this, greater joint working between portfolios of the partner authorities has been developed with a range of meetings and work streams developing from this. In particular joint county/district portfolio-holder meetings in the areas of Housing, Community Safety, Resources are happening regularly alongside groups such as the Economic Leaders Group.
- Development of a draft joint Communication Strategy for the Pioneer programme including the on-going development of a micro-site dedicated to internal communication of relevant information in relation to the programme. This site will give access to consistent information to all employees and Councillors in the partner authorities. Resources have also been agreed on a secondment basis to support the communications work.
- Sector led support provided by Somerset County Council and Sedgemoor District Council to West Somerset District Council in respect of s151 responsibilities and accountabilities.
- An innovative partnership between Somerset County Council and Mendip District Council for the provision of support around key corporate support services, including performance management, risk management, value for money and strategic asset management.



- A partnership between Mendip District Council and West Somerset District Council for the provision of legal services.
- Enhanced joined up local community engagement with a number of Districts working together with the county on local area boards, clusters and Parish groupings
- South Somerset District Council and Somerset County Council have agreed to establish Joint Area Committees at sub-district level undertaking a range of Council and executive decision-making responsibilities of both authorities. This exciting development is the first step in delivering a vision for that area of true multi-agency locally based decision-making and service delivery partnerships supported and influenced by local communities.
- A pilot series of local joint 'Council Question Time' events involving leading members of each Council
- Somerset local authorities are working to develop detailed proposals for a potential Somerset Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) Partnership. This would involve the creation of a new body to create a common notice processing and enforcement service. District Councils and the County Council would in effect purchase a patrol service and notice processing from the CPE Partnership. Recommendations will be brought back to each Council with details of the financial, resource and governance implications where approval will then be required to move forward with the delivery stage of the project.
- Exploration of East and West Building Control Partnerships: As far as the East of Somerset is concerned the principle of the partnership has been agreed by both South Somerset and Mendip District Councils' Management Boards and Portfolio Holders. Detailed work in relation to the set up and running costs of the partnership and HR issues will take place between January and March 2009 which should enable both Councils to make their final 'go/no go' decision in April 2009. Similar exploratory work is taking place with the district councils in the West of Somerset.
- Creation of more cost effective swimming provision - Building Schools for the Future – Sedgemoor District Council and the County Council are working closely together to achieve the benefits of the Building Schools for the Future projects. As part of this both parties are exploring the most cost effective way in which to provide joint wet and dry leisure provision including the construction of a new pool for the District. This project is designed to provide sustainable swimming provision with greatly reduced revenue costs in the future.
- Shared accommodation solutions: Somerset County Council and Sedgemoor District Council are currently exploring options to share office accommodation by releasing surplus assets and working more closely together. This seeks to both reduce the costs born by each authority and increase the degree of joint working between the tiers.
- Joint working on clean surrounds: Taunton Deane Borough Council and Sedgemoor District Council have been working together on a pilot project to deliver a joint street cleaning and horticultural service between the district and borough councils. This has involved sharing management, equipment and expertise to deliver the service at a reduced costs and higher quality. Both Council's are now considering the next steps from April 2009.
- A joint approach across the 6 councils to commission the Place Survey and its analysis.
- The establishment of Choice Based Lettings in the district councils' housing services. This involved not only establishing a shared IT system but also consistent lettings policies across the County.

### **Pioneer Somerset**

- Better for Residents, Better for Communities -

4.2 The achievements listed above provide an indication of the progress that has been made since the inception of the formal Pioneer programme. However these should be seen in the context and history of a number of county wide and sub-county service delivery partnerships that were already in place or evolving. Examples of some key partnerships are outlined below:-

- Southwest One – the joint venture company established by SCC, TDBC and the Avon & Somerset Police Authority with IBM to deliver a range of 'backroom' support services and business transformation under a 10 year contract.
- Somerset Waste Partnership (SWP) - Having gone live in 2007 the SWP is made up of all the local authorities in the county and it the first of its kind. The partnership has been successful in procuring a county-wide waste collection and recycling contract for the county securing both financial savings and service improvement. This partnership is an example of how all authorities can benefit from joint procurement while allowing a degree of flexibility in the level of service delivered by each of the individual partners. As a very significant partnership the SWP has been established as a Joint Committee with its own governance framework, just one of the options available for consideration for other services
- There is a history of good working relationships between the five Strategic Housing Authorities. Examples of joint working already include:-
  1. Joint Strategic Housing Market Assessment for two sub-regional Housing Market areas;
  2. Joint Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment;
  3. Joint posts hosted by various authorities – e.g. Research Post at Taunton Deane Borough Council; Choice Based Lettings co-ordination at SSDC;
  4. Platform provided for Supporting People Commissioning Board;
  5. Joint Housing Strategy Day;
  6. Joint responses to various consultation documents;
  7. Work on fuel poverty;
  8. WRT initiative – now involves 11 authorities;
  9. Developing countywide homeless and housing strategies

Most of the work is co-ordinated through countywide groups such as countywide private sector housing managers, countywide homeless and, chiefly, the Somerset Strategic Housing Officers Group. The Somerset Strategic Housing Officers Group in recent years has been joined by Portfolio Holders, who have now formed the Somerset Strategic Housing Partnership. Exploration of a joint Housing approach covering all 6 councils is on-going, following a recent IDeA review invited by the Somerset Strategic Housing Partnership. This has been augmented by a Delivery Workshop on Local Area Agreement targets (154 & 155), facilitated by the Audit Commission. There is a large area of agreement and commitment to work more closely together and further work with the IDeA is planned on outcomes and structures. Firm proposals should follow from this work.

- South West Audit Partnership – this is a partnership of all 6 councils for the delivery of internal audit inspections, advice and sharing of resources.

**4.3 *Recommendation 3 – Achievements: to note the update and instruct the Pioneer Somerset Directors Group to ensure that all of the achievements to date of Pioneer Somerset against the objectives are captured and publicised.***

## 5.0 Programme Management

- 5.1 Effective programme management is essential if the Pioneer programme is to be delivered effectively within the agreed timeframe and to ensure successful delivery of the agreed objectives of the programme. Following the early departure of the Programme Manager, appointed in July 2008, alternatives methods of programme management have been identified for consideration.
- 5.2 The Pioneer Programme of work is both demanding in its operational complexity and in its Political complexity and sensitivity. Added to this, any future programme manager will require significant senior management and Political skills and have the gravitas to be able to lead and deliver within the parameters of the PID.
- 5.3 **Table 2** below sets out a series of options which the Pioneer Somerset partners have considered in order to take the overall programme forward in a positive manner.
- 5.4 Options 1 to 4 below are based on the currently agreed Programme Initiation Document. Having considered these options the Leaders Group has decided to implement as a matter of urgency a variation of option 2 through to March 2009 through the commissioning of SOLACE Enterprises on a 2 day a week basis to fulfil the programme management role. Costs of this recruitment will be in the region of £28,500 to be funded from the RIEP monies provided for the programme. The intention beyond that is to implement option 4 for the secondment of a Chief Executive or Director for the future Programme Management arrangements. This will incur additional costs beyond the current budgetary provision and the 6 councils will have to consider the financial implications of this at the relevant time.
- 5.5 The priority tasks for SOLACE Enterprises will be to:-
- lead high level political / managerial discussions with individual councils to promote and communicate the achievements / potential of the Pioneer Somerset programme
  - ensure that the communications strategy for the programme is secure and operational
  - identify the key risks to the future delivery of the programme and appropriate mitigation measures
  - agree a target operating model for the identification/delivery of programme priorities
  - establish the remit of the seconded Chief Executive / Director
- 5.6 There are also other beneficial actions such as the bringing together of the relevant Directors from each authority to work together for two days a week in a Project Office, which could be combined with any of the options. The creation of this more structured team with administrative and project support should go some way to providing Pioneer Somerset with a firm base to move forward.
- 5.7 In addition to ensuring all workstreams are developed, this team would then be in a much stronger position to oversee and develop the substantial amount of partnership working (eg parking, regeneration and development control, Direct Labour Organisations). It is essential that this partnership working which is emerging and developing already within the County is recognised as being part of the Pioneer Somerset Programme. *As demonstrated elsewhere in the report, the formal programme has not maintained pace with activity on the ground.*
- 5.8 ***Recommendation 4 – Programme Management: to note the way forward agreed in respect of future programme management arrangements as set out in paras 5.4 and 5.5 above.***

**Table 2**

Advantages	Disadvantages	Financial Implications	Full Year Cost Estimate	Implications and consequences
<b>Option 1: Appointment of Programme Manager by advertisement against current specification</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Open and transparent process.</li> <li>• Should bring correct skill set.</li> <li>• Should bring independence.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of interest as demonstrated with last recruitment.</li> <li>• Lead time before commencement</li> <li>• Would need time to build relationships.</li> <li>• Unlikely to bring sufficient gravitas and political awareness required.</li> </ul>	Contained within financial provision.	£75,000	Considerable lead in times would impact on delivery of the work programme.
<b>Option 2: Appointment of Programme Manager against current specification through external agencies such as SOLACE, IDeA, Hay etc</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should bring correct skill set.</li> <li>• Should bring independence.</li> <li>• May bring sufficient gravitas and political awareness.</li> <li>• Shorter timescales than external advertisement.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential lack of interest from senior appointee with political awareness and gravitas, if the role remains fundamentally 'programme or project management'.</li> <li>• Would need time to build relationships.</li> <li>• Increased costs.</li> </ul>	Additional costs from agency appointment.	£138,000 based on daily rate of £750 for 4 days per week for 46 weeks	
<b>Option 3: Engagement of nationally recognised project lead and appointment of Programme Manager or Project Manager against amended specification</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would bring local credibility and credibility with agencies.</li> <li>• Demonstrate high level political and managerial commitment to Pioneer Somerset.</li> <li>• Experience and skills will assist with negotiations at right level.</li> <li>• Ability to challenge at highest level.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expensive</li> <li>• Unlikely to be full time.</li> <li>• Would require additional programme and/or project management support</li> <li>• Likely to be short term.</li> <li>• Lead in times could be lengthy.</li> </ul>	Potential for significant costs that would exceed budgets and are likely to fall to partner organisations	£120,000 based on annual contract of 60 days at £2000 per day.  £75,000 for Programme Manager support	Profile of Pioneer Somerset would be raised.

<b>Option 4: Secondment of existing Somerset Chief Executive or Director to deliver and programme manage Pioneer Somerset.</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would know the environment.</li> <li>• Political awareness.</li> <li>• Potential opportunity to demonstrate 'joint management' structure working.</li> <li>• Demonstrates commitment from partners to address programme with highest level support.</li> <li>• Support from fellow Chief Executives and Directors.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential concerns from other partners of independence of appointee.</li> <li>• Would require dedicated project management support</li> <li>• Detailed secondment arrangements would need to be agreed in advance which must also include remuneration and potentially (dependent upon circumstances) how ultimate potential pension impacts would</li> <li>• be handled.</li> </ul>	<p>Potential for significant costs that would exceed budgets but depending on skills set of appointee can be mitigated down.</p>	<p>In the region of £90,000 to £125,000 plus oncosts</p>	<p>Appointee would need to have detailed terms of reference and delegation to act on behalf of partners to develop Pioneer Somerset fully.</p> <p>The authority from where the secondee comes will need to either 'back fill' or seek to enter a 'joint management' arrangement. Pioneer Somerset Board responsibilities also need to be clarified if this arrangement is put in place.</p>

## 6.0 Programme Governance

6.1 Effective programme governance is essential for the managed delivery of the PID. This requires clear lines of delegation and authority. **Appendix C** to this report provides a proposed Governance Protocol for Members' consideration.

6.2 The protocol attached provides a framework within which decisions can be taken and progress made within the framework of this report. In agreeing to the content of the protocol each member authority should satisfy itself that it is comfortable with the proposed delegations and that these can be agreed within the context of its own communication and policy framework.

### 6.3 ***Recommendation 5 – Programme Governance: to approve the Governance Protocol attached as Appendix C.***

***Note: Somerset County Council adopted the Governance Protocol in advance of consideration of the main report at its meeting on 12<sup>th</sup> November 2008.***

## 7.0 Resource Requirements

7.1 Each PID provides an indication of the resources required to deliver the outputs from that work stream. These are summarised below firstly in terms of days per month (Table 3) and in the second table in terms of annual costs (Table 4).

**Table 3 – Days per Month**

<b>Workstream Days / Month</b>	<b>Lead Officers</b>	<b>Programme Team</b>	<b>Service Officers</b>	<b>Specialist Advice</b>	<b>Total</b>
Strategic Leadership (Political)	2.0 8.0	0.0	12.0	8.0	<b>30.0</b>
Strategic Leadership (Managerial)	2.0 2.5	1.0	15	Up to 1.5	<b>22</b>
Enhanced Strategic Partnership Working	0.5 2.0	1.0	9.0	2.0	<b>14.5</b>
Service Devolution	2.0 8.0	0.0	12.00	12.0	<b>34.0</b>
Community Engagement and Empowerment	0.5 2.0	1.0	GM 8 SO up to 4	Up to 2.0	<b>17.5</b>
Workforce Development	1.0 4.0	1.0	40.0	Up to 1.5	<b>47.5</b>
Customer Access	2.0 4.0	26.0	Up to 10.0	20 (for 4 months) 5 thereafter	<b>62.0 (max)</b>
Sector Led Support	1.0 4.0	1.0	13.0	2.0	<b>21.0</b>
Shared Services	2.0 8.0	26.0	12.0 SO up to 30.0	Up to 8.0	<b>86.0</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>55.5</b>	<b>59.0</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>57 (max)</b>	<b>334.5 (max)</b>

**Table 4 – Annual Costs**

<b>Workstream</b>	<b>Lead officers £'000</b>	<b>Prog. Team £'000</b>	<b>Spec. Prof. Advice £'000</b>	<b>Other (inc service officers £'000)</b>	<b>Less RIEP (LIFT) funding</b>	<b>Total £'000</b>
Strategic Leadership (Political)	54.9	0	27.5	20.8	19	84.2
Strategic Leadership (Managerial)	24	4	5.5	30	22	41.5
Enhanced Strategic Partnership Working	18.6	4.4	4.9	27.9	4.4	51.4
Service Devolution	54.9	0.0	41.3	20.8	19	98.0
Community Engagement and Empowerment	18.6	4.4	4.9	30.1	4.4	53.6
Workforce Development	15.4	4.4	3.9	77.1	22	78.8
Customer Access	26	49	19 (9.5 is a one off cost – not annual)	19	19	94
Sector Led Support	20.2	4.4	4.9	20.1	4.4	45.2
Shared Services	42	31	27	128	35	193
<b>Total</b>	<b>274.6</b>	<b>101.6</b>	<b>138.9</b>	<b>373.8</b>	<b>149.2</b>	<b>739.7</b>

7.2 The costs above have been calculated using the following formula:  
 $(\text{salary of employee} / 220 (\text{average working days per year})) \times \text{no. days required per month}$ . The costs **exclude** costs of members and conferences and on-costs, other than annual leave.

7.3 The resource requirements identified above clearly support the need to prioritise some elements of the work streams in order to ensure progress is made effectively and with the greatest impact, but without compromising service delivery within any of the partner authorities.

## **8.0 Phasing the Programme**

8.1 The Pioneer Programme comprises nine workstreams in total, all of which contribute in some way to achieving the aspirations of Pioneer Somerset. However as Phase 1 of the programme has progressed it has become clear that some workstreams are intrinsically linked, some are cross cutting themes within each of the other workstreams, and inevitably some workstreams by their very nature add more short-term value to reaching the programme outcomes than others.

- 8.2 The Directors Group has undertaken a high level review of the workstreams in which each has been scored to assess its contribution to the overall Pioneer outcomes of efficiency, reputation and customer satisfaction. Workstreams have been scored according to their 'do-ability' (ie speed of delivery, ease of delivery and probability of success). Using this methodology, the three workstreams which scored highest were:
- Shared Services
  - Customer Access
  - Managerial Leadership
- 8.3 Accepting that Pioneer Somerset is a means to an end, rather than the end itself, its work in re-shaping the delivery of services and improving the service experience and access to services for customers needs to be set within the context of an enhanced community leadership role and not simply a service delivery role. Thus political leadership and managerial leadership developments will need to have regard to what is needed in Somerset to work effectively across a broad range of partners and partnerships.
- 8.4 However, it is becoming increasingly clear that seeking to develop enhanced strategic partnership working across Somerset under the auspices of Pioneer Somerset does not have the broad support of a range of key partners. The new legislative framework and guidance sets out an expectation that authorities would do this through existing multi agency partnerships/LSPs. The proposed Pioneer Somerset governance arrangements would provide useful opportunities for the 6 authorities to consider any 'council only' issues and form a view to feed into the multi agency/partner discussions.
- 8.5 This evaluation, together with the review of workstream PIDs, suggests that the Programme could be reshaped across three key themes or strands:
- Community leadership (Political / Managerial)
  - Shared Services
  - Customer Access
- 8.6 As illustrated in **Appendix F** the attached diagram, the aim of re-shaping or re-phasing the programme in this way does not mean that the other workstreams are to be abandoned, but rather that they are re-phased or re-packaged in order to ensure maximum benefits from each piece of work. Thus ensuring that the cross cutting issues arising from some of the original workstreams, such as workforce development and sector led support, are fully integrated within the revised programme.
- 8.7 *Recommendation 6 – Programme Phasing:***
- *to re-phase the workstreams to concentrate on Community Leadership, Shared Services and Customer Access in order to allow resources to be concentrated on those areas most pivotal in delivering the agreed outcomes of the programme; and*
  - *to agree that the Pioneer Somerset Directors Group develop an Action Plan and timetable on this basis for recommendation to the Pioneer Somerset Board.*



**8.8 Recommendation 7 – Enhanced Strategic Partnership workstream: to accept the need for work on enhancing strategic partnership working in Somerset to be ‘owned’ by a wider range of partners building in appropriate ‘touch points’ with Pioneer Somerset as necessary.**

**9.0 The Financial Target**

9.1 The Pioneer programme has committed to delivering efficiency savings in the region of £20 million arising from joint working across the partners by 2012-13. This target should be seen in the context of the recently agreed Local Area Agreement for Somerset which requires all authorities in the county to deliver 3% savings (NI 179) and an additional 0.5% stretch target (NI 179a). It should be noted that NI 179a is one of the indicators flagged in the LAA Refresh which is underway currently. GOSW will be keen to discuss the deliverability of this indicator. The Pioneer Somerset savings target falls well within the overall LAA savings requirement, however partner authorities may have additional legitimate savings arising from joint working that should be counted as part of the Pioneer efficiencies that would not qualify under the rules of the LAA.

9.2 **Table 5** below puts these targets into context for each partner authority.

	<b>SCC £000</b>	<b>MDC £000</b>	<b>SDC £000</b>	<b>SSDC £000</b>	<b>TDBC £000</b>	<b>WSDC £000</b>	<b>TOTAL £ 000</b>
Total eligible spend	393,643	20,606	20,494	27,272	20,314	10,116	492,445
Efficiency Target by 2010-11 (NI 179)	36,609	1,916	1,906	2,536	1,889	941	45,797
Efficiency Target by 2010-11 (NI 179a)	6,101	319	318	423	315	157	7,633
<b>Total Efficiency Target by 2010-11</b>	<b>42,710</b>	<b>2,236</b>	<b>2,224</b>	<b>2,959</b>	<b>2,204</b>	<b>1,097</b>	<b>53,430</b>

**9.3 Recommendation 8 – Efficiency Target: to acknowledge each Council’s individual requirement to deliver efficiency savings to meet NI 179 and agree the need for a joint approach under Pioneer Somerset to deliver the NI 179a stretch element through improved 2 tier working. In addition, to authorise the Pioneer Somerset Directors Group to develop, regularly review and report to the Pioneer Somerset Board using a collective tracking tool to monitor the delivery of the efficiency savings.**

## **10.0 Financial Implications and Comments of the Section 151 Officer**

- 10.1 There are a number of financial issues arising from this report which should be considered when taking the Pioneer Programme forward. Members will all be aware that the Pioneer Somerset programme commits the partner authorities to savings of £20 million by 2012/13. This saving falls within the LAA targets 179 and 179a as detailed in Section 9.2 (Table 5) of this Report and are therefore non-negotiable in LAA terms.
- 10.2 It is essential that in order to achieve these savings, and demonstrate that achievement in the spirit of Pioneer Somerset, that targets be identified for each component workstream. It is therefore recommended that each project initiation document (PID) that comes forward should take account of this and include target savings from the outset. Equally in delivering improvements through the Pioneer work programme due regard should be given to the costs avoided through new ways of working. By joint working authorities are increasing resilience, allowing for the sharing of specialist expertise and joint procurement. By so doing costs are avoided and, again, these should be captured to recognise the full financial benefits that are accruing. Alongside target savings it is also important that each PID identifies its individual contribution to the other Pioneer Somerset objectives in the areas of reputation and customer satisfaction.
- 10.3 To date identification of savings remains rather ad hoc and further work is required early in Phase 2 to formally record these. This will be linked with the returns required for the LAA.
- 10.4 Table 4 in Section 7.0 of this Report outlines the resource requirements required as estimated by each of the partners. This should be read in the context of the REIP (LIFT SW) grant of £311,000. Further investigation is being made into the potential to re-cycle efficiency savings achieved through the programme to fund the ongoing programme management costs.

**10.5 *Recommendation 9 – Development of Workstream PIDs: to agree that future PIDs coming forward under the umbrella of the programme should clearly identify their individual contributions to the overall Pioneer Somerset objectives of savings, reputation and customer satisfaction.***

## **11.0 Legal Comments**

- 11.1 The key issue at this stage from a legal perspective is to have clarity in respect of the governance arrangements for the project to provide clear lines of delegation and authority. This is covered under Section 6 of this Report, and by the Recommendation under Section 16.1 which proposes the adoption of the Governance Protocol set out in **Appendix C**. This protocol was prepared by the Somerset Pioneer Lawyers Group comprising of the Monitoring Officers of all six authorities and it is important that all the Councils adopt the protocol to enable the project to proceed into its next phase in a businesslike and transparent manner.
- 11.2 In due course and as part of the delivery phase, particular actions and proposals may require a bi-lateral or multi-lateral contractual agreement between authorities in relation to transfer of powers, funding, staffing, joint decision making or co-option. The Pioneer Lawyers Group will develop a 'toolkit' of those arrangements, for agreement, in anticipation of such situations to facilitate the implementation of specific initiatives that will emerge from the Pioneer Somerset Programme.

## 12.0 Equality and Diversity

- 12.1 The Pioneer programme of work has customer service and access at its heart and as such all work streams will seek to ensure that equality and diversity issues have been addressed. Any proposed changes to the way in which services are delivered or administered will be subject to a full equalities impact assessment including consultation with the appropriate agencies.

## 13.0 Asset Management Implications

- 13.1 Management of the Councils' assets will be key to all workstreams as the programme rolls out. This will include land and buildings and information systems infrastructure. In order to reduce costs effectively the programme team will be seeking to streamline assets where both possible and practical.

## 14.0 Risk Assessment

- 14.1 The original risk register for the Pioneer Somerset programme is attached as **Appendix D**. Whilst a revised risk assessment has yet to be carried out by the Director's Group it is apparent that some of the risks associated with the programme have increased. In particular:

- **Risk A** – 'Programme does not run to time' (links to Risk C and L)  
In the current absence of a Programme Manager, there is now clearly a high risk that the programme will not run to time. Equally the current lack of clear governance arrangements increases the risk that necessary decision making processes are encumbered, thus potentially compromising delivery

(NB the decision to move forward with new programme management arrangements (para 5.4) should mitigate these risks as will a decision in respect of the programme governance arrangements (para 6.3.)

- **Risk I** – Political Support  
It is apparent that whilst there is clear Political support from within the Leaders Group, this appears to not necessarily be the case throughout each partner authority. There is therefore a risk that this will impact on decisions around the implementation of Phase 2 of the programme, which in turn will impact on the ability of the programme to deliver the agreed outcomes around efficiency savings, customer satisfaction and reputation.

It is likely that these factors are primarily those that have led the RIEP to 'red flag' the programme in terms of the overall risk to their investment and the likelihood of the agreed outcomes being delivered. It is hoped that the decision to address the lack of programme management arrangements will move the programme to 'amber' in the eyes of RIEP.

- 14.2 ***Recommendation 10 – Risk Management: to request SOLACE Enterprises in conjunction with the Pioneer Somerset Directors Group to develop appropriate risk management approaches to ensure delivery of the programme objectives.***

## 15.0 Conclusions

- 15.1 The Pioneer programme, as outlined, has progressed since the PID was agreed earlier this year with some achievements, as summarised in Section 4.0 of this report. However the greatest challenge has been bedding in the programme and the various working groups, and indeed establishing a clear governance and decision-making framework. This remains outstanding and is included with this report in Section 6.0 and **Appendix C**. The lack of clarity in this regard has caused some delay in certain aspects of the programme
- 15.2 The loss of the programme manager after a very short period of time has also reduced the team's capacity to deliver as originally planned.
- 15.3 Summaries of the workstreams have been provided within the body of the report and **Appendix B**. These provide an indication of which areas have progressed further than others. These summaries should be read in conjunction with the proposals for re-phasing of the programme through Phase 2.
- 15.4 All councils are now asked to consider and agree the recommendations set out throughout this report and summarized in section 16 below.

## 16.0 Summary of Report Recommendations

- 16.1 With reference to the specific Recommendations identified within this Report, all councils are asked to agree:
- (a) ***Recommendation 1 - Vision: to strengthen the vision of Pioneer Somerset through the inclusion of reference to the ultimate ambition of the programme to 'deliver better services for all residents of Somerset'. (Section 3)***
- (b) ***Recommendation 2 – Workstreams:***
- ***to note the progress of the workstreams, as identified in Table 1 and Appendix B,***
  - ***to note the further work necessary to progress the next steps***
  - ***to agree that the next phase of the programme should focus on the delivery of the agreed outcomes (para 2.4 above) and be taken forward in accordance with recommendation 6 for the re-phasing of the workstreams. (Section 3)***
- (c) ***Recommendation 3 – Achievements: to note the update and instruct the Pioneer Somerset Directors Group to ensure that all of the achievements to date of Pioneer Somerset against the objectives are captured and publicized. (Section 4)***
- (d) ***Recommendation 4 – Programme Management: to note the way forward agreed in respect of future programme management arrangements as set out in paras 5.4 and 5.5 above. (Section 5)***
- (e) ***Recommendation 5 – Programme Governance: to approve the Governance Protocol attached as Appendix C. (Section 6)***

***Note: Somerset County Council adopted the Governance Protocol in advance of consideration of the main report at its meeting on 12<sup>th</sup> November 2008.***

- (f) **Recommendation 6 – Programme Phasing:**
- **to re-phase the workstreams to concentrate on Community Leadership, Shared Services and Customer Access in order to allow resources to be concentrated on those areas most pivotal in delivering the agreed outcomes of the programme; and**
  - **to agree that the Pioneer Somerset Directors Group develop an Action Plan and timetable on this basis for recommendation to the Pioneer Somerset Board. (Section 8)**
- (g) **Recommendation 7 – Enhanced Strategic Partnership workstream: to accept the need for work on enhancing strategic partnership working in Somerset to be ‘owned’ by a wider range of partners building in appropriate ‘touch points’ with Pioneer Somerset as necessary. (Section 8)**
- (h) **Recommendation 8 – Efficiency Target: to acknowledge each Council’s individual requirement to deliver efficiency savings to meet NI 179 and agree the need for a joint approach under Pioneer Somerset to deliver the NI 179a stretch element through improved 2 tier working. In addition, to authorise the Pioneer Somerset Directors Group to develop, regularly review and report to the Pioneer Somerset Board using a collective tracking tool to monitor the delivery of the efficiency savings. (Section 9)**
- (i) **Recommendation 9 – Development of Workstream PIDs: to agree that future PIDs coming forward under the umbrella of the programme should clearly identify their individual contributions to the overall Pioneer Somerset objectives of savings, reputation and customer satisfaction. (Section 10)**
- (j) **Recommendation 10 – Risk Management: to authorise the interim Programme Manager in conjunction with the Pioneer Somerset Directors Group to develop appropriate risk management approaches to ensure delivery of the programme objectives. (Section 14)**