



Buckinghamshire County Council

Agenda

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMISSIONING COMMITTEE

Date	Tuesday 6 October 2009
Time	10.00 am
Venue	Mezzanine Room 2, County Hall, Aylesbury

Those wishing to speak at the Overview and Scrutiny Commissioning Committee regarding any of the items below, must register by 10.00 am on Friday 2 October 2009. Please see details on how to register at the bottom of the Agenda.

The Committee will not consider anyone wishing to address the meeting, unless the request to speak has been received by 10.00am on the Friday preceding this Committee meeting.

Agenda Item	Time	Page No
1 APOLOGIES/CHANGES IN MEMBERSHIP	10.00	
2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST To declare any personal or prejudicial interest.		
3 MINUTES To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 8 September 2009.		1 - 8
4 PUBLIC PLATFORM Members of the public have the opportunity to put their point of view to the committee about matters on its agenda. Each person will have a maximum of four minutes to put forward their views and comments on those items they wish to address. There will be an overall time limit of sixteen minutes. The Chairman will be expected to respond within 7 working days detailing any course of action resulting from the representation.		
5 COUNCILLOR CALL FOR ACTION		
6 CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS/FORWARD PLAN		
7 CALL-INS		

Visit www.buckscc.gov.uk/democracy for councillor information and email alerts for meetings, and decisions affecting your local area.
Buckinghamshire County Council, Mrs A Davies, Head of Legal and Democratic Services, County Hall, Aylesbury, Bucks HP20 1UA.

- | | | | |
|-----------|--|--------------|----------------|
| 8 | <p>CHAIRMAN'S UPDATE
 Contributors
 All</p> <p>Purpose
 To update Members on the progress of the Statutory, Mandatory and Discretionary Spend Scrutiny Review. The Chairman will also provide feedback from the recent SSG meeting.</p> <p>Paper
 None</p> | 10.20 | |
| 9 | <p>WORK PROGRAMME DISCUSSION
 Contributors
 All</p> <p>Purpose
 To plan the work programme priorities for the coming year</p> <p>Context
 The Committee at its previous meeting put forward suggestions for the future work programme and requested additional detail to be added to each topic area.</p> <p>Paper</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview & Scrutiny Commissioning Committee- Work Programme Suggestions | 10.35 | 9 - 10 |
| 10 | <p>PATHFINDER SHARED SUPPORT SERVICES
 Contributors
 Sue Barnes, Interim Director Shared Services</p> <p>Purpose
 To update the Committee on the procurement process</p> <p>Context
 The former Performance and Resources Overview and Scrutiny Committee previously provided democratic accountability for the Shared Support Services project. The preferred bidders have now been shortlisted and there is a mid term review point for all Councils in January 2010.</p> <p>Paper</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shared Services Project Update | 11.05 | 11 - 14 |
| 11 | <p>DATE OF NEXT MEETING
 The date for the next meeting is Tuesday 10 November 2009, 10.00am, Mezzanine 3 , County Hall, Aylesbury.</p> | | |

Members of the public wishing to speak at the Overview and Scrutiny Commissioning Committee should apply by contacting Democratic Services on 01296 383604/01296 382614.

*For further information please contact: Katy MacDonald on 01296 383604
Fax No 01296 382538, email: kmacdonald@buckscc.gov.uk*

Members

Mr B Allen
Mr M Appleyard, Non Voting Member
Mr P Cartwright (VC)
Mrs A Davies
Mr M Edmonds
Mr T Egleton (C)

Mr P Hardy
Mr N Hussain
Mrs B Jennings
Mrs W Mallen
Ms R Vigor-Hedderly

Co-opted Members

Mr J Bajina, Parent Governor, Secondary Sector
Mr J Bilson, Parent Governor, Primary Sector
Mr R Davey, Church of England
Mr P Monk, Parent Governor
Mr M Moore, Roman Catholic Church



Buckinghamshire County Council

Minutes

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMISSIONING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMISSIONING COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY 8 SEPTEMBER 2009, IN MEZZANINE ROOM 3, COUNTY HALL, AYLESBURY, COMMENCING AT 10.03 AM AND CONCLUDING AT 12.23 PM.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr B Allen, Mr P Cartwright (VC), Mrs A Davies, Mr M Edmonds, Mr T Egleton (C), Mr P Hardy, Mr N Hussain, Mrs B Jennings, Ms R Vigor-Hedderly and Mr M Appleyard (Non Voting)

CO-OPTED MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr R Davey and Mr M Moore

GUESTS PRESENT

Mr M Tett and Mrs M Clayton

OFFICERS PRESENT

Ms K MacDonald, Ms H Wailling, Mrs K Woods, Mr M Dickman, Mrs D Munday, Mrs K Sutherland, Mr M Chard and Mr D Spencer

1. APOLOGIES/CHANGES IN MEMBERSHIP

Apologies were received from Mrs W Mallen.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

3. THE FOLLOWING WILL BE REGULAR ITEMS FEATURING ON THE COMMITTEE'S AGENDA:

Public Platform

The Committee was informed that there will be an opportunity for members of the public to put their point of view to the committee about matters on its agenda. It had been previously suggested that each person have a maximum of three minutes, however it was agreed that this should be four minutes with a maximum overall time limit of 16 minutes. The Chairman will be expected to respond within 7 working days detailing any course of action resulting from the representation.

Councillor Calls for Action

Any Councillor is able to present issues of concern to the Committee on behalf of their local community.

Cabinet Member decisions/Forward Plan

The Chairman invited Members to monitor a Cabinet Member portfolio area to alert Members to forthcoming important or controversial Cabinet or Cabinet Member decisions. Mr P Hardy asked if the Committee could in addition consider the County Council Forward Plan, commenting that this would highlight forthcoming items which may also influence a Councillor call for action. Members would receive an update at the next meeting of the Commissioning Committee regarding which Committee Member would be monitoring each Cabinet Member portfolio area.

Call-ins

Any potential call-ins of key decisions will be discussed

Chairman's Update

The Chairman will have the opportunity to bring the Committee up to date on any relevant matters of interest.

4. REMIT OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMISSIONING COMMITTEE

The Chairman informed the Committee that the remit of the Committee will include holding partners such as the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership known as the Safer Bucks Partnership to account for the decisions it takes.

Members had a discussion regarding the inclusion of 'maintaining an overview of the Buckinghamshire County Council Corporate Plan' within the remit of the Committee. It was noted that the remit of the Committee is part of the Council's Constitution and that the Commissioning Committee was not able to make amendments to the Constitution. The Chairman said that in his opinion the Corporate Plan should guide the actions of the Council and stated that consideration of the Corporate Plan is already covered within the overall terms of reference of the Overview and Scrutiny Commissioning Committee.

Ms A Davies commented on the position of the Corporate Plan and said that the Committee should be using these policy documents as yardsticks.

Members NOTED the remit of the new committee, as agreed at Full Council on 23 July 2009.

5. ENERGY FROM WASTE INITIATIVE

Mr M Tett, Cabinet Member Planning and Environment, Mr M Dickman, Waste Management Service Manager and Mr D Spencer, Communications Manager attended the meeting to inform members of the processes followed to select the preferred bidder for the Energy from Waste initiative and to outline how the decision will be communicated.

The Cabinet Member introduced the item and highlighted that the Energy from Waste initiative had previously been discussed at the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for

Community and Environment on the procurement process and evaluation of Detailed Solutions on 9 July 2008 and on the evaluation of Final Tenders on 28 January 2009. The Cabinet Member informed the Committee that Cabinet took the decision back in January 2007 and that before Cabinet took the decision to proceed with the project, technology advisors were appointed to analyse both options to treat municipal solid waste and that the Project Team was supported throughout the process by specialist legal, technical and financial advisors.

Following that decision the procurement process has been followed. The procurement process had now identified two potential suppliers namely Covanta who is based in the USA, with a proposed site in Bedfordshire and WRG which is a Spanish owned company with a site proposed in Calvert, Buckinghamshire.

The Cabinet Member informed the Committee that the County Council had been advised by experts at each stage of the process and assured Members that the County Council will be communicating pro-actively to Members, the press, the wider media and the public to inform them what to expect at the Cabinet meeting and once Cabinet had reached its decision the reasons for that decision. After Cabinet an email will be distributed to all key County and District Councillors. The Cabinet Member said the key was to ensure that the County Council communicated directly and as openly as possible with key stakeholders.

Members asked the following questions:

Since the decision was made to go down a particular route, you are likely to hear that technology has changed as the process has been lengthy. Are you confident incineration is still the best option?

The Cabinet Member commented that the public procurement process is a lengthy process but highlighted that it is a statutory process. The Cabinet Member said that there had been a very comprehensive analysis undertaken by a waste management specialist to assess all the options and advise the Council on a wide range of waste treatment technologies. The Cabinet Member said he had also visited a gasification plant in Bristol and that results consistently showed that thermal treatment solutions which include gasification, plasma gasification and EfW, combined with improved recycling and collection processes, were the best solution. The Official Journal of European Union (OJEU) stated that thermal treatment technology should be used for Buckinghamshire and that only one bidder came forward with anything other than incineration. That bidder also then subsequently dropped out.

Would the County Council be in a position of being vulnerable in that so much had changed the money might be better off being spent elsewhere such as on composting?

The Cabinet Member said that composting applications were previously submitted but ended as failed bids as they were pulled by bidders. It was not the County Council who had pulled the bids. The Committee was advised that a 'do nothing' scenario was looked at and there was consideration regarding whether it would be a viable position to continue or not with incineration. To 'do nothing' would result in increases to council taxes in the future and it was decided that it was better for the County Council to build an incinerator than a 'do nothing' scenario.

Would Members be able to see the sensitivity analysis and would you be able to inform Members of the figures if something becomes unviable?

The Cabinet Member said this was completed for Landfill Allowance Trading Scheme

(LATs) and that Mr M Dickman had also looked at landfill tax. When looking at the figures a pessimistic, optimistic and normal position were considered. The Council has a good recycling record, which currently stands at 43% of all municipal waste. However landfill tax has risen year on year and due to the current economic situation this cost is likely to increase further.

Has a transport analysis been undertaken for the waste facility regardless of whether it is to be in Buckinghamshire or Bedfordshire?

The Cabinet Member said that transport is a key issue. In terms of the overall structure of a plan, instead of all dust carts going to the plant the waste will be consolidated. The Planning and transport teams have looked at incremental volumes and sites affected. Mr M Dickman also advised that both bidders had been asked for information on their transport plans and had submitted them with their final tenders.

Looking at the decision notice on the website, there is a lot of information which has been censored. Can you confirm that the business case will be made available to Members of the Committee prior to the end of the 'Call in' period?

The Cabinet Member said that he would need to take advice on disclosure as there is information provided from the bidders such as pricing information. He suggested that relevant County Councillors apply for relevant information. A Member commented that all County Councillors should be considered relevant and that Members should consider Buckinghamshire as a whole in relation to decisions. The Cabinet Member said he would take advice from Mrs A Davies, Head of Legal and Democratic Services and the bidders regarding what information can be disclosed.

After the decision for the preferred bidder has been made, the planning process should commence. Has the County Council considered this as part of the process?

The Cabinet Member commented that one of the key aspects taken into account in determining the decision is 'deliverability'. However he highlighted that the planning process was not part of Cabinets role and that a separate statutory body would be required to consider this issue in further detail. Mr M Dickman told the Committee that planning and deliverability were considered the biggest risks by Officers involved in the project.

Both of the proposed sites for the project will have an affect on transport around the County and impact on rural routes. Can Members be assured that this has been considered seriously?

The Cabinet Member said that transport impacts have been considered in the evaluation of both bids and that it will also be a key consideration in relation to any planning applications and that this will be for the Development Control Committee relevant for the proposed site to consider in greater detail. Mr M Dickman told the Committee that although the transport impacts of either proposal were important in the consideration of the best bid it couldn't be taken in isolation. The Officer advised that you had to look at the overall impact of the proposal in terms of Co2 emissions and when you consider that there will be a reduction of Co2 from the EfW plant compared to landfill, that therefore reduces the transport impacts.

The Committee was advised that the County Council had communicated to County Councillors, District Councillors and Parish Councillors throughout the process.

Mr D Spencer, Communications Manager informed the Committee of the Communications Strategy and highlighted that Members had received a list of

stakeholders with whom the County Council will communicate with following Cabinet's decision on 14 September, which includes:

- All Bucks County Councillors
- All Bucks Town and District Councillors
- All Parish Council clerks
- All Bucks MPs and MEPs
- News release to local, regional and national media
- Press conference and interviews given by Martin Tett
- Environment Agency, Primary Care Trust, SEEDA
- Central Bedfordshire Council (regardless of the decision)
- Manager Brief, Team Brief and Changing Times
- Local Area Forums

The Chairman thanked the Cabinet Member and Officers for attending.

6. SECONDARY SCHOOL CATCHMENT AREA REVIEW 2009

Mrs M Clayton, Cabinet Member for Achievement and Learning, and Ms D Munday, Admissions and Transport Manager attended the meeting to brief members on the forthcoming review of secondary school catchment areas and talk through the methodology that will be followed, including the criteria for the review, how the consultation will be carried out and the timescale.

The Cabinet Member introduced the item and informed Members that the last major review of secondary school catchment areas was in 2003, which in terms of what is happening with schools is a relatively long time ago.

The Cabinet Member highlighted the following areas which would need to be considered in the review:

- Housing Growth
- The Academy – as this may have an impact on parental preference
- National Challenge Schools – Buckinghamshire started with 8 schools and now have 2. There will be a need for intervention in these schools.
- Foundation Schools – which may affect the ability to set catchment areas. The schools will work in partnership with Buckinghamshire County Council but their catchment areas might change
- Demographic Shifts – population projections indicated that there would be a reduction in the South and an increase in the North. These figures are constantly changing
- Changes in other authorities Catchment areas – Edge of County catchments need to be monitored
- Financial situation – an increase in parents wanting a place in state school for their child, rather than continuing in an independent school. This puts pressure particularly on secondary school places.
- Restriction on expanding grammar schools under the current government.

The Cabinet Member advised the Committee that the review would be conducted by an independent consultant – Mr A Parker and read out some of the achievements and bodies he had worked with, which included acting as a schools adjudicator.

The Chairman commented that he was pleased an independent person would be carrying out the review.

Members asked the following questions:

If the Independent consultant suggests rigid policies such as boundaries which run through the middle of streets, would this see the County Council returning to a rigid boundary policy as opposed to parental preference which might increase the number of appeals?

The Cabinet Member said that parents have a statutory right to express a preference and the authority has a duty to offer the highest preference possible. Boundaries are a guidance tool to ensure that as many parents/pupils as possible are offered their first preference school, which is presently very high at around 93%. (*Addendum: subsequent to the meeting Ms D Munday confirmed that last years figure stood at 92%*)

The County Council has to conduct the review openly and transparently. If there is informal consultation, will Mr A Parker, the consultant be available to members of the public who may wish to make and comment on recommendations?

Mr A Parker will be available to members of the public. He made it very clear that he wants to hear the views of the public as well as County Council Members, schools and governing bodies. Ms D Munday highlighted that one of the functions of a schools adjudicator is to look at the validity of opinions expressed and not just the volume. The Cabinet Member commented that the consultant will take a professional view but that ultimately Buckinghamshire County Council will make any decisions.

Are Catchment areas a thing of the past? Is the 14-19 Strategy and parental preference shifting the focus away from catchment areas and will the consultant be allowed to think outside the box and throw all the pieces in the air?

The consultant will be positively encouraged to think outside the box and take a fresh look at catchment areas. Ms D Munday said that catchment areas are one of the tools regarding prioritisation. The Officer commented that catchment areas are useful to ensure local schools service local pupils. The 14-19 strategy will have an impact but pupils are required to register a school although part of their study may take place elsewhere.

Couldn't pupils be part of a group of schools?

The Cabinet Member said she would not pre-empt any decisions which the consultant may make.

There appears to be a problem north of Aylesbury as there are few secondary schools and a growing population, which also creates transport issues as it is not unusual for pupils to spend upto an hour and a half travelling to and from school.

The Cabinet Member agreed that there are few secondary schools north of Aylesbury and that growth will affect pupil numbers. The Committee was advised that Mr C Munday and his team have been undertaking a review in relation to this which has identified the need for 3 new secondary schools, the location of which will be critical.

You mentioned the demographic changes in Aylesbury, Wycombe has seen tremendous changes such as a huge increase in the Asian population and Cressex school is not easily accessible north of Wycombe. Schools are also specialising and this is one area where catchment areas fail as a school might be out of catchment for a pupil who wants to attend a school with that specialism. Could Buckinghamshire County Council's admission policy be

more flexible as for some pupils out of catchment schools may be easier to travel to?

Specialist schools are able to select up to 10% of pupils on the basis of aptitude in their specialism. The testing of specialisms is prescribed in the Admissions code as schools have to be careful to select on the basis of the specialism and not other factors.

I am concerned about the timescale of the exercise as the review will need to be agreed by early next year in time for implementation for the next academic year. There does not appear to be sufficient time to consider all the issues such as housing growth and the need to consult. Is the timescale sufficient for the consultant to address all the issues?

The review will identify the issues and make recommendations; then it will be the responsibility of the Cabinet Member for Achievement and Learning to make any decisions. There is a statutory obligation to consult and the earliest we can look at implementing is for admissions in September 2011.

Why can't we scrap catchment areas as we have the fallback of distance anyway?

Distance would not work for all areas. For example Dr Challoners grammar school is located on the edge of the County and some of the closest areas to that school are Chorleywood, Rickmansworth. In this instance distance would not provide the same protection to pupils in the Chalfonts area as a catchment area would. Anomalies like these need to be considered.

What remit are you going to give the consultant? Can you assure us it will be a radical review as opposed to quick wins?

This is a radical review, out of which we are hoping some quick wins might be possible. He has not been asked specifically to locate quick wins but hopefully during the review he will find some.

A Member commented that the County Council has undertaken two of the most difficult reviews: Secondary schools catchment areas and School Place Planning framework. He said that in his opinion the work on School Place Planning is most impressive and highlighted the need to keep Members and the Commissioning Committee updated as the primary planning will also affect secondary school provision.

7. WORK PROGRAMME DISCUSSION

The Committee considered and discussed their priorities for the work programme for the coming year.

The Chairman explained his view on the purpose of Overview and Scrutiny, describing it as a critical friend, providing a check and balance on Cabinet, to drive improvements and add value to the work of the Council.

The Chairman suggested that it might be useful for the Committee to look at statutory and discretionary spending of the Council. He highlighted that it will be a difficult task as in some areas there may not be an absolute definition of what is statutory and discretionary. He suggested when looking at statutory services Members might like to consider the level and type of services provided. He proposed that the Committee split into four groups to gather information, with each looking at the following portfolio areas:

- Children and Young People
- Adults and Family Wellbeing
- Communities and Built Environment
- Business and Customer Transformation

The groups will interview the Heads of Service to obtain an officer view on what is statutory, what is discretionary and what services they provide. Following the initial information gathering session two task and finish groups will be set up and other County Councillors will be encouraged to be involved.

Members had a discussion on the suggested scrutiny review. A Member asked if it would be possible to have a clear definition of statutory and discretionary to ensure a clear and consistent view on the terms. In response it was suggested that Members discuss this issue in further detail at an information gathering session. Concern was raised that as the County Council delivers so many services it may not be possible to review statutory and discretionary spending.

The Chairman also highlighted that the Committee have the annual budget to scrutinise and suggested a task and finish group be set up to consider this. This task and finish group will need to meet for three days in the middle of January 2010.

A Member stressed the importance of encouraging all County Councillors to get involved in the scrutiny reviews and said that the Committee should be more strategic.

Members were also invited to consider whether locality working should be reviewed. Members agreed to add this to the Committee work programme.

It was highlighted that the Committee may have a wider remit, with the need to scrutinise areas which involve partners and that for some task and finish groups the Committee will need to consider whether District Councillors be invited to attend. Members discussed whether a review of the Local Area Agreement (LAA) would be a possible review topic and to consider inviting District Councillors.

Action: Ms K Woods agreed to provide Members with a briefing paper on each of the areas highlighted as possible areas to scrutinise.

The Chairman asked Members to advise him which of the four portfolio area groups they would like to join.

It was agreed that an information gathering session be arranged for Tuesday 15 September. The Chairman informed the Committee that the Task and Finish groups will be monthly public meetings with minutes produced as an accurate record.

8. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The date for the next meeting is Tuesday 6 October 2009, 10.00am, Mezzanine 2, County Hall, Aylesbury.

CHAIRMAN

Overview & Scrutiny Commissioning Committee- Work Programme Suggestions

At the Overview and Scrutiny Commissioning Committee (OSCC) meeting on 8 September members suggested potential topics they may wish to explore in further detail. The text below provides narrative to the suggested work programme topics and also a basis for further discussions of the work the OSCC may wish to pursue.

Locality Working- is it working?

The Getting Closer to Communities (GC2C) programme is dedicated to developing strong working relationships with our partners and communities in Buckinghamshire. The aim of the programme is to:

- *provide services to meet community needs.*
- *ensure local services are joined-up*
- *improve local access to public services*
- *enhance the community leadership role of our local Members*
- *increase community empowerment*

A piece of scrutiny work could examine whether GC2C is meeting the programme aims listed above and make recommendations to Cabinet and partners to improve outcomes for the wider community. Alternatively members could focus on one of the programme aims and pursue the success of this in greater detail.

Partnerships

In 2008 overview and scrutiny undertook a joint scrutiny review into the '*The effectiveness of Buckinghamshire's Local Area Agreement (LAA) in its early stages*'.

Members may wish to follow on from this review and examine the way in which the Council, along with its partners, delivers strategic plans, frontline services and meets performance targets. The options listed below are some ways in which members may wish to explore further:

Local Area Agreement (LAA)

The Buckinghamshire LAA is a 3 year agreement between partners in Buckinghamshire and central government. It is a delivery plan for the Sustainable Community Strategy that sets out the shared outcomes towards which partners will work together to improve the quality of life for local residents.

Having already examined the effectiveness of the LAA in its early stages, members may wish to examine specific targets within the LAA. Such a review could be undertaken in numerous forms, these could include:

- Receiving an exception report of the LAA indicators and then choosing to focus in detail on an area of under or poor performance.
- Holding a half day select committee style committee examining how a specific partnership is performing or to ascertain their key concerns and issues which scrutiny could potentially contribute to, e.g. Safer & Stronger Bucks Partnership

Comprehensive Area Assessment (CAA)

The CAA is a joint inspectorate judgement about how well public services are tackling local priorities. This focuses on 3 key questions:

1. How well do local priorities express community needs & aspirations?
2. How well are outcomes and improvements being delivered?
3. What are the prospects for improvement?

The final report is due to be published on 10 December 2009. Members could assess the findings of the area assessment process to see what issues could be usefully addressed within the committee's future work programme.

Any review that the committee commissions to examine issues associated with locality or partnership working should seek to extend its membership to include our partners. Members could co-opt representatives from the district councils,

Inequalities or Tackling Disadvantage

Tackling Disadvantage has been identified as a priority for partnership activity through the family of sustainable community strategies and the Buckinghamshire LAA 2008-11. The programme board for the Tackling Disadvantage has chosen to initially focus on geographic areas where disadvantage has clustered.

Buckinghamshire County Council is involved in the *Tackling Disadvantage Partnership Programme*. This is a strategic approach to addressing needs of those experiencing unfavourable conditions or circumstances within the county.

Scrutiny could seek to add to this work by undertaking reviews in the following areas:

- By scrutinising the progress of the programme one year on.
- Tackling disadvantage could be examined within the context of a review into locality working.
- By examining a specific area in relation to disadvantage, e.g. rural disadvantage.



Overview and Scrutiny

Title: Shared Services Project Update

Date: 6 October 2009

Author: Susan Barnes – Interim Director Shared Services

Contact Officer: Jean Gamester – Programme Manager

Summary

This paper updates Members on the current position on the Shared Support Services project. It is important that all Members are kept updated, given the potential impact of the project for the Council and all Services. Further updates will be brought to Members via the Council Blue Book as the project progresses.

Recommendation

To note the update.

Supporting information

What is the Shared Support Services Programme?

- 1 As part of the Pathfinder Agreement, Aylesbury Vale District Council, Buckinghamshire County Council, Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes Fire Authority, South Bucks District Council and Wycombe District Council (referred to in this report as “the partners”) have been working towards the “joining of back office services” through the procurement of a private sector partner, with whom a Joint Venture Company (JV Co) will be established. This is the Pathfinder Shared Support Services Project (referred to in this report as “the project”). The key aims are to achieve cost savings and improve service delivery.

What Services are in scope?

- 2 Bidders will be asked to submit proposals covering:
 - Professional Human Resources (HR)
 - Payroll and transactional HR processing
 - Professional Finance
 - Transactional financial processing (excluding revenues and benefits)
 - Strategic Information and Communications Technology (ICT) and development
 - Operational ICT and helpdesk

- Operational Facilities Management, Property Services, Repairs & Maintenance and helpdesk

What are the Benefits?

- 3 The aim is to secure a contract and a JVCo that will enable the partners to:
- Improve the efficiency of support services to realise cashable savings
 - Achieve economies of scale to reduce capital investment
 - Improve business continuity
 - Provide leadership for shared services within two-tier areas
 - Create an environment to share and implement best practice

Programme Arrangements

- 4 A Programme Team has been formed to lead and co-ordinate the project in accordance with the Business Case. Sue Barnes is the Partnership Programme Director and is responsible to all 5 partners for direction, advice and the delivery of the project. Jean Gamester is the Programme Manager, with day to day responsibility for programme management and co-ordination. Necessary specialist legal and procurement advice is provided by Bevan Brittan and Deloitte. Each partner has a Senior Responsible Officer (SROs); for BCC this is Dean Taylor. The Programme Sponsor is Chris Furness, Chief Executive of South Bucks District Council. In addition, Jackie Yates provides financial advice to the Programme Board.
- 5 The project is overseen by a Programme Board, which is chaired by Nick Cave, Pathfinder Director. Where appropriate, the Board make recommendations to the Joint Committee, which consists of the 4 Council Leaders and the Chairman of the Fire Authority. There are various other groups for the technical areas in scope, for design, evaluation and dialogue with bidders.

C CURRENT POSITION

What Has Happened So Far?

- 6 Background information about the project is contained in the reports to Overview and Scrutiny, Cabinet and County Council in January 2009. This set out the Business Case for the project. On 29 January 2009, the Council agreed to proceed with the project and made a number of decisions about the project:
- Agreement of the Strategic Business Case
 - Agreement of the Procurement Strategy
 - Agreement to the setting up of a Joint Committee
 - Associated delegations to the Leader and Chief Executive and Senior Responsible Officer
 - Delegation of a budget to cover the pre contract costs of the project
 - Agreement to a Memorandum of Understanding
 - Agreement to the key issues in relation to the proposed Joint Venture Company (JV Co)
- 7 On 30 March 2009 the Cabinet agreed the Inter Authority Agreement, including the arrangements for the Joint Committee.

8 Since then the key developments have been as follows:

- The Official Journal of the European Union (OJEU) Notice inviting private sector companies to bid for the contract was published on 26 June 2009
- Responses were received by the deadline of 3 August 2009
- These bids have been evaluated by representatives from the partners against set criteria: financial status, employee and health and safety information, partnering experience and experience of providing the services in scope
- Following the evaluation consultation and sharing recommendations with the Joint Committee, the Shared Services Programme Board confirmed their shortlist on 10 September 2009.
- In parallel, significant work has taken place to develop the service specifications across all functions and partners as input into dialogue. These specifications will evolve throughout the dialogue process.
- We are actively engaging Trade Unions and staff representatives. In parallel an engagement framework with those people is under review.
- Work has started on client side options
- The Joint Committee have met and agreed the following:-

8 June 2009

- Terms of Reference
- Inter Authority Agreement and Procurement Strategy
- OJEU notice
- Procurement costs

10 September 2009

- Project update and information on the shortlisting of the Pre Qualification Questionnaire.

24 September 2009

- to receive representations from Trade Unions and Staff Representatives and to agree the Evaluation Criteria

Link to Joint Committee papers

<http://www.buckscc.gov.uk/moderngov/ieListMeetings.aspx?Committeeld=647>

Next Steps

9 The key next steps are as follows:

- Long listed bidders will then be invited to submit outline proposals based on our specification of services, the published list includes BT, Mouchel, Capita and IBM.
- Dialogue will then commence for Bidders to develop outline proposals
- There is a mid-term review point for all Councils in January 2010 to ensure that the project will meet the objectives of each Authority.
-

Key Dates for the Rest of the Current Timetable

10 Timings may change as the process unfolds, but the key dates are as follows:

Procurement Stage	Timescale
Publication of OJEU Contract Notice	26 June 2009
Deadline for receiving completed PQQs	03 August 2009
Notification of shortlist	11 - 14 September 2009
Issue of draft Invitation to Submit Outline Proposals (ISOP)	11 - 14 September 2009
Bidders Conference	2 October 2009
Issue of full Invitation to Submit Outline Proposals (ISOP)	05 October 2009
1 Day of dialogue per bidder	19 October 2009 – 22 October 2009
Deadline for receipt of Outline Proposals	17 November 2009
Issue of Invitation to Submit Detailed Proposals (ISDP)	28 January 2010
Deadline for receipt of Detailed Proposals	May 2010
Issue of Invitation to Submit Final Tenders (ISFT)	June 2010
Deadline for receipt of Final Tenders	August 2010
Contract Award and Mandatory Standstill Period	November 2010

D COMMENTARY

11 Current issues for Members to note include:

- Events are planned in the coming weeks to brief employees in scope, this will be an ongoing requirement as the process unfolds
- When we see the shape of Bidders' proposals, there will also be engagement with all Services and Schools - we will all be customers of the JVCo
- A Member Briefing is being planned for all partners later in the Autumn when we have a clearer idea of Bidders' proposals (a BCC event may also be held)