

Canterbury City Council
Dover district Council
Thanet District Council

Agenda

East Kent Services Committee

Monday

8 January 2024

at 1.00 pm

The Guildhall
St Peter's Place
Canterbury
CT1 2DB

Membership of the East Kent Services Committee

Councillor Alan Baldock
Councillor Michael Dixey
Councillor Kevin Mills
Councillor Jamie Pout
Councillor Rick Everitt
Councillor Helen Whitehead

Quorum: 3 councillors, 1 from each council

NOTES

1. Members of the public may speak at meetings of the Committee so long as they contact Democratic Services by 12.30pm the working day before the meeting.
2. The venue for the meeting is wheelchair accessible and has an induction loop to help people who are hearing impaired.
3. Everyone is welcome to record meetings of the Council and its Committees using whatever non-disruptive methods you think are suitable. If you are intending to do this please mention it to the Democratic Services Officer and do not use flash photograph unless you have previously asked whether you may do so. If you have any questions about this please contact Democratic Services (members of the press please contact the Press Office).

Please note that the Chair of the meeting has the discretion to withdraw permission and halt any recording if in the Chair's opinion continuing to do so would prejudice proceedings at the meeting. Reasons may include disruption caused by the filming or recording or the nature of the business being conducted.

Anyone filming a meeting is asked to only focus on those actively participating but please also be aware that you may be filmed or recorded whilst attending a council meeting and that attendance at the meeting signifies your agreement to this if it occurs. You are also reminded that the laws of defamation apply and all participants whether speaking, filming or recording are reminded that respect should be shown to all those included in the democratic process.

Persons making recordings are requested not to put undue restrictions on the material produced so that it can be reused and edited by all local people and organisations on a non-commercial basis.

If a meeting passes a motion to exclude the press and public then, in conjunction with this, all rights to record the meeting are removed.

4. The information contained within this agenda is available in other formats, including Braille, large print, audio cassettes and other languages.

Contact Officer: Democratic Services 01227 862009, democracy@canterbury.gov.uk

Agenda

Page (s)

1 Apologies for absence

To receive any apologies for absence.

2 Substitute Members

The Chair to report any notifications received prior to this meeting regarding the attendance of substitutes for the named members of this committee.

3 Appointment of a Chair and Vice-Chair for 2023/24

Under the operating arrangements, the Chair for the municipal year 2023/24 will be a representative of Dover District Council, and the Vice-Chair will be a representative of Canterbury City Council.

4 Declaration of any interests

To receive any declarations of interest.

5 Minutes of the previous meeting

4 - 5

To receive the minutes of the previous meeting.

6 East Kent Services Transition Business Case

6 - 65

TO CONSIDER the report of the Interim EKS Services Transition Manager.

7 Any other urgent business to be dealt with in public

8 Any other business which falls under the exempt provisions of the Local Government Act 1972 or the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or both

It may be necessary to exclude the press or public for this item.

CANTERBURY CITY COUNCIL
EAST KENT SERVICES COMMITTEE

**Minutes of a meeting held on Monday, 7th November, 2022
at 2.00 pm in The Guildhall, St Peter's Place, Westgate, Canterbury**

Present: Councillor Fitter-Harding (Chair)
Councillor Bartlett
Councillor Ashbee

Officers: Dan Evans - Head of ICT
Colin Carmichael - Chief Executive (Thanet District Council)
Tricia Marshall - Director of Corporate Services
Vanessa (Canterbury City Council)
Montgomery - Interim Democratic Services Manager

342 Apologies for absence

Apologies were received from Councillors Richardson, Pugh and Carnac.

343 Substitute Members

There were no substitutes for the meeting.

344 Appointment of Chair and Vice-Chair

It was proposed, seconded and when put to vote by show of hands unanimously

RESOLVED:

That Councillor Fitter-Harding be elected Chair for the municipal year 2022/23.

(Councillor Fitter Harding then took the Chair for the remainder of the meeting)

It was proposed, seconded and when put to vote by show of hands unanimously

RESOLVED:

That Councillor Ashbee be elected Vice Chair for the municipal year 2022/23.

345 Minutes of the previous meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 10th September, 2021 were agreed as a true record by general assent.

346 **Declaration of any interests**

There were no declarations of interest for the meeting.

347 **Any other urgent business to be dealt with in public**

There was no urgent business.

348 **Exclusion of the press and public**

It was proposed, seconded and when put to vote by show of hands unanimously

RESOLVED: That under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public and press be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act or the Freedom of Information Act or both.

349 **The future of East Kent ICT**

The Head of ICT, EKS introduced the report that sought authority from the committee to partially disband EK Services by bringing in-house part of ICT, Contract and Procurement Service.

It was proposed, seconded and when put to vote by show of hands unanimously

RESOLVED:

1. That part of the ICT, Contract and Procurement Service is taken in-house by each partner Authority.

2. That a residual EK Services team remains in place to support the partner Authorities with Security, Software and Database Administration until the end of March 2024 and to provide ICT, Contract and Procurement and Quality Assurance support to the Civica contract on an on-going basis.

Reason for the decision: Taking the service back in-house would enable each Council to design the service to meet their specific needs, and would give each Council direct control over an essential service area and avoided unwieldy service management and recharging arrangements. All three councils have already individually agreed to these arrangements.

350 **Any other business which falls under the exempt provisions of the Local Government Act 1972 or the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or both**

There was no other business.

There being no other business the meeting closed at 2.07 pm

East Kent Services Committee

8th January 2024

Subject: EKS Service Transition Business Case

Director and Head of Service:

Chris Blundell - Director of Corporate Services, Thanet DC

Nicci Mills - Service Director Finance and Procurement, Canterbury CC

Mike Davis - Strategic Director (Finance and Housing), Dover DC

Officer:

Jasvir Chohan - Interim EKS Service Transition Manager

Key or Non Key decision: Non-Key

Decision Issues:

These matters are within the authority of the East Kent Services Committee.

Is any of the information exempt from publication:

No.

Summary and purpose of the report:

This report provides a summary and appraisal of the options for the transition of services from the Civica contract to a suitable service delivery vehicle (SDV). The report recommends a LATCo (local authority trading company) approach as the preferred option with an analysis of the benefits and associated risks.

To Recommend

1. To recommend to the cabinet/executive of Canterbury City Council, Dover District Council and Thanet District Council that each agrees-
 - a. To exit from the contract with Civica UK Limited for the delivery of the Revenue, Benefits and Customer Services.
 - b. To approve the LATCo service delivery vehicle as the preferred option for future service delivery.
 - c. To approve the business case for the LATCo pursuant to Article 2(2)(b) of the Local Government (Best Value Authorities) Power to Trade) (England) Order 2009.
 - d. To the extent that it is not otherwise authorised to do so, to authorise the East Kent Services Committee, to exercise the powers and functions of the Council

to form the LATco and to enter into the contract with it, (to include but not limited to); making decisions on behalf of the Council in relation to:-

- i. Establishing the LATco and enter into any associated shareholders agreements.
- ii. Appointing officers to the LATco.
- iii. Subscribing for shares in the LATco.
- iv. Advancing money by way of loan capital to the LATco to finance its capital requirements.
- v. Entering into a contract with LATco for the delivery of the Revenue, Benefits and Customer Services on behalf of each of the councils.
- vi. Managing the contract.
- vii. Renegotiating the contract.
- viii. Varying the contract.
- ix. Assigning the contract.
- x. Novating the contract.
- xi. Terminating the contract.
- xii. Enforcing the contract.
- xiii. The doing of anything in relation to the exercise of the powers and functions under Part II of the Deregulation and Contracting Out Act 1994 and the orders and regulations made under it.
- xiv. Authorising entry into contracts* with third parties in relation to any functions of the Council which are not the Revenues, Benefits and Customer Services Functions but which can usefully be entered into in connection with or in order to facilitate contracts entered into, or to be entered into with regard to the Revenues, Benefits and Customer Service Functions.
*the contracts shall be entered into in accordance with each local authority's respective Contract Standing Orders.
- xv. Anything which is calculated to facilitate, or is conducive or incidental to or otherwise expedient to (i) to (xv) above.

2. That a report be considered by EKSC on final contract terms and, if approved, authorisation of entry into the contract and associated documentation.

Next stage in process:

The report will be presented to the individual cabinets/executive for approval.

1. Introduction

In 2011, Canterbury, Dover and Thanet councils formed a Shared Service vehicle - 'EK Services', through which Revenues, Benefits, Customer Services, and ICT functions were delivered on behalf of the three authorities.

In 2017, Canterbury, Dover and Thanet councils made a joint decision to outsource the Revenues, Benefits and Customer Services functions to Civica. The decision to outsource was based on the financial challenges facing the partner councils and the lack of additional savings EK services could deliver.

Since 2018 the service has been delivered by Civica. To date the services provided by the senior management team and its staff have delivered a successful service with customer satisfaction scores regularly above 96%.

In 2021 Civica informed the Councils that it was strategically exiting the BPO (business process outsourcing) market and that the initial contract would not be extended beyond January 2025. However, Civica has requested to return the service early, as they would like to focus on their software business. Given the change in strategic direction of Civica, the East Kent Strategic Board (EKS) agreed to the principle of returning the service early.

In October 2022 , an outline business case was developed and subsequently approved by the EKS board, and the go ahead given for a full business case to be developed along with an appraisal of several suitable options.

This report outlines the range of options appraised within the business case, the benefits and risks of these options and the cost of delivery. The report recommends the option that delivers the most value for money, aligns with the current successful commercial model and provides a range of benefits.

The purpose of this report is for the EKS committee to approve the transition of outsourced services to a LATCO service delivery vehicle.

The following table summarises the estimated net impact to the partnership, with the LATCo SDV generating savings from year 1. The shared services SDV will incur additional costs till year 3.

| | Transiti on year | Year 1 Year 2 | Year 3 Year 4 | Year 5 |
|-----------------|---------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|
| LATCo | (-73,020) | (-250,827) (-304,668) | (-375,227) (-448,056) | (-543,338) |
| Shared services | 186,054 | 44,635 7,192 | (-46,748) (-117,930) | (-211,627) |

2. Options available

2.1 The outline business case considered a range of available options;

- Shared services
- LATCo – local authority trading company
- Disaggregation of services
- Alternative outsourcing company
- Do nothing

Of the five options available two were discounted early in the process. In 2021 the EKS board was presented with an outline business case of the options available. Disaggregation provides greater local control of services when brought back in house. However the disaggregation option was discounted due to the cost implications, increased IT, management and staffing costs and complexity of disaggregation.

2.1.1 The costs of disaggregation identified an increase in operating costs of approximately

£4 million. The detailed costs are presented in appendix 5 of the business case. Each council would have to separate the service and transition to the individual council, which would have required separate additional management structures and separation of infrastructure and data. All of which would have added additional operating costs and loss of economies of scale.

2.1.2 There are significant risks of doing nothing, these would include an unplanned transfer back to the councils when the contract ends in 2025. Resulting in very high costs with no delivery vehicle to manage the services.

2.1.3 Outsourcing as an option transfers risk to the commercial entity and provides the ability to quickly scale services according to demand. However this option was discounted due to the lack of suppliers in the market and a potentially complex and lengthy procurement process. Research identified only one viable option, Liberata, which would have led to an increase in operating costs compared to the Civica contract.

The two remaining options were shortlisted and appraised .

2.2 Option 1 - Shared services

Shared services is where a number of councils can join their services together leading to streamlined processes and economies of scale.

Benefits

- Tried and tested model for delivering efficiencies and sharing limited resources
 - Greater control for the council compared to outsourced services
- Benefit from economies of scale
- Centralisation of services makes it easier to monitor performance, standardisation of processes and methodologies
- Reduced infrastructure costs by sharing technology and data
- Not subject to corporation tax or VAT

Risks

- Increased costs due to pensions requirements of LGPS and salary costs. - SDV is not set up to deliver additional revenue, leading to viability challenges in the future
- Decision making governance more complex and lengthy with cabinet/committee structure
- Lack of buy in from staff leading to demotivation and drop in productivity levels

Financial implications

- The original rationale for transferring EKS shared services to Civica was to maintain the shared services function for the 3 council partnership. Otherwise the partnership would have had to make significant savings to maintain the quality of services being provided to customers and approximately 67 posts would have been at risk. Funding would have needed to increase by approximately £400,000 in 2018/19 to maintain services, equating to 2.8 million over seven years. The outsourcing to a commercial operation generated savings, maintained the quality of services and provided further process efficiencies due to streamlining throughout the contract.

- A shared service SDV incurs an increased pension liability than all the other options, with LGPS employee contributions in the range of 20% compared to approximately 5% contributions for commercial organisations.
- The shared services model is expected to incur additional costs in the first two years. As an estimate a productivity loss of 2% has been incorporated into the business case, this is based on a minimal drop in productivity.

2.3 Option 2- LATCo

A LATCo is a local authority trading company that can operate in the commercial environment as well delivering traditional council services

Benefits

- Greater control for the council when compared with an outsourced SDV - Ability to trade commercially and generate new revenue streams such as EPA assessments services to support council services
- Strong buy in from staff will enable delivery of current productivity levels - Ability to react and adapt quickly to the changing financial environment, leading to innovation and agility
- Opportunity for cost reductions with more commercial terms and conditions e.g procurement of new IT systems
- The ability to set own pension rates to enable an improved offer of higher salaries
- Operational agility with streamlined decision making
- A LATCo can promote social value, e.g increase take up of welfare benefits

Risks

- Subject to VAT implications and corporation tax
- More complex to set up structure of company and legal advice required
 - Possible implications for the authority with an existing LATCo

Financial implications

- The financial analysis indicates a surplus being generated from year 1 with an additional saving to each of the three councils, as a consequence of moving to a LATCo SDV. Detailed costs have been outlined in appendix 4 of the business case.
- Further discounts or dividends can be paid to each council as part of the commercial trading model. Income from new revenue streams has been incorporated into the business case.
- There are currently 26 staff employed by Civica that are not on the LGPS. Given the differential between the current Civica pension contribution rate of 5% and LGPS contribution rates, 20% it would be reasonable to assume that a LATCo would provide recurring annual savings of approximately £120,000 compared to an in-house shared service. Through the passage of time, this saving should increase through natural turnover in staffing with more employees moving on to a LATCo pension scheme.

3. Conclusion

With the added ability to generate new revenue income streams, flexibility to attract and retain high calibre staff, due to enhanced terms and conditions, the LATCo is the preferred choice of service delivery vehicle. With an uncertain and challenging financial environment the LATCo is more able to weather the uncertainty by generating additional income streams to support frontline services. The ability of a LATCo to minimise costs and maximise efficiencies and deliver innovative services to communities and residents is a significant factor to support the LATCo approach.

The shared services are already operating in a streamlined efficient manner making it difficult to find further ways of identifying additional financial savings if needed. The shared services model will also incur additional costs year 1 and 2.

The LATCo will deliver savings to each council along with a streamlined budgeting and operating cost process, moving away from the more complex current recharge model. Whilst the level of current surplus on the arrangement is commercially sensitive, we are assured that the level of profit is sufficient to absorb the proposed level of additional costs and still deliver a surplus. This indicative budget will therefore be subject to further due diligence once the business case is agreed and the CCN is signed.

The Civica contract has transformed the way the services are delivered enabling commercialisation and delivering cost effective and efficient services. The LATCo service delivery vehicle is the only SDV that closely resembles the successful commercial model that Civica has developed.

The commercial approach of the Civica contract has delivered an agile and flexible workforce with new ways of working. The LATCo SDV is well suited to continue to deliver services which are commercially focused and foster an innovative commercial culture.

4. Recommendation

East Kent Services Committee is asked to approve the exit from the Civica contract. East

Kent Services Committee is asked to approve the business case and the preferred

LATCo service delivery vehicle and for the individual councils to recommend the approach to its executive leadership and cabinet.

The Civica contract expires in January 2025 , requiring a decision to be made to select one of the options outlined above. Doing nothing puts major services at risk of non delivery and significant additional cost being incurred. A delivery timescale including stabilisation of 7 - 9 months is required at the very least to ensure an effective transition to a new service delivery vehicle.

5. Corporate plans

The business case is aligned to the corporate values and priorities of the three councils. The councils require services to continue to be provided efficiently, effectively and economically

to reduce reliance on council tax and government funding, this supports the business case. The developing corporate plans show a desire to foster a commercial culture and focus for services, work more smartly, effectively and efficiently.

6. Consultation planned or undertaken

Consultation will take place with the East Kent services committee, individual cabinets and overview and scrutiny panel.

7. Implications

(a) Financial

The financial analysis indicates a surplus being generated from year 1 onwards with an additional saving to each of the three councils, as a consequence of moving to a LATCo SDV. Detailed costs have been outlined in appendix 4 of the business case..

(b) Legal

There are several legal implications associated with this recommendation. An intent to exit the Civica contract requires legal advice and action. New contracts required between the separate parties will require formulation. Novation of IT contracts and pensions considerations need to be considered.

(c) Equalities

None identified

(d) Environmental including carbon emissions and biodiversity

None identified

(e) Staffing resource

Type implications and associated regulatory consultation will have to be considered for staff transitioning to a LATCo.

Contact Officer: Jasvir Chohan interim service transition manager

Background documents and appendices

EKS Transition Business Case

Additional document(s) containing information exempt from publication:

No

East Kent Services partnership

Service transition business case

December 2023

Contents

Executive summary

1. Background

2. Strategic case

2.1 Organisational overview

2.2 National backdrop

2.3 The case for change

2.4 Existing arrangements

2.5 Business needs and requirements

2.6 Constraints and dependencies

3. Economic case

3.1 Critical success factors

3.2 Options analysis

3.3 Shortlisted options

3.4 Benefit analysis

3.5 Preferred way forward

3.6 Governance

3.6.1 Articles of Association

3.6.2 Shareholders agreement

3.6.3 Conflict of interest

3.6.4 Shareholders panel

3.6.5 Company board and directors

3.6.6 Training and induction

4. Commercial case

4.1 Technology workstream

4.2 Legal/Governance workstream

4.3 Payroll and HR workstream

4.4 Internal audit

5. Financial case

5.1 VAT implications

5.2 Corporation tax implications

5.3 Inflation

5.4 Support and operational costs

5.4.1 Legal and Governance services

5.4.2 Financial services and Audit

5.4.3 HR and Payroll services

5.4.4 IT Development and support services

5.4.5 Accommodation services

5.4.6 Structural costs

5.5 Financial analysis

5.6 Market/Competitor analysis

5.7 Historical growth

6. Management case

- 6.1 Programme governance
- 6.2 Change management framework and strategy
- 6.3 Benefits realisation
- 6.4 Risk management arrangements
- 6.5 Programme assurance and evaluation

Table 1 Success criteria

Table 2 - Risks and benefits

Table 3 - LATCo Benefits appraisal

Table 4 - Proposed governance model

Table 5 a&b - Financial analysis

Table 6 - Indicative Programme governance model

Table 7 - Programme team

Table 8 - Change management framework

Appendix 1 - SWOT analysis

Appendix 2 - High level Programme plan

Appendix 3 - Risk Register

Appendix 4 - Financial analysis

Appendix 5 - Total disaggregation of service costs

Appendix 6 - Service outline and performance

Appendix 7 - Governance model

Executive summary

Thanet, Canterbury and Dover councils have utilised a tri-council partnership, outsourced to Civica to deliver Revenues & Benefits and frontline customer services. The service is well established and operating effectively, delivering high quality services. See Appendix 6 for an outline of services and performance.

However, it is Civica's intention to vacate the Business Process Outsourcing (BPO) market leaving the partnership in a position where it must source an alternative service delivery vehicle to continue to deliver services to its customers.

The purpose of this report is to put forward a range of options, assess those options and recommend a preferred way forward. The programme business case follows the guidelines stated in the best practice framework, [HMRC Green Book](#) five case model methodology.

- Ensure the programme business case is aligned to the partnerships strategic direction
- Ensure the programme business case will maximise wider social value to communities and residents
- Confirm the programme business case is commercially viable
- Confirm the programme business case is affordable and fundable.
- Confirm the partnership has adequate resources to deliver the programme successfully

The business case recommends the option of a local authority trading company (LATCo) service delivery vehicle, facilitating a continued commercial approach to delivering services.

There are a number of key benefits a LATCo Service Delivery Vehicle (SDV) can deliver for the councils, discussed in more detail further down in the economic case;

- A sustainable, agile and adaptable business model which can weather difficult financial environments and generate further efficiencies.
- The ability to generate additional revenue streams to support frontline services and create a profit for purpose approach.
- The councils' ability to monitor and oversee operations more closely than an outsourced SDV.
- The ability of a LATCo to minimise costs and maximise efficiencies and deliver innovative services to communities and residents.

- The ability to attract and recruit high quality personnel, by offering favourable commercial terms and conditions. Increased productivity due to retention of a highly skilled and motivated workforce.

The business case has been developed with the knowledge and review of previous implementations of LATCo's across the partnership. The development of the governance model and financial assessment of the EKS LATCo has been supported by knowledge from the implementations of Canenco, the Canterbury LATCo and EKH, East Kent Housing.

1. Background

In 2011, Canterbury, Dover and Thanet councils formed a shared service vehicle - 'EK Services', through which Revenues, Benefits, Customer Services and ICT functions were delivered on behalf of the three authorities. The shared service successfully delivered savings to all partners for 6 years, but ultimately the need for additional savings beyond year 6, exceeded the shared service vehicles ability to deliver them.

In light of the need to deliver these further savings, in 2017, Canterbury, Dover and Thanet councils made a joint decision to outsource the Revenues, Benefits and Customer Services functions to Civica.

The decision to outsource was based on the financial challenges facing the partner councils and the lack of additional savings the Shared Service was able to deliver. Under the shared services arrangement, there was a need to increase funding to maintain a level of staffing required to deliver services to the agreed standards. Therefore, EKS in its existing shared services form, was not sustainable in the medium to long term future.

It was felt that a strategic commercial venture with a private sector partner had the potential to protect and grow jobs and develop services whilst still delivering savings. In 2018 the shared services function was outsourced to Civica.

The services were further transformed by Civica, generating process, structural and financial efficiencies. Culturally the service has become commercially focused and agile, managing demand effectively. The arrangement delivered the financial savings required by the Councils.

Since 2018, Civica have delivered the service within budget, they have met the KPIs set, achieved good customer ratings, delivered the various government business and public support schemes throughout Covid quickly, with a low error and fraud rate, at no extra charge to the Councils. The services are high performing and customer satisfaction scores are regularly above 96%.

In 2021 Civica informed the Councils that it was strategically exiting the BPO market and that the initial contract would not be extended beyond January 2025. Civica asked for the contract to return before this date.

In light of this, in 2021 delivery options were explored and an outline business case approved by the EKS board with further approval to move forward and develop a full

business case. Following the approval of the initial outline business case, CIPFA were engaged to review the proposal and make recommendations on developing a full and robust business case.

This business case now reflects the recommendations of the outline business case and CIPFA review, taking into consideration the strategic case, a range of options, a full financial analysis , an implementation plan and capacity and capability to deliver.

2. Strategic Case

2.1 Organisational overview

As mentioned above, Thanet, Canterbury and Dover have been in a partnership delivering front line services to its residents and customers for over a decade. The partnership has been effective in delivering a range of efficiencies and service improvements.

All three councils have recently had a change of political leadership, with Canterbury gaining a Labour/Liberal Democratic coalition and Thanet and Dover gaining Labour administrations.

There is little appetite to move away from a high performing and commercially focused service being delivered by Civica. Therefore whichever service delivery vehicle is selected, it needs to replicate the level of service currently being provided.

Corporate plans are under development for all three councils, however there is a continued desire to deliver services that are efficient, cost effective and high performing.

2.2 National backdrop

The impact of austerity has increased the need for greater savings and efficiencies and with the reduction of local government funding, local authorities have been obliged to investigate a range of mechanisms to reduce overheads and raise revenue to minimise the impact on frontline services.

The impact of both Brexit and the Covid pandemic has seen significant outward migration of skills and resources. The loss of free movement of labour has diminished supply of labour in the local market (traditional areas that were dependent on recruitment from the EU e.g. hospitality/retail etc can no longer recruit there, so we are now in competition with these sectors for more local talent) and loss of expertise and experience due to a shift towards early retirement within the UK workforce, has effected availability of staff. Maintaining a skilled and adequately resourced workforce will inevitably become more difficult.

UK inflation continues to be relatively high and interest rate increases provide for an uncertain future if not managed effectively. The impact on vulnerable segments of the population could lead to greater deprivation with the cost of living crisis. With increased deprivation and hardship, an increase in demand for services will inevitably follow.

There has been a national trend towards insourcing services back in house, due to a number of reasons, ranging from the collapse of major contractors e.g. Carillion, contractors voluntarily exiting the public sector and local authorities wishing to exercise more control over their services." *Local government: alternative models of service delivery*" briefing paper 9th september 2019.

A recent study conducted by *APSE May 2019, Association for Public Service Excellence* pointed towards a trend of insourcing. Local authorities expressed the desire to improve service quality and flexibility without the constraints of outsourced inflexible contracts. The need for greater control of allocating resources to meet local demand was seen as a key driver for insourcing.

2.3 The Case for Change

As a result of Civica exiting the BPO market, an outline business case was approved in October 2022, by the East Kent Chief Executive forum. An approval was gained to investigate alternative service delivery vehicles for the Revenues and Benefits and Customer services functions.

Local government is increasingly under pressure from a rising demand in services and a continued reduction in public funding. This has led councils to become more innovative in service delivery.

A programme brief has been prepared with a clear scope and defined objectives. This has been agreed with the programme board. The programme brief covers the following objectives;

- To avert a service delivery failure by re-provisioning services for the Revenues and Benefits and customer services function to a financially viable service delivery vehicle by December 2024
- To develop a sales pipeline and deliver growth enabling surplus income to be redirected to support council services
- To increase the council's ability to further their social value agenda and support frontline services
- To promote and sustain a commercial culture across the authorities, exploring further opportunities for commercialisation.
- The programme will examine the relationship between the existing commercial entity at Canterbury, Canenco, and the merits of a group structure approach.

2.4 Existing arrangements

The current cost of the service is £8 million, which is spread across the three councils. The outsourced contract with Civica is a people only contract, utilising the councils' IT infrastructure and systems, which is based on premises at Thanet DC. The Openrevenues database is utilised for benefits and revenue management and a new cloud telephony service has recently been implemented. EKS utilises the google suite of programs for administration, email, calendar management, file management and word processing, with print and mailroom services being outsourced off site.

Going forward there is a plan to utilise laptops and Microsoft products. There is also a plan, in the near future, to migrate to a SaaS (Software as a Service) model for Openrevenues once the SaaS product has stabilised.

The service is operated on a hybrid basis, with staff working across three sites and remotely. There is a face to face community hub based in Margate, with a small presence at Dover and Canterbury, delivering front of house services.

Business support is provided via a range of mechanisms; payroll services are provided by Civica and finance support is provided by 1.5 FTE based in Thanet. HR support has recently been disaggregated back to the individual councils as have IT services. However the EKS partnership retains a small residual IT team that supports all IT requirements.

2.5 Business needs and requirements

Continuity of service is paramount to the partnership, ensuring a sustainable and high performing service continues to function and deliver services to customers and its communities.

Councillors and officers are also eager to maintain the skills and expertise of a high performing team. The workforce is agile and adaptable and has displayed a strong commitment to supporting the partnership through difficult operating environments such as the Covid pandemic.

To support business operations a revised IT operating platform will be required to facilitate operations and information management. Data and infrastructure will require decoupling from the partnership's current infrastructure. New information governance and compliance will require new policies and administration.

2.6 Constraints and dependencies

There are a number of constraints that may have an impact on this programme, firstly the Civica contract will terminate in January 2025 therefore the partnership will require an alternative service delivery vehicle in place by then to ensure service continuity. Secondly, with an increasingly challenging financial landscape for businesses and residents, funding and investment will be limited.

Success of the programme will depend on strong political buy-in from the new administrations, a practical and rational approach from Civica and IT service continuity and resource availability.

There are a number of technology implementations in progress, such as a new finance system procurement at Thanet and the disaggregation of IT infrastructure across the tri-council partnership. These implementations will require careful programming and dovetailing into the transition plan.

3. Economic Case

As noted above, the programme is essentially a lift and shift of a high performing, qualitative service and introducing a new service delivery vehicle. There is no major transformation and services will continue to be delivered to residents seamlessly.

The economic case outlines the options for the delivery of the programme and recommends the option that is most likely to offer best value for money, least risk and maximum social value to the EK partnership. A number of critical success factors have been identified, which must be met for the programme to be considered successful.

Initially, a disaggregation of services into its constituents parts was costed and considered alongside a LATCo, shared services model, secondary outsourcing and do nothing approach. These are discussed in detail below.

A SWOT analysis was conducted to determine the strength of the options based on risk, benefits and costs. A further managers workshop was arranged to supplement the SWOT analysis and promote engagement and ownership. See appendix 1 for SWOT analysis.

A number of factors were considered when developing the critical success factors and shaping the preferred approach;

- Business needs and requirements
- The wider environment
- Strategic fit
- Organisational culture
- Resources
- Affordability and achievability
- Optimal financial viability

3.1 Critical success criteria

These are the areas that must go right for the programme to be determined a success, meeting the expectations of key stakeholders.

- Maintenance of key performance indicators
- Seamless transfer of operations to new SDV
- Income generation
- Delivery of surplus
- Increase in welfare take up
- Minimise staff turnover
- Long term financial sustainability of model

Key:

X - partially met

XX - fully met

0 - not met

Table 1 Success criteria

| | Maint. of KPI's | Seamless transfer | Income generation | Delivery of surplus | Incr. in welfare take up | Min. staff turnover | Sustainable model |
|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Shared services | XX | X | X | X | 0 | X | 0 |
| LATCo | XX | X | XX | XX | XX | XX | XX |
| Outsource | X | X | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | X |
| Disaggregation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Do nothing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

3.2 Options analysis

Desktop research was carried out to identify best practice within the sector and a number of business cases reviewed to assess potential options. Research from leading financial and economic institutions such as Cipfa and Grant Thornton "In good company" September 2018 was also appraised.

Options considered as part of this long list are;

- Shared services
- LATCo
- Disaggregation of services
- Alternative outsourcing company
- Do nothing

The following table summarises the key outputs from a SWOT analysis conducted, appendix 1, and in addition expands the analysis to include a do minimal option.

Table 2 Benefits/Risks

| Option | Benefits | Risk |
|--|---|---|
| Shared services model - bought back in house | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Partnership has full control of the service ● Cost effective model ● Allows economies of scale ● Sharing of limited resources and skills ● Not subject to VAT and corporation tax ● Centralisation of services makes it easier to monitor performance, standardisation of processes and methodologies ● Ability to sell services | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Lack of buy in from staff ● Lack of commercial culture ● Less sustainable model moving forward. ● Model not set up to generate additional surplus ● Decision making governance more complex and lengthy with cabinet/committee structure ● Increased costs due to pensions requirements of LGPS. ● Staff pay would be aligned to council pay levels |
| LATCo - local authority trading company | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Partnership has full control of the service ● Cost effective model ● Allows economies of scale ● Sharing of limited resources and skills ● Strong buy in from staff ● Ability to trade commercially and generate surplus to support council services ● Ability to generate surplus within the private sector ● Ability to react and adapt quickly to the | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Subject to VAT implications and corporation tax ● More complex to set up structure of company |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | <p>changing financial environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunity for cost reductions with more commercial t&c's • Operational agility with streamlined decision making • Model supports secondary outsourcing if required later. | |
| Disaggregation of services into individual councils | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater control of services for individual councils • Greater locally tailored services | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unsustainable model going forward • High cost association • Cannot benefit from economies of scale • Potential issues with sourcing adequate skills and resources |
| Secondary outsourcing | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued agility and flexibility with economies of scale across a large organisation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited options, companies moving away from outsourcing model • Increased costs compared to Civica contract • Market analysis indicates only 1 suitable supplier creating a sellers market • Issues with cost and quality, inflexibility and recent public failures of larger suppliers • Potential disruption of a tender exercise to transfer services |
| Do nothing/minimum | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • n/a | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing contract expires in Feb 25. Services will automatically transfer back from Civica to the partnership in an |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>unplanned manner.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● TRansfer back to EKs? ● Staff uncertainty/flight ● No opportunity to extend contract |
|--|--|---|

3.3 Short listed options

The secondary outsourcing , disaggregation and do nothing options have been discounted from the list of options. The secondary outsourcing option was discounted due to the limited number of suppliers available, only Liberata was identified as a suitable option. The limited supply of BPO organisations creates a sellers market with increased costs in comparison to the Civica contract. Also the requirement of a potentially lengthy procurement process will introduce additional risk to service transition.

Disaggregation of services has been discounted due to the cost implications, an additional £4 million cost and impact on services. Disaggregating services and transferring them back will incur in depth re-design of IT and data infrastructure, process change and cultural alignment to individual councils.

The do nothing option is not sustainable as the Civica contract expires in January 2025, when services automatically revert back to the partnership. There is no opportunity to extend the contract leaving staff and services in an exposed high risk position.

Therefore the two remaining viable options from the long list which could provide a function that continues to deliver high performing qualitative services to customers and residents are a LATCo or shared services SDV.

3.4 Benefits Analysis

A LATCo is able to generate new revenue streams when compared to shared services, having the ability to trade outside of the public sector. Any additional surplus generated can be used to offset frontline service costs. A shared services SDV can to a degree generate additional revenue, however not to the extent of a LATCo.

Research has shown councils that have successfully utilised a commercial approach to deliver services, have been successful in attracting and retaining high quality personnel. Commercial terms and conditions which are more favourable, are better placed to retain a high performing workforce. This has been evidenced at both Publica and PSPL, partnerships both using a commercial approach.

The public sector is increasingly looking to promote social value, e.g. increase take up of welfare benefits. Profits generated by commercial entities can be ploughed back to support council services, increase social value activities and generate new revenue streams.

“Councils’ commercial activity can provide a catalyst to bridge the increasing funding gap whilst also delivering ‘wider’ social value, providing that commercial initiatives create profit with a purpose.” *LGA Profit with a purpose Delivering social value through commercial activity*. The LATCo approach in particular, through its income generation activities, is able to fund additional activities to increase welfare take up. This can lead to improved support for the community and the vulnerable. This work is linked to the core activities of local government.

Oversight and strategic control being provided by councillors and a commercial streamlined governance structure will allow the LATCo tactical freedom to innovate and respond to market opportunities and productivity innovations.

A successful commercial culture allows greater efficiency, where management and staff are focused on delivering cost effective, efficient services. A commercial culture promotes a business-like environment, knowledge of the marketplace in which the company operates, and delivering services and products which are designed for customers.

A LATCo is sustainable and future-proofed when compared to shared services. This has been evidenced in the original decision to outsource to Civica. Maintaining a shared service for EKS would have had budgetary implications and ongoing issues with funding the services, with 67 posts at risk.

Financially, a LATCo incurs less of a pension liability than shared services, with LGPS employee contributions in the range of 20% compared to approximately 5% contributions for commercial organisations.

There is an added benefit with a low risk, lift and shift approach of migrating services from an already commercial entity to another commercial SDV. The impact on staff would be minimised by continuing with a commercial culture and approach.

Both shared services and a LATCo allow the partnership greater control over services than an outsourced SDV. Shared services are however not liable to corporation tax and VAT, whilst LATCo's which trade services are.

One of the potential scenarios to consider would be a drop in productivity due to lower staff engagement in the case of a shared services SDV. Staff have communicated a preference to migrate to a commercially focused SDV. In the case of a 2% drop in productivity an additional operating cost of £148,000 would be incurred. With an average staff cost of 37k across a base of 200 staff, the partnership would have to employ an additional 6 staff. In the case of a 3% drop in productivity the impact on operating costs would be an additional cost of £222,000 and in the case of a 5% drop in productivity an additional operating cost of £370,000 would be incurred.

3.5 Preferred Way Forward

The costs associated with a shared service model is higher due to the increased costs associated with terms and conditions of employment. There are currently 26 staff out of 188 , employed by Civica that are not on the LGPS. Given the differential between the current Civica pension contribution rate of 5% and LGPS contribution rates of 20%, it would be reasonable to assume that a LATCo would provide recurring annual savings of approximately £120k compared to an in-house shared service. Through the passage of time, this saving should increase through natural turnover in staffing with more employees moving on to a LATCo pension scheme.

LATCo's have been strongly associated with innovation and creativity, leading to increased productivity and staff morale. Developing new ways of working to counter unforeseen pressures such as Covid has maintained the ability to deliver services effectively. The ability to hold costs down and increase efficiency has been demonstrated by the transfer to Civica.

Taking into account the summary above the preferred way forward is to develop a LATCo business model.

The LATCo approach also presents the option of moving to a shared services vehicle at a later date if required by the partnership. There is an opportunity to consider implementing a two year break clause in order to review and assess the success of the LATCo. If it is felt the LATCo has not delivered the benefits identified, the LATCo can migrate to a shared services model. However if a shared services model is the preferred option, services cannot be transitioned to a LATCo due to pensions implications. The model would be unsustainable with no trading surplus and a substantial increase in pensions liability.

3.6 Governance

Good governance considers how to balance the freedom required by a commercial entity and retaining effective oversight of a company. It is important the EK partnership safeguards the spending of public money and ensures that trading activities are carried out in accordance with the partnership's ethos and values.

The model below is for information purposes only and is indicative of the type of governance that can be put in place. The governance arrangements set out in this section may be further developed or changed in the light of advice from our professional legal advisers in the event the business case is approved. For a full size model please refer to appendix 7.

Indicative model (subject to further advice from legal advisers)




Table 4 Indicative governance model

3.6.1 Articles of association

The company will be formed as a private company limited by shares, with 100% of the share capital retained by the EK partnership. Two key governance documents will be required, firstly a shareholders agreement and secondly the articles of association. The Articles of Association is essentially the constitution, outlining decision making powers of the directors.

The LATCo will have the ability to trade outside of the EK partnership but provide the majority of services to the EK partnership. The articles of association should ensure a Teckal exemption by;

- Confirming the rights to remove and appoint directors and provide for retirements where appropriate
- Ensuring that board composition is kept under review.
- Ensure at least 80% of the services are delivered to the EK partnership

3.6.2 Shareholders agreement

The shareholders agreement supplements the articles of association by setting out a contractual agreement between the LATCo and its shareholders (EK Partnership). It clarifies the powers of the LATCo and how the shareholders might influence those powers. It can be amended as the company evolves.

It would be beneficial for the agreement to indicate how any resultant surplus will be treated, e.g. a transfer to reserves for future investment and/or the paying of dividends to its shareholders and subsequent reinvestment to public services.

The agreement should clarify requirements for business planning and approval of the business plan, performance reporting, governance, decision making reporting and frequency.

3.6.3 Conflict of interest

A conflict of interest policy should be developed to ensure that councillors and officers are aware of potential conflicts of interest when performing their role for the local authority and their role in respect of the LATCo.

A formalised protocol should be introduced for when a council director is acting as a director for the new company.

3.6.4 Shareholders panel

The shareholders panel is a non-decision making body. There is an opportunity for the functions of the existing EKS committee to be reconstituted as a shareholders panel. The terms of reference could be reviewed and the panel could act as the political and strategic overview.

The shareholder panel is able to act as a mechanism to communicate the shareholders' views to the LATCo, and a means to evaluate the effectiveness of the LATCo and performance against strategic objectives.

3.6.5 Company board and Directors

All directors must comply with the Company act 2006 and act within their powers in accordance with the company's constitution, avoid conflicts of interest and exercise reasonable care, skill and diligence.

- An effective and entrepreneurial board will generate value for its shareholders
- The board must act with integrity, lead by example and promote a commercially focused but ethical culture
- The board will ensure adequate resources, measure performance and maintain effective controls including risk management and financial reporting
- Ensure there is effective engagement with shareholders and stakeholders
- The board should ensure effective workplace practices are in place for long term sustainable success

It is proposed that the company board of directors consist of the following;

- Managing Director - Mark Emery
- Head of Finance - tba
- Client manager by invite - tba
- 3* LA reps

The chief financial officer position could be filled by an existing Head of finance, if required from the partnership, until the LATCo is in a position to fund the post independently.

A client manager position could act as a coordination role between the board and individual councils. The position would act as a single point of contact for the councils and act as a smart client, proactively managing company performance.

This streamlined approach will facilitate speedier decision making and efficiency, ease communications and promote relationship building. It would also be advisable for the client manager to have the requisite skills set required, such as a revenues and benefits background. A pragmatic approach with a commitment to achieving the shared aims of all parties, would be of significant benefit.

3.6.6 Training and Induction

The existing team currently functions as a commercial organisation so has an in-depth knowledge of the services, however new directors/board members will still require training to ensure their understanding of the role within a LATCo, code of conduct and obligations as members of the board.

4. Commercial Case

The purpose of this section is to set out the procurement arrangements for the programme's projects and key activities. The choice of procurement method will be outlined below for each of the workstream outputs and approximate timescales for delivery.

4.1 Technology workstream

The main procurement of IT infrastructure, backup/storage, end user computing and security/access applications is outside of scope for this programme and the procurement of any new applications or hardware is being managed by the disaggregation project.

There is a requirement for an ongoing IT repairs and replacements programme ensuring the benefits of the latest technology is maximised and staff have the most up to date equipment supporting efficient and effective service delivery. It is envisaged that this programme will refresh on a 3 to 4 year basis and due to the investment required this project will follow a full procurement exercise. It is also expected that this programme will be managed by the LATCo's in-house IT team, as detailed below.

There is one key software application, OpenRevenues, that is currently owned by Civica. In order to facilitate a low risk implementation, the contract will be novated to the LATCo which will also allow the commercial entity to negotiate further favourable terms and conditions moving forward. It is envisaged the contract novation will commence after the LATCo receives approval and is formally set up.

IT support requirements will be met via an inhouse IT team of 5, who will TUPE across from EKS services to the LATCo. The ICT team to TUPE across consists of:

- ICT Support Manager x 1
- Senior ICT Support Engineer x 3
- Infrastructure Engineer x 1

Depending on the decisions currently being made on the form of provision of ICT security services to the EK partnership, additional ICT security resources may be required for LATCo.

A temporary number of licences for a SaaS finance system will be procured for approximately 6-12 months till a permanent finance system is installed. The existing finance system based at Thanet currently being utilised by EKS is end of life and undergoing a full procurement process. However due to the timescales of the project a decision has been made to lower the risk and implement an interim stand-alone solution for the LATCo.

4.2 Legal/Governance workstream

There is a requirement to procure legal advisory services to support the setup of the commercial entity, contract development, contract novation and ad hoc legal advice. This procurement will follow a soft procurement approach consisting of a scope of works being

prepared in order to attract three tenders. It is envisaged that the soft procurement exercise will commence once the business case has been formally approved by cabinet.

4.3 Payroll and HR services

Payroll services will be provided by Dover DC as well as HR services and these will operate via a recharge model. Dover DC currently provides payroll services as part of a shared service to the tri-council partnership.

4.4 Internal audit

As the Revenues and Benefits function is heavily regulated internal audit requirements are key to continual service delivery. Internal audit requirements will continue to be met by EKAP, a shared services partnership. The LATCo will procure the consultancy services on a day rate basis as part of the annual audit plan.

5. Financial Case

This financial case proves the affordability and funding of the EKS transition to the preferred service delivery vehicle of a LATCo. In the economic analysis above, a number of options were outlined and appraised of which the LATCo was deemed to offer the greatest benefits and lowest risk.

The purpose of this financial appraisal is to determine whether the EK partnership is able to fund and deliver the new LATCo, outlining the impact on capital, revenue and whole life costs of the new commercial company.

As the service is an existing commercial model, a lift and shift approach will be developed to the service transition leading to a low risk implementation. The financial case will therefore identify existing costs of the service and any new additional costs required to move to a LATCo service delivery vehicle.

The LATCo will be formed as a company limited by shares, allowing the company to trade in the private sector and passing any surplus back to the controlling local authorities. This legal status will be recognised as a private limited company.

5.1 VAT implications

The LATCo would be required to treat VAT in the same way that Civica currently does. As such a management fee chargeable by the LATCo would be at standard rate and could be recovered in full by the councils.

After tax, profit can be paid to the councils in the form of dividends, which themselves would not be subject to taxation.

5.2 Corporation tax implications

As a company limited by shares the LATCo will be liable for tax on any trading surplus made. Any trading surplus generated by the LATCo will be subject to corporation tax, however there are opportunities to offer the EK partnership a discount thereby minimising the impact if required.

Where surplus is generated it will be subject to corporation tax at either 19% or 25% depending on the level of surplus generated.

5.3 Inflation

Inflationary costs will be built into the pricing structure for new services and existing services utilising the average sector wage index. Any additional inflationary requirements such as

software contracts etc will be dealt with case by case to ensure services remain viable in the longer term.

5.4 Support and operational costs

Support services will be managed via a contract which identifies which support services will be provided by the LA's. SLA agreements, with clear KPI's outlined will be utilised to set out and manage performance. To avoid unfair competition rules all support services provided by the local authorities will have to be charged at full cost, in adherence with the Local Government and Housing Act 1989.

Support services will be reviewed every two years to ensure accurate costs are reflected within the contract and the ability to build in efficiencies realised as part of technology change or process efficiency.

5.4.1 Legal and Governance services

Legal support will have to be procured externally on an as and when required basis, due to lack of resources within the EK partnership. An agreement with a legal service will be procured. Information governance advice will be procured via the EK partnership. The partnership has an existing team which has resources available.

5.4.2 Financial services and Audit services

The LATCo will utilise financial systems based at Thanet and operational finance and insurance services will be provided by the EK partnership. Specialist accounting services will be procured from third parties ensuring statutory accounts preparation and external audit is compliant and also where corporation tax and VAT filing requires completion.

Internal Audit services will be procured via EKAP, a rolling audit programme will provide assurance and internal control. The internal audit service will require access to company data which requires outlining in the shareholders agreement.

The quality assurance team currently residing in Civica may transfer to EKAP or the client management team as part of the service transition, this will formally be agreed as part of the consultation and set up of operations with EKAP. There are minimal cost implications associated with the transfer, for one management uplift.

5.4.3 HR and payroll services

Payroll services will be provided by Dover DC, who currently provide services to a number of the partners. Costs will be incurred for setup and build of the new payroll scheme which will be factored into the business case. HR services will also be provided by a 0.3 FTE resource at Dover DC.

5.4.4 IT development and support services

The existing residual IT team of 6, who provides support and maintenance services, will remain in place and no additional support is envisaged. The centralised IT security team will also continue to provide services to the LATCo.

A replacements and renewals cost will be added to the business case for IT hardware to ensure resilience, as a technology refresh programme. A current refresh programme has been agreed but will not form part of this financial case.

Software licences in use for key systems will be novated to the LATCo and have been presented as part of the business case.

5.4.5 Accommodation services

Currently accommodation is supplied at a nominal fee across the three sites, with a move to a LATCo all accommodation costs will have to be charged at a market rate. This additional cost has been factored into the business case.

5.4.6 Structural costs

The LATCo senior management team supporting the board will consist of a;

- Service director
- Corporate head of service
- Head of Customer service
- Head of Revenues and Benefits.
- An existing Head of Finance
- A client manager

The remaining staff structure will be transferred across as is and it is anticipated that there will be no structural salary increases and no redundancy costs incurred.

5.5 Financial analysis

A detailed financial analysis and operating budget is attached in appendix 4, indicating savings being generated for all three councils from year 1 of the transition, as a consequence of moving to a LATCo model. The financial model has been developed to minimise the surplus in order to realise savings for the councils. As the business grows there will be an opportunity to re-invest and generate new income streams to support council services.

Whilst the level of current surplus on the arrangement is commercially sensitive, we are assured that the level of profit is sufficient to absorb the proposed level of additional costs and still deliver a surplus. This indicative budget will therefore be subject to further due diligence once the business case is agreed and the CCN is signed.

The two tables below compare costs associated with a LATCo SDV and a shared services SDV. Although it cannot be guaranteed, both models will deliver savings which will be

identified and confirmed as part of the implementation process. With both models no additional costs will be incurred.

Table 5 (a)

| LATCO | Transition Year | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 |
|------------------------------|-----------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| Revenue | -8,167,430 | -8,509,127 | -8,879,492 | -9,279,672 | -9,710,859 | -10,179,293 |
| Staffing costs | 6,750,810 | 6,990,900 | 7,256,824 | 7,533,845 | 7,837,603 | 8,153,555 |
| Support services | 678,100 | 705,300 | 733,500 | 762,700 | 793,000 | 824,800 |
| Services and supplies | 540,500 | 562,100 | 584,500 | 607,900 | 632,200 | 657,600 |
| One Off Company set up costs | 125,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Cost | 8,094,410 | 8,258,300 | 8,574,824 | 8,904,445 | 9,262,803 | 9,635,955 |
| Trading Position | -73,020 | -250,827 | -304,668 | -375,227 | -448,056 | -543,338 |

Table 5 (b)

| Shared Service | Transition Year | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 |
|------------------------------|-----------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| Revenue | -8,167,430 | -8,509,127 | -8,879,492 | -9,279,672 | -9,710,859 | -10,179,293 |
| Staffing costs | 7,134,884 | 7,343,562 | 7,628,184 | 7,924,124 | 8,231,929 | 8,552,066 |
| Support services | 623,100 | 648,100 | 674,000 | 700,900 | 728,800 | 758,000 |
| Services and supplies | 540,500 | 562,100 | 584,500 | 607,900 | 632,200 | 657,600 |
| One Off Company set up costs | 55,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Cost | 8,353,484 | 8,553,762 | 8,886,684 | 9,232,924 | 9,592,929 | 9,967,666 |
| Trading Position | 186,054 | 44,635 | 7,192 | -46,748 | -117,930 | -211,627 |

5.6 Market/Competitor analysis

The LATCo has a number of commercial products which have been market tested for potential revenue growth and the intention is to build a solid sales pipeline for approximately 20% of the work, 80% being allocated to the owning councils, as stated under Teckel exemption rules. The financial case outlines product 1 which has been considered suitable for bringing to the market;

Product 1 (external market) - End point assessments (Revenues and Benefits Apprenticeships)

- Market location - national, UK wide.
- Market segment - 112 active apprentices, market is worth approx 100k currently. Market can be further capitalised for customer services as phase 2.
- Competition - one main supplier - South west councils
- USP - Civica have a strong Revenues and Benefits skills set which is commercially focused.
- Set up costs are low; £3,300
- Revenue forecast based on a conservative estimate of 10% of the market
- Pricing model is £937 per apprentice.

Further market analysis will be conducted as part of the business plan before progressing to service delivery.

5.7 Historical growth

The service has experienced strong growth, especially in Civica's on demand services function. This growth shows a strong business model with an active market to generate further revenue and growth. With a LATCo service delivery vehicle there are a number of opportunities to grow the business further and redirect surplus to support council services.

6. Management Case


The management business case demonstrates the robust arrangements in place for the delivery, monitoring and evaluation of the service transition programme. The case below demonstrates the preferred option of a commercial LATCo, can be successfully delivered and is managed in accordance with best practice and subject to independent assurance.

This part of the business case outlines the partnership's ability to deliver the programme, ensuring capacity, capability and resources have been taken into account.

The service transition programme will follow the MSP (Managing Successful Programmes) framework, an established best practice programme management framework, designed to align programmes and projects to organisational strategy and enable enterprise agility. MSP focuses on the delivery of outcomes of benefit, while mitigating risk and actively engaging stakeholders.

Table 6

Service transition programme governance model



6.1 Programme governance

The programme is being managed by a qualified MSP practitioner with service transition experience, along with executive sponsorship from the EK section 151 officers group. The programme board consists of experienced staff across the three councils, ensuring a consistent and coherent approach.

Political overview is managed via the EKS committee, ensuring effective engagement is in place with key stakeholders and governance is robust. See Appendix 2 for a detailed programme plan.

The contract strategic board will be utilised as a governance link to Civica, ensuring the transition is well managed, communication is effective and decision making is transparent and effective. The two service transition programmes will be dovetailed to ensure a smooth transition.

Communications is being managed by the communications lead from Canterbury CC, who will act as the central point of contact and manage information flow to ensure consistency and transparency.

The programme team consists of subject matter experts across the partnership and external programme assurance will be provided by EKAP, the East Kent Audit Partnership. EKAP will provide audit facilitation, ensuring robust risk management is in place. EKAP will also provide Programme assurance and act as a critical friend to the programme team.

To minimise ambiguity, refine and improve delivery and bring certainty wherever possible, planning and control activities will take place at programme board and workstream level throughout the lifecycle of the programme. Highlight reports, risk registers and issue logs will be produced for each monthly programme board meeting. Progress will be monitored against milestones and where required issues will be escalated to the sponsoring group and sponsor.

Table 7 Programme team

| Name | Title | Organisation | Role |
|----------------|--|---------------------|---|
| Chris Blundell | Director of Corporate Services/ Head of Shared Services | Thanet | Senior Responsible Owner (SRO) Chair programme board |
| Jasvir Chohan | Interim EKS Transition Manager | Thanet | Programme manager |
| Mark Emery | Partnership director | Civica | Programme board member |
| Mike Davis | Director of Finance | Dover | Sponsoring group |
| Nicci Mills | Service director Finance and Procurement | Canterbury | Sponsoring group |
| Harvey Rudd | Solicitor to the council | Dover | Programme team Legal |
| Peter Francis | Head of HR and Payroll | Dover | Programme team HR |

| | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------|------------|-------------------------------------|
| Leo Whitlock | Head of Policy and Communications | Canterbury | Programme team Communications |
| Dan Evans | Head of ICT | Thanet | Programme team IT |
| Matt Sanham | Head of Finance and Procurement | Thanet | Programme team Finance |
| Julian Stanbury | Information Governance Manager | Canterbury | Programme team Corporate governance |

The programme has promoted the use of specialist advisers when required, bringing in depth expertise, skills and capacity to support the programme. An external review was conducted by CIPFA (Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy) which is a UK-based international accountancy membership and standard-setting body. The external expertise was brought in to test the outline business case and recommend an approach to develop a full robust business case. The service transition manager is a MSP and certified change management practitioner.

To support the transition Civica has provided a detailed service exit plan to support the transition phase. External Civica support has also been available from a decommissioning point of view and they have worked closely with the partnership to ensure a smooth transition takes place.

6.2 Change management framework and strategy

The change management strategy and framework will need to reflect the complexity of change required and the pace, taking into account the drivers for change and anticipated resistance. The EKS transition programme is a service transition programme brought about by a market exit of the supplier and not due to service improvement requirements or other external factors. The change management strategy will be based on the Letwin model of change;




Table 8 Change management framework

As part of the engagement process undertaken to date and outlined in the communications and engagement strategy, the programme has significant support of key stakeholders.

However there are a number of alternative service delivery vehicle options that can be utilised to deliver outcomes and the programme has taken this into account. Therefore the change management framework and strategy reflects the level of buy-in already gained and the political support for the LATCo commercial option.

The implementation approach will follow a big bang approach where services will decommission from Civica and transfer to the LATCo. A CCN/Deed will be served with notice to Civica to indicate an exit date.

As the majority of systems and processes will remain intact training requirements will be limited and the existing commercial culture of the team and service will be encouraged to transfer across.

6.3 Benefits realisation

The outline business case defines a number of benefits associated with the transition to a commercial LATCo, see table 2. The benefits register will be reviewed at programme board meetings to ensure benefits are realised during and post transition. Some of the benefits are longer term in that it will require a number of months to realise growth targets. All tangible and intangible benefits have been identified in the economic case above.

6.4 Risk management arrangements

The outline business case included a risk register which is now being developed further to consider programme risk, financial risk, reputational risk and operational risk. An initial risk mapping exercise, conducted at the inaugural programme board meeting, identified key risks associated with the service transition programme.

All programme risk will be managed via the programme board via a risk register. The programme risk management will be aligned to the council's risk management policy which sets out risk identification, assessment and evaluation.

6.5 Programme assurance and evaluation

Internal audit will conduct a review to independently assess the risk management protocols and mitigations put into place for the programme. This level of programme assurance will ensure that procedures are rigorously followed and risk identification and management is proactively managed at programme board level.

Internal audit will provide assurance on use of risk registers, approval processes, governance and councillor involvement & oversight.

Internal audit will act as a critical friend to provide programme assurance, this provides independent and impartial assessment that the service transition programme's spending objectives, technical requirements, security and critical success factors can be delivered successfully.

Prior to going live Internal audit along with the programme sponsor will sign off the transition plan and move to BAU.

Once the new service delivery vehicle has been implemented, a programme closure stage will be initiated and the programme organisation will be disbanded. A lessons learnt register will feedback any learning to policy and strategy and any established PMO functions.

Full programme closure can be confirmed when the business case has been satisfied, all workstream activities completed and any remaining handover or transition activities defined and assigned to relevant BAU operations.

There is an intention to develop a contingency plan with Civica to support operations from June 24 to January 25 in case of major complications.

Contingency communications plan and narrative to be agreed prior to going live with Leo Whitlock.

Appendices

Appendix 1 SWOT analysis

| Option 1: Refuse to accept early contract termination | |
|---|--|
| Strengths/Opportunities for LA | Weakness/Threats for LA |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract in place until February 2025. No immediate action required by the Council. Certainty of price. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Risk of service withdrawal/running the contract down which may degrade performance. Risk of relationship breakdown Increased flight risk of key personnel. |

| Option 2: Recontract with another outsourcer | |
|---|--|
| Strengths/Opportunities for LA | Weakness/Threats for LA |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fixed costs Guaranteed service with contractual penalties. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Second source outsourcing and therefore there may be little market interest, ie how would a provider cover bid costs. Resource intensive for the Authority to conduct a procurement exercise. Potential for reduced strategic fit with remaining providers – The original Civica offer was attractive because of the jobs guarantee. Against the current flow of insourcing. Increased short term flight risk of key personnel May not fit with political ideology. |

| Option 3: Bring in house and disaggregate in part or full | |
|---|--|
| Strengths/Opportunities for LA | Weakness/Threats for LA |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fits with trend to insource | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Breaks up a highly performing service – removes ‘one Team’ approach. Potential for significant extra ICT cost if Open Revenues is split into 3 installations. |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Some specialist teams result in difficulties in dividing staff between LA's which is likely to result in increased staff costs. ● One team approach would be less viable resulting in the need to staff for the mean or median rather than the trough. ● Possible Challenges in recruiting externally to significant numbers of both key and transactional vacant posts. ● New operating model would need to be introduced which increased the risk of service failure. ● All TUPE staff and future employees would gain access to LGPS at increased cost. ● LA terms and conditions which can be generous compared to Civica Terms. For example Leave, sickness, maternity etc. |
|--|---|

| Option 4: Bring into EKS | |
|--|---|
| Strengths/Opportunities for LA | Weakness/Threats for LA |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Existing vehicle available. ● Governance model in place. ● Already has admitted body status to KCC LGPS. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Existing negative perception of EKS which will be a challenge to sell positively as 'next phase' – would be viewed as retrograde step. ● Existing motivation and recognition approach not wholly compatible – resulting risk of additional staff costs. ● Business model needs to be fully considered and sustainable to avoid previous pitfalls – The original business model of absorbing all cost increases was the primary cause of the need to outsource. The returning service is lean, and achieving further efficiencies to cover cost increases would not be possible. |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All staff would gain access to LGPS which will significantly increase cost. • May not fit with political ideology |
|--|--|

| Option 5: Create a new LATCo | |
|--|--|
| Strengths/Opportunities for LA | Weakness/Threats for LA |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimises future cost as will be run as a commercial entity with appropriate financial and operational governance managed locally. • Retention of all surpluses to re-invest into the service. • Ability to trade under Teckal rules which opens up trading opportunities with other LAs. • T's & C's could be developed to maximise retention whilst minimising costs. • Commercial approach to staff motivation and recognition to drive performance – minimising overall staff costs. • Makes optimum use of the skills learned by the team in the previous 3 years. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would require initial consultancy investment for due diligence, set up and boundaries of a LATCo, e.g vaT, trading and reporting obligations etc. • Legacy perceptions of EKH failure so the Business model needs to be fully considered and sustainable to avoid previous pitfalls. • LATCo would require Finance, HR and Payroll support. • LATCo would need admitted body status to KCC LGPS and to establish its own pension scheme. • May not fit with political ideology |

Left Blank

East Kent Services partnership

| PROGRAMME TITLE | | SE Service Transition programme | Programme Sponsor | Chris Stunell | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|--|---------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|----------|----------------------|------------------------|-----------|---------|-----------|----------|---------|-------------|-------|-------|------------|------|------|--------|-----------|---------|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| PROGRAMME MANAGER | | Jarvis Chetham | DATE | 22/09/23 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | M | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Stabilisation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WBS NUMBER | TASK TITLE | TASK OWNER | START DATE | DUE DATE | DURATION | PCT OF TASK COMPLETE | PHASE ONE - Initiation | | | PHASE TWO | | | PHASE THREE | | | PHASE FOUR | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | August | September | October | November | December | January | February | March | April | May | June | July | August | September | October | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | MT | TD | WT | MT | TD | WT | MT | TD | WT | MT | TD | WT | MT | TD | WT | MT | TD | WT | MT | TD | WT |
| 1 | Programme Conception and Initiation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.1 | Agree Programme brief | Jarvis C | 01/06/23 | 11/09/23 | 10 | 100% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.2 | Develop and Agree programme definition plan | Jarvis C | 11/06/23 | 25/09/23 | 14 | 80% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.3 | Agree Comms & engagement plan | SW/JC | 01/06/23 | 11/09/23 | 10 | 80% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.4 | Develop risk register | Jarvis C | 16/06/23 | 23/09/23 | 7 | 100% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.5 | Develop stakeholder management plan | Jarvis C | 01/06/23 | 11/09/23 | 10 | 70% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.6 | Develop programme control docs | Jarvis C | 01/06/23 | 11/09/23 | 10 | 80% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.7 | Develop programme plan | Jarvis C | 01/06/23 | 21/09/23 | 20 | 100% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.8 | Merge Civica exit plan | Jarvis C | 14/06/23 | 18/09/23 | 4 | 100% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.9 | Review Civica contract | JC/ME | 21/06/23 | 01/09/23 | 10 | 80% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.9 | Agree Governance | JC/HR | 01/06/23 | 11/09/23 | 10 | 100% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.9.1 | Develop and agree business case | Jarvis C | 01/06/23 | 20/09/23 | 49 | 90% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.9.2 | Approval of business case - M | Jarvis C | 06/11/23 | 16/11/23 | 10 | 0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | HR/Payroll workstream | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.1 | Agree HR provision and cost for SDV | PI/ME | 01/06/23 | 11/09/23 | 10 | 0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.2 | Agree payroll build costs | Peter F | 01/06/23 | 28/09/23 | 24 | 0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.3 | Agree payroll change to SDV | Peter F | 29/06/23 | 30/09/23 | 1 | 0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.4 | Agree alternative pension scheme | Peter F | 01/06/23 | 28/09/23 | 28 | 0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.5 | Consult unions | ME/PI | 20/11/23 | 08/12/23 | 19 | 0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.6 | Agree Tape due diligence process | Peter F | 17/11/23 | 17/12/23 | 30 | 0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.7 | Agree Tape consultation & timetable | Peter F | 17/11/23 | 17/12/23 | 30 | 0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.8 | Agree residual staff structure/developments - ITCA staff | ME/DB | 17/11/23 | 17/12/23 | 30 | 0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.9 | Implement HR/Payroll processes for new SDV | Peter F | 15/04/24 | 10/04/24 | 35 | 0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.9.1 | Commence Tape consultation | PI/ME | 01/02/24 | 01/05/24 | 90 | 0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Finance workstream | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.1 | Produce financial business case | MS/JC | 01/06/23 | 31/09/23 | 30 | 80% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.2 | Confirm financial/accountancy function for SDV | Matt S | 21/06/23 | 31/09/23 | 10 | 0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.3 | Confirm insurance changes required with new SDV | Alison J | 21/06/23 | 31/09/23 | 10 | 0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.4 | Confirm tax/WRT process for new SDV | Matt S | 21/06/23 | 31/09/23 | 10 | 0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.5 | Apply for new pension scheme - M | Matt S | 01/06/23 | 28/09/23 | 28 | 0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.6 | Remedial and simplify recharges for SDV | Greg D | 21/06/23 | 31/09/23 | 10 | 80% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.7 | SDV setup on new temp finance system | Greg D | 01/01/24 | 08/04/24 | 97 | 0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.8 | Setup CA - financial statements etc | Greg D | 01/01/24 | 08/04/24 | 97 | 0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.9 | Setup new processes | Greg D | 01/01/24 | 08/04/24 | 97 | 0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.9.1 | Go live new finance system - M | Matt S | 26/05/24 | 10/04/24 | 14 | 0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Legal/Governance workstream | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.1 | Provide notice to Civica - M | CB/HR | 01/12/23 | 15/12/23 | 14 | 0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.2 | Agree committee structure | HR/Matt A | 01/06/23 | 08/09/23 | 7 | 100% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.3 | Develop a scope and brief for legal work | HR/JC | 01/06/23 | 18/09/23 | 14 | 100% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.4 | Self procurement of legal support - Co setup/contracts etc | Harvey R | 17/11/23 | 17/12/23 | 30 | 0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.5 | Review delegations of HoSs | Harvey R | 17/11/23 | 17/01/24 | 66 | 0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.6 | Review contract setup - 1st 3 | Harvey R | 17/11/23 | 17/01/24 | 66 | 0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.7 | Check service contracts with councils - IT/HR/Payroll | JC/ME | 17/11/23 | 30/12/23 | 39 | 0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Information Governance workstream | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5.1 | Assess data processing responsibility | Julian S | 02/06/23 | 11/09/23 | 9 | 100% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5.2 | Develop DP policy | JL/ME | 02/01/24 | 01/02/24 | 29 | 0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5.3 | Register SDV with ICO as data controller | Julian S | 02/01/24 | 08/01/24 | 6 | 0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5.4 | Agree FOI/SARS processes/SLA | JL/ME | 09/01/24 | 08/02/24 | 30 | 0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5.5 | Arrange appt of Qualified Person per FOIA200 s36(5) | Julian S | 22/01/24 | 01/01/24 | 9 | 0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Information Technology workstream | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| ID | Task | Responsible | Start Date | End Date | Duration | Progress % | Completion Status |
|--------------------|--|-----------------|------------|----------|----------|------------|-------------------|
| 6.1 | Design IT Infrastructure roadmap | Dan E | 01/06/23 | 11/08/23 | 10 | 65% | Progress |
| 6.2 | Paper to S&P group | Dan E | 21/06/23 | 25/09/23 | 4 | 0% | Not Started |
| 6.3 | Agree access and security of data/environment | Dan E | 17/11/23 | 17/01/24 | 60 | 0% | Not Started |
| 6.4 | Develop data migration plan - staff/applications | Dan E | 17/11/23 | 17/01/24 | 60 | 0% | Not Started |
| 6.5 | Procure data backup (S&P) and protection for SDV | Dan E | 17/11/23 | 17/03/24 | 120 | 0% | Not Started |
| 6.6 | Review software integrations | Dan E | 17/11/23 | 17/02/24 | 90 | 0% | Not Started |
| 6.7 | Relocate laptops/MSOffice/elo to Civica staff | Dan E | 17/11/23 | 17/03/24 | 120 | 0% | Not Started |
| 6.8 | Review and update software contracts | Dan E/Mark E | 17/11/23 | 17/01/24 | 60 | 0% | Not Started |
| 6.9 | Novation of Openview/ecs contract to new SDV | MS/H&SE | 29/04/24 | 29/05/24 | 30 | 0% | Not Started |
| 6.9.1 | Register web domain for SDV | Dan E | 01/02/24 | 15/02/24 | 14 | 0% | Not Started |
| 6.9.2 | Implement new IT Infrastructure | Dan E | 01/04/24 | 31/05/24 | 60 | 0% | Not Started |
| 6.9.3 | Go live preparations | Dan E | 25/06/24 | 30/09/24 | 95 | 0% | Not Started |
| 7 SDV setup | | | | | | | |
| 7.1 | Set up SDV structure/governance | Legal | 02/01/24 | 02/04/24 | 90 | 0% | Not Started |
| 7.2 | Appoint board of directors | Coly/C/O's | 02/01/24 | 02/04/24 | 90 | 0% | Not Started |
| 7.3 | Agree shadow board of directors? | Coly/C/O's | 02/01/24 | 02/04/24 | 90 | 0% | Not Started |
| 7.4 | Train board of directors | Sam/anna | 02/04/24 | 01/05/24 | 29 | 0% | Not Started |
| 7.5 | Agree branding and values | Mark E | 01/03/24 | 31/05/24 | 90 | 0% | Not Started |
| 7.6 | Develop service/business plan | Mark E | 01/03/24 | 31/05/24 | 90 | 0% | Not Started |
| 7.7 | Agree KPIs | Mark E | 01/03/24 | 31/05/24 | 90 | 0% | Not Started |
| 7.8 | Develop staff policies | Mark E | 01/03/24 | 31/05/24 | 90 | 0% | Not Started |
| 7.9 | Agree support service set up/coord - HR/IT/Finance/Legal | JC/ME | 01/03/24 | 31/05/24 | 90 | 0% | Not Started |
| 7.9.1 | Agree SLAs | Mark E | 01/03/24 | 31/05/24 | 90 | 0% | Not Started |
| 7.9.2 | Agree pay review/bonus process/deals | Mark E | 01/03/24 | 31/05/24 | 90 | 0% | Not Started |
| 7.9.3 | Review and update business continuity plans | Mark E/Councils | 17/04/24 | 08/07/24 | 21 | 0% | Not Started |
| 7.9.4 | Freeze vacant posts | Mark E | 10/05/24 | 10/06/24 | 30 | 0% | Not Started |
| 7.9.5 | Transition services and staff to new SDV | Prog team | 17/05/24 | 10/06/24 | 23 | 0% | Not Started |

Appendix 3 Risk Register

| Risk Ref | Nature of Primary Risk | Risk Description | Effect (if risk occurs, issue is unresolved, assumption is incorrect) | Pre Mitigation | | | | | Post Mitigation | | | | | Risk escalation (Corporate/service/programme/withdrawn) | Risk Owner | Date Last Reviewed | |
|-------------|------------------------|---|--|----------------|-------|-------------|-------|-------------|--|------------|-------|----------|-------|---|------------|--------------------|-------------|
| | | | | Likelihood | Score | Impact | Score | Risk rating | Risk Mitigation or Corrective Measure | Likelihood | Score | Impact | Score | | | | Risk rating |
| EKSTRANS_02 | Financial | Those associated with a threat to funding/budgets/income generation | Revs/Bens system licensing issues lead to additional cost being incurred | Likely | 3 | Moderate | 2 | 6 | Ensure financial case incorporates contingency amount. | Unlikely | 2 | Minor | 1 | 2 | Programme | MS | 23/8/2023 |
| EKSTRANS_03 | Financial | Those associated with a threat to funding/budgets/income generation | LATCo does not deliver growth in year 1 | Unlikely | 2 | Moderate | 2 | 4 | Focus on developing business for alternative product & improve market research | Rare | 1 | Minor | 1 | 1 | Corporate | ME | 23/8/2023 |
| EKSTRANS_04 | Financial | Those associated with a threat to funding/ | New SDV has impact on all 3 councils reserves | Unlikely | 2 | Significant | 3 | 6 | If year 2 financial position still impacting councils | Rare | 1 | Moderate | 2 | 2 | Corporate | CB | 23/8/2023 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|------------|-----------------------------------|---|----------|---|-------------|---|---|---|------|---|----------|---|---|-----------|-------|-----------|
| | | budgets/income generation | | | | | | | consider year 2 break clause and move to alternative outsourcing supplier | | | | | | | | |
| EKSTRANS_05 | Governance | Those relating to decision making | Business case approval has to be approved by council impacting delivery timeline and greater scrutiny | Unlikely | 2 | Moderate | 2 | 4 | Ensure decision making route has been confirmed prior to approval and agree with demservs | Rare | 1 | Minor | 1 | 1 | Programme | JC | 23/8/2023 |
| EKSTRANS_06 | Governance | Those relating to decision making | Business case recommends a SS model, leading to staff flight | Unlikely | 2 | Significant | 3 | 6 | Ensure staff engagement is effective from start to end of programme | Rare | 1 | Moderate | 2 | 2 | Programme | JC/ME | 23/8/2023 |
| EKSTRANS_07 | Governance | Those relating to decision making | New administration does not ratify a LATCo approach | Unlikely | 2 | Significant | 3 | 6 | Ensure LATCo business case is robust and communicate benefits | Rare | 1 | Moderate | 2 | 2 | Corporate | JC | 23/8/2023 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|-----------------|---|--|----------|---|-------------|---|---|--|----------|---|-------------|---|---|-----------|----|-----------|
| EKSTRANS_08 | Governance | Those relating to decision making | Pension scheme requires approval by pensions committee, delaying delivery significantly and increasing costs | Rare | 1 | Severe | 4 | 4 | Ensure early engagement with KCC pensions team to confirm process | Rare | 1 | Significant | 3 | 3 | Programme | CB | 23/8/2023 |
| EKSTRANS_09 | Governance | Those relating to decision making | Civica do not extend contract deadline | Unlikely | 2 | Severe | 4 | 8 | Ensure transition planning incorporates a fall back position/process | Unlikely | 2 | Significant | 3 | 6 | Programme | ME | 23/8/2023 |
| EKSTRANS_10 | Human resources | Those relating to the impact on staff and resources | Lack of resource/illness leading to time impact on programme delivery - Finance/IT | likely | 3 | Significant | 3 | 9 | Investigate and secure temporary resources | Likely | 3 | Significant | 3 | 9 | Service | CB | 23/8/2023 |
| EKSTRANS_11 | Human resources | Those relating to the impact on staff and resources | Lack of IT skills to develop new IT model | Unlikely | 2 | Severe | 4 | 8 | Temporary staff recruitment plan | Unlikely | 2 | Significant | 3 | 6 | Service | DE | 23/8/2023 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|-----------------|--|---|-------------|---|-------------|---|----|---|----------|---|-------------|---|---|-----------|-------|-----------|
| EKSTRANS_12 | Human resources | Those relating to the impact on staff and resources | Lack of Internal Legal resource leads to poor governance design, impacting new SDV operations | Very Likely | 4 | Significant | 3 | 12 | Engage external legal advisors and scope work required. | Unlikely | 2 | Moderate | 2 | 4 | Service | HR | 23/8/2023 |
| EKSTRANS_13 | Technology | Those relating to core utilities or ability to provide effective ICT | Lack of long term investment leads to inefficiency and loss of business | Unlikely | 2 | Significant | 3 | 6 | Ensure business plan is robust and approved | Rare | 1 | Moderate | 2 | 2 | Corporate | CB/MS | 23/8/2023 |
| EKSTRANS_14 | Technology | Those relating to core utilities or ability to provide effective ICT | Insufficient information governance leads to data breach and financial penalty and loss of reputation | Unlikely | 2 | Severe | 4 | 8 | Ensure IG policies are developed and rolled out prior to transition | Rare | 1 | Significant | 3 | 3 | Service | JS/ME | 23/8/2023 |
| EKSTRANS_15 | Technology | Those relating to core utilities or ability to provide effective ICT | Existing payroll system capacity leads to impact on payroll processing for new SDV | Unlikely | 2 | Severe | 4 | 8 | Investigate alternative providers and ensure early engagement with PF | Rare | 1 | Moderate | 2 | 2 | Programme | PF | 23/8/2023 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|------------------------|--|---|----------|---|----------|---|---|---|----------|---|----------|---|---|-----------|-------|-----------|
| EKSTRANS_17 | Technology | Those relating to core utilities or ability to provide effective ICT | Issues with disaggregated IT impacts access to HB/CT data. | Unlikely | 2 | Severe | 4 | 8 | Ensure IT disaggregation plan incorporates early testing of HB/CT data access | Rare | 1 | Moderate | 2 | 2 | Service | DE | 23/8/2023 |
| EKSTRANS_18 | Strategic/reputational | Those impacting the success of the programme to meet its objectives | Non agreement of programme brief and objectives by partners | Unlikely | 2 | Moderate | 2 | 4 | Ensure early engagement with partners to assess scope of work | Rare | 1 | Minor | 1 | 1 | Programme | JC | 23/8/2023 |
| EKSTRANS_19 | Strategic/reputational | Those impacting the success of the programme to meet its objectives | Change of SDV leads to impact on customers | Unlikely | 2 | Moderate | 2 | 4 | Consider year 2 break clause and move to alternative outsourcing supplier | Unlikely | 2 | Moderate | 2 | 4 | Corporate | JC/ME | 23/8/2023 |
| EKSTRANS_20 | Strategic/reputational | Those impacting the success of the programme to meet its objectives | Civica relationship is impacted by delayed decision making | Unlikely | 2 | Moderate | 2 | 4 | ME to liaise closely with Civica via CSB and ensure business case approval to agreed timescales | Rare | 1 | Minor | 1 | 1 | Programme | ME/JC | 23/8/2023 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|-------------|-------------------------------|--|----------|---|----------|---|----|--|----------|---|-------------|---|---|-----------|----------|-----------|
| EKSTRANS_21 | Operational | Impacts delivery of programme | Poor planning leads to transition failure and roll back required | Unlikely | 2 | Severe | 4 | 8 | Ensure early engagement with programme team re: programme plan and dovetail to civic exit plan. | Rare | 1 | Moderate | 2 | 2 | Programme | CB | 23/8/2023 |
| EKSTRANS_22 | Operational | Impacts delivery of programme | Key staff unavailable for transition | likely | 3 | Severe | 4 | 12 | Develop transition plan to ensure annual leave is not permitted during transition and avoid key dates. | Unlikely | 2 | Significant | 3 | 6 | Programme | JC/Leads | 23/8/2023 |
| EKSTRANS_23 | Operational | Impacts delivery of programme | User acceptance testing of new processes and systems fails | Unlikely | 2 | Severe | 4 | 8 | Build stabilisation capacity and timescale to iron out issues | Unlikely | 2 | Significant | 3 | 6 | Programme | ME/DE | 23/8/2023 |
| EKSTRANS_24 | Operational | Impacts delivery of programme | Drop in service levels impacts performance | Unlikely | 2 | Moderate | 2 | 4 | Ensure effective communications with customers and develop key messaging | Rare | 1 | Moderate | 2 | 2 | Programme | ME/LW | 23/8/2023 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | | prior to go live | | | | | | | | |
| EKSTRANS_25 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Appendix 4 - Financial analysis

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| Average wage index (inflation) | | 6.20% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4 | 4 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Revenue | | Transition Year | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Trading Growth (New Opportunities) | | | -5,000 | -15,000 | -25,000 | -35,000 | -50,000 |
| Trading Growth (Training) | | | -10,000 | -15,000 | -20,000 | -25,000 | -30,000 |
| Council Recharge | | -8,167,430 | -8,494,127 | -8,849,492 | -9,234,672 | -9,650,859 | -10,099,293 |
| Total | | -8,167,430 | -8,509,127 | -8,879,492 | -9,279,672 | -9,710,859 | -10,179,293 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Staffing costs | Exist/ New | | | | | | |
| Salaries inc On costs | Exist | 6,608,710 | 6,873,100 | 7,148,024 | 7,433,945 | 7,731,303 | 8,040,555 |
| Pension Reduction | New | 0 | -30,000 | -45,000 | -60,000 | -60,000 | -60,000 |
| Misc Staff costs | Exist | 38,100 | 39,600 | 41,200 | 42,800 | 44,500 | 46,300 |
| Corporate Services | New | 100,000 | 104,000 | 108,200 | 112,500 | 117,000 | 121,700 |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| NED expenses | New | 4,000 | 4,200 | 4,400 | 4,600 | 4,800 | 5,000 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Support services | | | | | | | |
| HR | New | 20,000 | 20,800 | 21,600 | 22,500 | 23,400 | 24,300 |
| H&S | New | 10,000 | 10,400 | 10,800 | 11,200 | 11,600 | 12,100 |
| ICT | Exist | 451,600 | 469,700 | 488,500 | 508,000 | 528,300 | 549,400 |
| Finance | Exist | 61,900 | 64,400 | 67,000 | 69,700 | 72,500 | 75,400 |
| Internal audit | Exist | 29,600 | 30,800 | 32,000 | 33,300 | 34,600 | 36,000 |
| External finance | New | 45,000 | 46,800 | 48,700 | 50,600 | 52,600 | 54,700 |
| Legal | Exist | 10,000 | 10,400 | 10,800 | 11,200 | 11,600 | 12,100 |
| Payroll | New | 40,000 | 41,600 | 43,300 | 45,000 | 46,800 | 48,700 |
| Digital services - website | New | 10,000 | 10,400 | 10,800 | 11,200 | 11,600 | 12,100 |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Services and supplies | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| 365 Licences | | 46,250 | 48,100 | 50,000 | 52,000 | 54,100 | 56,300 |
| IT software Licences(Open R) | New | 177,000 | 184,100 | 191,500 | 199,200 | 207,200 | 215,500 |
| IT software Licences(E-forms etc) | New | 14,000 | 14,600 | 15,200 | 15,800 | 16,400 | 17,100 |
| IT software 8*8 | Exist | 99,750 | 103,700 | 107,800 | 112,100 | 116,600 | 121,300 |

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Infrastructure Costs | | 20,000 | 20,800 | 21,600 | 22,500 | 23,400 | 24,300 |
| IT Hardware Rentals | New | 55,000 | 57,200 | 59,500 | 61,900 | 64,400 | 67,000 |
| Print and mail services | Exist | 10,000 | 10,400 | 10,800 | 11,200 | 11,600 | 12,100 |
| Accommodation | New | 118,500 | 123,200 | 128,100 | 133,200 | 138,500 | 144,000 |
| | | | | | | | |
| One Off Company set up costs | | | | | | | |
| Legal | New | 50,000 | | | | | |
| Payroll | New | 30,000 | | | | | |
| HR | New | 15,000 | | | | | |
| Marketing/Rebranding | New | 10,000 | | | | | |
| Governance - training | New | 5,000 | | | | | |
| Finance | New | 15,000 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Total Cost | | 8,094,410 | 8,248,300 | 8,559,824 | 8,884,445 | 9,237,803 | 9,605,955 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Trading Position | | -73,020 | -260,827 | -319,668 | -395,227 | -473,056 | -573,338 |

Appendix 5

Total disaggregation costs

| Option B total disaggregation | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------|--------|--------|--------|
| | costs | CCC | DDC | TDC |
| Service now | £6,428 | £2,013 | £1,882 | £2,533 |
| Service new | £10,027 | £3,139 | £2,936 | £3,952 |
| Extra LA ICT platform/agency | £370 | £116 | £108 | £146 |
| Year 1 agency ICT purchase | £600 | £188 | £176 | £236 |
| Difference | £3,969 | £1,243 | £1,162 | £1,564 |
| | | | | |
| | £10,397 | £3,255 | £3,044 | £4,098 |

Appendix 6

| | DDC | CCC | TDC | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|---------|
| INCOME | | | | |
| Council Tax Caseload | 55,000 | 71,000 | 69,000 | 195,000 |
| Council Tax £m collected annually | £87m | £112m | £100m | £299m |
| CT% collected in year | 97% in year. | 97.5% | 95.5% | - |
| CT% collected after 4 years | 99% after 4 years | 99% after 4 years | 99% after 6 years | - |
| | | | | |
| BR caseload | 4,500 | 6,400 | 5,600 | 16,500 |
| BR Collected annually | £43m | £47m | £33m | £123m |
| BR % | 98% in year. 99% after 3 years | 99% in year | 98% in year. 99% after 3 years | - |
| | | | | |
| <u>Total of all income collected</u> | £130m | £159m | £133m | £422m |
| | | | | |
| Benefits | | | | |
| HB Caseload | 4,000 | 4,700 | 6,000 | 14,700 |
| HB awarded annually | £22m | £29m | £36m | £87m |
| | | | | |
| CTRS Caseload | 9,000 | 10,000 | 13,000 | 32,000 |
| CTRS awarded | £10m | £11m | £15m | £36m |
| | | | | |
| Changes reported annually | 43,000 | 43,000 | 55,000 | 141,000 |
| | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| <u>Total of all benefits awarded</u> | £32m | £40m | £51m | £123m |
| | | | | |
| Customer Services | | | | |
| Customer services – calls handled | 130,000 | 145,500 | 148,000 | 423,500 |
| Customer services – emails handled | 16,800 | 10,700 | 11,200 | 38,700 |
| Customer services – reception visits. | 8,500 | 1,400 | 8,000 | 17,900 |
| Total Customer Service Interactions | 155,300 | 146,900 | 167,200 | 480,100 |
| Customer Satisfaction | 98% | 98% | 98% | 98% |

Appendix 7

Indicative model *(subject to further advice from legal advisers)*

Council owned company

Service delivery/contract management

