

GUILDFORD & WAVERLEY JOINT GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

Friday, 17 March 2023 at 10.00 am

Committee Room 1, Council Offices, The Burys, Godalming

Members:

Cllr Paul Follows, Leader, Waverley Borough Council (Joint Chair)
Cllr Julia McShane, Leader, Guildford Borough Council (Joint Chair)
Cllr Peter Clark, Deputy Leader, Waverley Borough Council
Cllr Joss Bigmore, Deputy Leader, Guildford Borough Council
Cllr Graham Eyre, Guildford Borough Council
Cllr Michael Goodridge, Waverley Borough Council
Cllr Peter Marriott, Waverley Borough Council
Cllr Stephen Mulliner, Waverley Borough Council
Cllr Ramsey Nagaty, Guildford Borough Council
Cllr George Potter, Guildford Borough Council
Cllr John Redpath, Guildford Borough Council
Cllr John Robini, Waverley Borough Council

A G E N D A

- 1 **Apologies for absence and notification of substitutes**
To receive apologies for absence and notification of substitutes attending.
- 2 **Minutes of the previous meeting** (Pages 3 - 6)
To agree the Minutes of the meeting held on 9 December 2022.
- 3 **Disclosures of interests**
To receive from Members declarations of interests in relation to any items included on the agenda for this meeting in accordance with the respective Guildford and Waverley Codes of Conduct for Councillors.
- 4 **Matters arising from the formal review of the Inter-Authority Agreement and the Collaboration Risk Register (December 2022)** (Pages 7 - 12)
- 5 **Collaboration Risk Register Review** (Pages 13 - 24)
- 6 **Date of next meeting**
Friday 22 September 2023, 10.00am, at Guildford Borough Council Offices, Millmead, Guildford

**MINUTES OF THE GUILDFORD & WAVERLEY JOINT GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE -
9 DECEMBER 2022**

(To be read in conjunction with the Agenda for the Meeting)

Present (GBC/WBC)

Cllr Julia McShane (GBC), Chair
Cllr Paul Follows (WBC), Co-Chair
Cllr Carole Cockburn (WBC)
Cllr Michael Goodridge (WBC)
Cllr Ramsey Nagaty (GBC)
Cllr John Redpath (GBC)
Cllr John Robini (GBC)
Cllr Deborah Seabrook (GBC)
Cllr John Ward (WBC)

Apologies

Cllr Peter Clark (WBC), Cllr Joss Bigmore (GBC), Cllr Peter Marriott (WBC)
and Cllr Stephen Mulliner (WBC)

1 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS (Agenda item)

In accordance with the Terms of Reference of the Joint Governance Committee, this first meeting of the committee was held at the Guildford Borough Council offices and chaired by the Leader of Guildford Borough Council, Cllr Julia McShane.

Cllr McShane welcomed Members and Officers to the meeting and invited those present to introduce themselves.

2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTES (Agenda item 1)

Apologies for absence had been received from Cllrs Peter Clark (Waverley), Joss Bigmore (Guildford), Stephen Mulliner (Waverley) and Peter Marriott (Waverley).

Cllrs John Ward (Waverley), Deborah Seabrook (Guildford) and Carole Cockburn (Waverley) were present as substitutes.

3 DISCLOSURES OF INTERESTS (Agenda item 2)

There were no interests declared by Members in relation to items on the agenda for the meeting.

4 FORMAL REVIEW OF THE INTER-AUTHORITY AGREEMENT (Agenda item 3)

The Joint Chief Executive, Tom Horwood, introduced the report on the Inter-Authority Agreement.

The Terms of Reference of the Joint Governance Committee required that it carry out a periodic (and at least every 12 months) formal review of the Inter-Authority Agreement (IAA), to ensure that it remained fit for purpose. Any changes considered necessary would be referred to the Full Councils of Guildford and Waverley.

The Committee noted that the Heads of Terms of the IAA had been approved by Full Council meetings of Guildford and Waverley in April 2022, and the IAA had been formally executed and sealed by both Councils in September 2022. The IAA related to the provision of a joint senior management team and this structure had been implemented on 1 October 2022.

The Committee noted that the Terms of Reference of the Joint Appointments Committee within the IAA did not allow substitute members to be appointed, whilst the Joint Governance Committee did allow substitutions. The Committee agreed that substitutes should be allowed on the Joint Appointments Committee, and should reflect the membership as specified by each council, as follows:

“Substitutes: Substitutes may be appointed. Guildford may appoint two substitute members. Waverley may appoint two substitute members, with one being nominated by the Leader of the council, and one nominated by the Leader of Waverley’s Principal Opposition Group.”

On the advice of the Monitoring Officer, this would require a change to each councils’ constitution that would need to be recommended to the Full Council of Guildford and Waverley via their respective governance routes for such matters.

RESOLVED to recommend to the Guildford Corporate Governance & Standards Committee and the Waverley Standards & General Purposes Committee that the constitutions of Guildford and Waverley councils be amended to allow for substitute members on the Joint Appointments Committee, as set out above.

5 COLLABORATION RISK REGISTER REVIEW (Agenda item 4)

The Joint Executive Head of Organisational Development, Robin Taylor, introduced the report and the collaboration risk register, which the Joint Governance Committee was required to review at least every six-months. The initial collaboration risk register had been approved by Guildford and Waverley councils in April 2022, and had been updated by officers to reflect developments and actions to mitigate risks. The risk register set out the risk rating as at April 2022, the current rating, anticipated rating at November 2023, and a residual rating.

Members of the Committee raised a number of queries in relation to specific risks identified on the collaboration risk register. These are noted below in the order that they appear on the risk register rather than the order in which they were discussed:

No. 5 Risk that JMT resource will not be apportioned fairly. Relates to Risk no. 11 and no.19 – unfair apportionment of JMT resource, one council’s priorities dominating JMT resource for a period, perception by councillors that officers are

less available than previously. Noted that some councillors felt communication to back bench Members had been poor and this had fostered a perception that officers were less available. There was a cultural issue that needed to be addressed to ensure that councillors' expectations of the shared JMT, and of hybrid working, were realistic, but also they were informed of how to address questions and concerns to the correct management level in the respective organisations.

No. 6 Risk that either or both councils will decide to terminate the partnership. Members queried the relation of this risk to clauses 21 and 22 of the IAA, whether there still a need for those clauses, and whether the notice periods were correct. It was noted that legal advice had been to include dispute resolution arrangements in the IAA, and that further legal advice would be needed before changing these clauses. The Committee asked officers to obtain legal advice on this issue so that the risks could be reflected correctly in the risk register. The risk register needed to reflect that the closer the collaboration became, the more impactful an ending of the partnership would be to the councils.

No. 8 Risk that officer capacity will be over-stretched during the transition. This was showing a Residual High risk rating, which indicated that further mitigation was needed. The target risk should not be High.

No.13 Risk that expected savings cannot be realised at one or both councils. This risk was shown as moving from Medium to High over the next 12 months, and it was noted that the savings target would change from year to year, and as budget mitigations were identified each year.

No. 17 Failure to address the different IT legacy systems. Members noted that this was anticipated to still be a High risk at November 2023 and asked what actions were in train to address the issue. Officers advised that there was no mandate for the councils to harmonise their IT, but this would be explored on a case-by-case basis and supported by a business case where there was a recommendation to align IT systems. Some areas were more reliant on IT integration than others. The ICT Strategy Board would be meeting 9 January 2023 to begin the development of a shared ICT strategy focussed on supporting the partnership and identifying resources required and return on investment that is possible. It was agreed that **Risk No. 14** which was currently shown as Medium should also be rated High as this related to transition costs, including those of IT.

The following general points were identified during the discussion on the risk register:

- The key to the R-A-G ratings needed to be circulated with the risk register so that it is clear how the likelihood and impact are weighted and reflected in the overall risk rating.
- Financial thresholds in the key need to be clear and may need to be revised.
- The risk register needed to be clearer in distinguishing between the residual risk, after identified mitigations, and the target risk. Where identified mitigations are not sufficient to reach the target risk rating, more action would be needed, except where these are risks that were beyond the scope of the council to influence such as a change in government policy on local government reorganisation.

- The column headings on the risk register were confusing: there needed to be a Target risk added (by Jan 2027) so that the committee could see the current risk, residual risk (after mitigation), and target risk.

The Committee agreed to meet again in March 2023 to review a revised collaboration risk register, taking into account the suggested revisions to the layout, and the need to review the key alongside the register.

6 DATE OF NEXT MEETING (Agenda item 5)

The Committee agreed to meeting in March 2023 to review the Collaboration Risk Register. The next meeting would be held at the Waverley Borough Council offices.

The meeting commenced at 1.00 pm and concluded at 2.40 pm

Chair

Joint Governance Committee

Ward(s) affected: All

Report of Director of Transformation & Governance

Author: Stephen Rix, Executive Head of Legal and Democratic Services (Interim)

Tel: 01483 444991

Email: Stephen.rix@guildford.gov.uk

Lead Councillor responsible: GBC: Cllr McShane & WBC: Cllr Follows

Date: 17 March 2023

Matters arising from the formal review of the Inter-Authority Agreement and the Collaboration Risk Register (December 2022)

Executive Summary

At its first meeting on 9 December 2022 the Joint Governance Committee considered reports on:

- (a) the formal review of the Inter-Authority Agreement (IAA), to ensure that it continues to be fit for purpose, with any changes required being recommended to both Full Councils; and
- (b) the six-monthly review of the collaboration risk register.

In their discussion on the review of the risk register, the Committee raised a number of queries in respect of specific risks. With regard to Risk No. 6 (*that either or both councils will decide to terminate the partnership*), councillors queried the relation of this risk to clauses 21 and 22 of the IAA, and whether:

- (i) there was still a need for those clauses, and
- (ii) the notice periods were correct.

It was noted that legal advice had been to include dispute resolution arrangements in the IAA, and that further legal advice would be needed before changing these clauses. The Committee therefore asked officers to obtain legal advice on this issue so that the risks could be reflected correctly in the risk register. The risk register needed to reflect that the closer the collaboration became, the more impactful an ending of the partnership would be to the councils.

This report sets out details of the further legal advice sought and suggests an amendment to the wording of the IAA, which will require the formal approval by the full Councils of both authorities.

Recommendation to Committee

That the Committee recommends to both Councils that clause 21.1 of the Inter-Authority Agreement be amended to read:

“21 TERMINATION FOR CAUSE

21.1 Without affecting any other right or remedy available to it, any Party may terminate this Agreement ~~with immediate effect~~ by giving ~~written notice to a minimum of three months’ notice in writing~~ to the other Party”

Reasons for Recommendation:

To ensure that any recommended change to the inter-authority agreement following a review is reported to the full Council meetings of both authorities

Is the report (or part of it) exempt from publication? No

1. Background

- 1.1 The Joint Government Committee’s terms of reference include a requirement to undertake periodically a formal review (at least once every 12 months) of the inter-authority agreement (IAA), ensuring it continues to be fit for purpose and recommending to both Full Councils any changes required. The Committee is also required to undertake a six-monthly review of the Collaboration Risk Register.
- 1.2 The Joint Governance Committee undertook the first formal review of the IAA and the Collaboration Risk Register at its meeting held on 9 December 2022. In their discussion on the review of the risk register, the Committee raised a number of queries in respect of specific risks. With regard to Risk No. 6 (*that either or both councils will decide to terminate the partnership*), councillors queried the relation of this risk to clauses 21 and 22 of the IAA, which currently read as follows:

“21. TERMINATION FOR CAUSE

21.1. Without affecting any other right or remedy available to it, any Party may terminate this Agreement with immediate effect by giving written notice to the other Party:

- 21.1.1. *if the other Party commits a material breach of any term of this Agreement which breach is irremediable or (if such breach is remediable) fails to remedy that breach within a period of fourteen days after being notified in writing to do so;*
- 21.1.2. *if the other Party repeatedly breaches any of the terms of this Agreement in such a manner as to reasonably justify the opinion that its conduct is inconsistent with it having the intention or ability to give effect to the terms of this Agreement;*

21.2 *For the purposes of clause 21.1.1 **material breach** means a breach (including an anticipatory breach) that is serious in the widest sense of having a serious effect on the benefit which the terminating Party would otherwise derive from a substantial portion of this Agreement.*

22. TERMINATION WITHOUT CAUSE

22.1. *A Party may terminate this Agreement by giving the other Party a minimum of twelve months' notice in writing.*

22.2 *A notice to terminate may only be served once in each calendar year and in any event no later than 30 September in each calendar year. In the event a notice is served after 30 September in a calendar it shall be deemed to be served on the 1 April in the following calendar year."*

1.3 The Committee expressed concern as to whether:

- (i) there was still a need for clauses 21 and 22 above, and
- (ii) the notice periods were correct.

1.4 It was noted that specialist legal advice sought in the drafting of the IAA had recommended the inclusion of dispute resolution arrangements in the IAA, and that further legal advice would be needed before changing these clauses. The Committee therefore asked officers to obtain legal advice on this issue so that the risks could be reflected correctly in the risk register. The risk register needed to reflect that the closer the collaboration became, the more impactful an ending of the partnership would be to the councils.

1.5 This report sets out details of the further legal advice sought and suggests, as a consequence, an amendment to the wording of Clause 21.1, which will require the formal approval by the full Councils of both authorities.

2. Proposed Amendment to the IAA

2.1 In response to the Committee's concerns, the Interim Executive Head of Legal and Democratic Services considers that both clauses 21 and 22 of the IAA are required as the Agreement should have termination provisions like any other contract. However, the notice period in the termination for cause provision (clause 21), requires amendment because the current contractual provision permits one authority to terminate the IAA with "*immediate effect*" where the other authority commits a material breach of any term of the IAA which breach is irremediable or (if such breach is remediable) fails to remedy that breach within a period of fourteen days after being notified in writing to do so.

2.2 It is suggested that clause 21.1 should be amended to read:

"21.1 Without affecting any other right or remedy available to it, any Party may terminate this Agreement ~~with immediate effect~~ by giving ~~written notice to a minimum of three months' notice in writing~~ to the other Party:

2.3 The proposed amendment replaces "*immediate effect*" with "*three months' notice*" thereby affording each authority a three-month period, in the very unlikely event this clause was ever triggered, to prepare for the ending of the IAA. The Committee may wish to consider whether such notice period needs to be longer.

3. Consultations

3.1 There is no requirement for consultation.

4. Key Risks

4.1 The Committee's terms of reference include undertaking periodically a formal review (at least once every 6 months) of the collaboration risk assessment, reviewing current and target impact and likelihood scores and making any changes to the list of risks and mitigating actions. There is a separate report to this committee on the review of the collaboration risk assessment.

5. Financial Implications

5.1 There are no direct financial implications arising from this report.

6. Legal Implications

6.1 There are no direct legal implications arising from this report.

7. Human Resource Implications

7.1 There are no direct human resource implications arising from this report.

8. Equality and Diversity Implications

8.1 This duty has been considered in the context of this report and it has been concluded that there are no equality and diversity implications arising directly from this report.

9. Climate Change/Sustainability Implications

9.1 There are no relevant climate change/sustainability implications.

10. Summary of Options

10.1 If the Committee accepts there is still a need for clauses 21 and 22 of the IAA as detailed above, and that a reasonable notice period is required for clause 21.1, it does have the option of determining what is a reasonable notice period. Officers are recommending that such notice period should be three months.

11. Background Papers

None

12. Appendices

None

This page is intentionally left blank

Joint Governance Committee Report

Ward(s) affected: All

Report of Director of Transformation and Governance

Author: Robin Taylor

Tel: 01483 523108

Email: robin.taylor@guildford.gov.uk

Lead Councillor responsible: Councillors McShane, Bigmore, Follows and Clark

Tel: 01483 837736, 07974 979369, 07946 288824, 01252 711026

Email: julia.mcshane@guildford.gov.uk, joss.bigmore@guildford.gov.uk,
paul.follows@waverley.gov.uk, peter.clark@waverley.gov.uk

Date: 17 March 2023

Collaboration Risk Register Review

Executive Summary

This report presents the collaboration risk register for its six-monthly review by the Joint Governance Committee (the Committee). The register was last presented to the Committee in December 2022. Since then, it has been updated by officers, including the assessment of scores and updates to mitigations, and the addition of proposed target scores (for January 2027).

Recommendations to Committee

1. That the Committee reviews the collaboration risk register and the changes to the risk ratings suggested by officers, including the addition of target risk scores, and agrees any further changes.
2. That the Committee reviews the risk criteria/key used for this risk register and considers any changes, as suggested at its last meeting.

Reason(s) for Recommendation:

As the partnership progresses officers have updated the collaboration risk register with changes to mitigations and scoring. The Committee's role is to undertake a formal review of the risk register and make any changes. Further, at its meeting in December 2022, the Committee decided it would review the criteria for risk scores.

Is the report (or part of it) exempt from publication?

No

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to present the most up to date version of the collaboration risk register in order for the Joint Governance Committee (the Committee) to fulfil its function to:

- undertake a six-monthly formal review of the collaboration risk assessment
- review current and target impact and likelihood scores
- make any changes to the list of risks and mitigating actions.

This report also provides the Committee with the opportunity to review the scoring criteria for the collaboration risk register.

2. Strategic Priorities

- 2.1 The collaboration between Guildford and Waverley Borough Councils will enable both Councils to better deliver their strategic priorities by achieving financial savings and making our services more sustainable. Effective risk management is vital to achieving the objectives of the collaboration and therefore supporting both councils to deliver their strategic priorities.

3. Background

- 3.1 At their Council meetings in July 2021, Guildford and Waverley Borough Councils agreed to create a single management team comprising statutory officers, Directors, and Heads of Service, with a view to collaborate further to make financial savings and deliver sustainable services. An initial analysis of strategic risks related to the collaboration was included on the agenda of the Council meetings in July 2021, which was then developed into a collaboration risk register. Since its approval in April 2022 and its review by the Committee in December 2022, the risk register has been updated by officers and is presented alongside this report for review by the Committee.
- 3.2 At its last meeting the Committee agreed the key to the RAG ratings needed to be circulated with the risk register and the financial thresholds may need to be reviewed. Appendix 1 contains the risk register along with the risk criteria/key, with the financial thresholds highlighted in orange.
- 3.3 The Committee also agreed to add a final column to the spreadsheet setting out the target score for each risk, to be achieved by January 2027. Officers have added this column and drafted scores. The Committee is asked to review the draft scores.

4. Consultations

- 4.1 The risk register is presented in this report following its review and updating by the Strategic Director for Transformation and Governance, Executive Head of Organisational Development, Senior Policy Officer and Policy Officer. In appendix 1 description changes are shown in blue, increased scores in red text and decreased scores in green text.
- 4.2 The register was presented to Joint Management Team (JMT) 1 March 2023.

5. Key Risks

- 5.1 There is a risk that the register will not be monitored by all appropriate stakeholders should the Committee fail to fulfil its function of reviewing the register on a six-monthly basis.
- 5.2 Officers continue to monitor the risks and mitigations within the register as the collaboration progresses. Ownership of the register currently sits with CMB, providing responsive reaction to developments and proactive mitigations to reduce risks, including any resources that may need to be assigned.

6. Financial Implications

- 6.1 The financial risks to the collaboration and actions to mitigate these risks are listed in the register (appendix 1).
- 6.2 Some of the further mitigations in appendix 1 will require financial investment. This could be capital or revenue spend and is not factored into budgets currently. A detailed business case will come forward with requests for funding as required.

7. Legal Implications

- 7.1 There are no direct legal implications arising from this report.

8. Human Resource Implications

- 8.1 The HR risks to the collaboration and actions to mitigate these are listed in the register (Appendix 1).

9. Equality and Diversity Implications

- 9.1 This duty has been considered in the context of this report and it has been concluded that there are no equality and diversity implications arising directly from this report.

10. Climate Change/Sustainability Implications

- 10.1 One of the objectives of the collaboration and partnership is to better enable both councils to achieve their carbon neutrality targets. Working closely together across the two boroughs, Guildford and Waverley Borough Councils have enhanced opportunities to deliver their carbon neutrality goals.
- 10.2 This report and appendix 1 have no direct climate change implications.

13. Summary of Options

- 13.1 The Committee is asked to review the risk register attached at appendix 1 and agree any changes.

Background Papers

None

16. Appendices

Appendix 1 – Collaboration Risk Register

Service	Sign off date
<i>Finance / S.151 Officer</i>	<i>6 March 2023</i>
<i>Legal / Governance</i>	<i>16 Feb. 23</i>
<i>HR</i>	<i>15 Feb. 23</i>
<i>Equalities</i>	<i>15 Feb. 23</i>
<i>Lead Councillor</i>	<i>7 March 2023</i>
<i>CMB</i>	<i>NA</i>
<i>JMT</i>	<i>01 March 23</i>
<i>Executive Liaison</i>	<i>NA</i>
<i>Committee Services</i>	<i>NA</i>

Theme	Risk	Risk no	Consequence	Current control measures in place or in flight	Risk owner	Further planned actions to mitigate to the target risk appetite	Current likelihood	Current impact	Current rating	Residual likelihood	Residual impact	Residual rating	Target likelihood	Target impact	Target rating (January 2027)
GOVERNANCE	There is a risk that the partnership lacks clear objectives	1	which results in inefficiency and mission creep, which results in stakeholder dissatisfaction and misunderstanding and undermines benefits	Completed: adopt and communicate a shared vision statement; develop the vision statement into clear metrics and expectations, agreed by all partners; implement IAA; JMT roadmap achieved on time. Ongoing: clear road map of actions with milestone dates/goals to be put together; business cases in progress, timetable to be produced	Joint Chief Executive (JCX)	To confirm and document how both authorities will function, in terms of people, processes and technology, so that further change, transformation and collaboration activity in both councils will strategically align with that planned approach	3 - Low	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	2 - Significant	Low	2 - Very Low	2 - Significant	Low
GOVERNANCE	There is a risk that the councils will not continue with any collaboration	2	which results in foregoing any further benefits of partnership, which results in greater pressure on the council's financial challenge and service sustainability. Cost and reputational damage.	Completed: JMT now in place, first stage of collaboration complete. Ongoing: business cases in progress, timetable to be produced; focus more aggressively on each council's individual transformation programme; identify more options for efficiency, income, savings and potentially service reductions.	Joint Chief Executive (JCX)	Inclusion of quarterly gateway reviews at each stage before progressing to the next. Clear business cases to be presented to Council and frequent communications to public re: benefits. Ongoing review to be by the partnership governing board in future. Consider need for further joint committees or sub-committees to make key decisions about collaboration activity	3 - Low	2 - Significant	Medium	3 - Low	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	2 - Significant	Low
GOVERNANCE	There is a risk that the two councils disagree on an important aspect of the partnership	3	which results in dissatisfaction with the partnership and mistrust, which results in the partnership ending or being delayed.	Completed: agreed vision statement that is reviewed at least annually by both council Executives; an agreed Inter-Authority Agreement (IAA) which sets out protocols for dispute resolution and termination with an appropriate notice period. Ongoing: quarterly progress updates to O&S at each authority on progress of the collaboration; CMB members in close contact with key councillors	Joint chief Executive/Leaders	Regular opportunities for councillors to meet across boundaries, both formally and informally. Continue with Joint Governance Committee, reviewing IAA on a regular basis	3 - Low	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low
GOVERNANCE	There is a risk that costs and savings will not be apportioned fairly	4	which results in mistrust, which results in dispute and distraction.	Completed: a clear, early and agreed mechanism for cost and savings apportionment, enshrined in the IAA; regular clear accounting of savings and costs to the relevant committees. Ongoing: preparation & approval of business cases for collaboration beyond SMT	Joint S151 Officer	Business case development for opportunities identified and agreed by both councils.	3 - Low	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low
GOVERNANCE	There is a risk that JMT resource will not be apportioned fairly	5	which results in mistrust, which results in dispute and distraction. The Council fails to achieve milestones of objectives for either authority	Completed: Joint S151 in place and weighted cost sharing protocols agreed for JMT members. Ongoing: close monitoring during familiarisation period whilst new structure embeds	Joint chief Executive/CMB	Regular communication and concerns raised between lead members and CMB. Regular appraisals and one to one discussions between officers, ensuring that objectives are being met and not compromised in each authority	4 - Medium	2 - Significant	Medium	4 - Medium	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	2 - Significant	Low

GOVERNANCE	There is a risk that either or both councils will decide to terminate the partnership	6	Which results in lower-than-expected benefits realisation and reputational harm, increasing in impact with closer collaboration.	Completed: Clear agreement of priorities and objectives; JMT in place, partnership is sufficiently in place to mitigate this likelihood; clear clauses on termination in the IAA with an appropriate notice period to allow for transition. Ongoing: regular contact between councillors in the Executives and wider Councils; proactive communications with all stakeholders and the public; strong governance and oversight as per the IAA requirements.	Joint chief Executive/Leaders	Ensure mechanism in governance arrangements for backbench councillor input. Consider need for further joint committees or sub-committees to make key decisions about collaboration activity	2 - Very Low	4 - Devastating	Medium	2 - Very Low	4 - Devastating	Medium	2 - Very Low	4 - Devastating	Medium
GOVERNANCE	There is a risk that future political change leads to a serious change of partnership direction	7	Which results in a change in direction or a termination, which could lessen or increase benefits of collaboration.	Ongoing: engage all councillors throughout the transition process, with openness among all participants; identify where the disagreements and different priorities exist and be ready to adapt to them should a change occur.	Joint chief Executive/Leaders	Prepare communication plan about collaboration for councillors around election cycles to ensure the new intake are aware of the collaboration and address concerns. Establish aims/vision of partnership at early stage of each new municipal cycle. Current likelihood based on elections being in May 2023. Target likelihood reflects risk occurs every election cycle of 3-4 years	4 - Medium	3 - Critical	High	2 - Very Low	3 - Critical	Low	2 - Very Low	3 - Critical	Low
CAPACITY/RESOURCES	There is a risk that officer capacity will be over-stretched during the transition	8	Leading to lack of focus, which results in negative impacts on service delivery, partnership progress and morale.	Ongoing: build in investment during the earlier phases, potentially including external support; set clear timetable and pace, agreed by both councils, with appropriate resources and succession planning; develop early a programme of HR support for resilience, strategies for dealing with change, and team building.	Joint Management Team	Need clearly funded invest to save strategy for collaboration project. Additional staff resource procured to support key aspects of the project (e.g., HR and ICT consultancy resource) Create a single shared programme management team at the start. Appropriate business support to be put in place. Change to culture of councillors and officers to focus on prioritisation to support delivery of collaboration Achieve political direction across both Councils on single officer structure	5 - High	3 - Critical	High	3 - Low	2 - Significant	Medium	3 - Low	2 - Significant	Medium
CAPACITY/RESOURCES	There is a risk that the collaboration will impact on current projects/programmes which be delayed by diversion of capacity.	9	Leading to delays in achieving key objectives, which results in harm to the beneficiaries of those programmes.	Ongoing: individual council work programmes and corporate/service plans in place; clear programme management and reporting to senior management and councillors on progress of current service plans.	Joint Management Team	Early investment in the partnership so that it is not displacing resource from other key priorities. Review with councillors the existing priorities and agree where displacement may take place in a planned and agreed way. Identify any additional resource needed to support programme and project management in both authorities	4 - Medium	3 - Critical	High	4 - Medium	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	2 - Significant	Low

CAPACITY /RESOURCES	There is a risk that due to concerns about the collaboration, knowledgeable officers may leave and we fail to recruit in a buoyant market.	10	Leading to missing information and dilution of 'corporate memory', which results in delays and confusion. Capacity gaps leading to service failure and impact on other staff	Ongoing: individual council handover arrangements and procedure/process notes already in place; effective management of, and communication with, key staff; clear process and time for 'downloading' corporate knowledge from those that may leave; clear and consistent record-keeping and retention; transition plans to be documented; clearly documented hand-over and succession processes for when officers leave.	Joint Chief Executive	Continue to monitor the staff changes across the partnership particularly at management level. HR programme for management succession planning, recruitment, retention and reward.	4 - Medium	2 - Significant	Medium	3 - Low	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	2 - Significant	Low
CAPACITY /RESOURCES	There is a risk that one council's priorities will (or will be perceived to) dominate for a period	11	Which could result in conflict amongst members, resentment and potential dissolution of the partnership	Ongoing: regular communication with both Executives on specific local issues and priorities that arise; Joint S151 in place and weighted cost sharing protocols agreed for JMT members.	Joint Chief Executive (JCX)	Cultural strategy to 'work together'. Joint communications plan with equality at the core. Shared annual business plans for each service agreed by the councils, clearly articulating the apportionment on planned projects.	4 - Medium	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low
CAPACITY /RESOURCES	There is a risk that working across two councils leads to increased travel	12	Which results in wasted time and negative impact on the environment.	Ongoing: encourage video-conferencing and home working	Joint Management Team	Standardised approach to hybrid working across both authorities. Committee scheduling to be combined. Single location should be considered for any shared service and tools and systems harmonised. Consistent policies and training for standardised video-conferencing and home working Consider further expanding electric vehicles within the fleet(s). Progress a project for considering a single office to serve both councils. Agreed protocol aimed at reducing multiple officer attendance at committees as well as consideration of earlier committee meeting start times e.g. 6pm and the implementation of guillotine time restriction	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low
FINANCIAL	There is a risk that expected savings, beyond that of the JMT , cannot be realised at one or both councils	13	Which results in unexpected further pressure on services and undermines the partnership.	Ongoing: regular communication to both councils as to plans and progress; agreed IAA; JMT savings have been achieved; Joint S151 has been appointed and working towards standard financial reporting; criteria for business cases are being developed and will include cost sharing prior to approval	Joint Management Team	Standard financial reporting, forecast and assumptions to be used. Robust business cases documenting allocation of costs and savings. Standardisation of business cases and project management methodology. Detailed business cases to verify the savings identified in the LPP financial feasibility study. Savings based on movement from 2021-22 base budget for each council. Achieve political direction across both Councils on single officer structure	4 - Medium	3 - Critical	High	3 - Low	3 - Critical	Medium	2 - Very Low	3 - Critical	Low

FINANCIAL	There is a risk that costs of collaboration are prohibitively high	14	which results in a threat to the viability of some aspects of the collaboration for either or both councils, which results in an unviable partnership and reputational impact.	Ongoing: clear communication with councillors and the public throughout the partnership	Joint Management Team	Sensitivity analysis on estimates. Councillor involvement in working groups to look at each service/business case Identify and include transition costs in business cases as they are developed. Agree and document a common approach to rate-of-return and cost/benefit sharing. Change the phasing of transition to reduce the impact of unexpected new costs that arise. Focus first on those areas that present the biggest 'wins'.	4 - Medium	3 - Critical	High	2 - Very Low	2 - Significant	Low	2 - Very Low	2 - Significant	Low
SYSTEMS	There is a risk that different HR and service policies lead to confusion and duplication,	15	resulting in inefficiency or failures of governance	Completed: decision made on employment policies that will apply to members of the JMT Ongoing: strong engagement with unions	Joint Management Team	Strong combined target operating model and cultural framework. Review learning points from GBC's recent transformation and consider at next HR session. A programme of policy harmonisation and standardisation wherever possible, recognising that this huge task will take time. A single shared intranet hub for managers to consult policies, with cross-references where they are different. Regular communication of policy changes. Achieve political direction across both Councils on single officer structure	4 - Medium	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low
SYSTEMS	There is a risk that support functions and processes remain disparate during the collaboration leading to mis-application of policies/processes	16	resulting in confusion and potential challenge to decision-making.	Completed: Vision statement for both authorities contains the commitment to harmonise internal policies and procedures unless there is good reason not to Ongoing: strong and regular communication from the senior political and management	Joint Management Team	Strong combined target operating model and cultural framework. A plan for an early harmonisation of HR, IT and change management functions and key policies, with accompanying significant financial investment. A single intranet Achieve political direction across both Councils on single officer structure as a priority for support functions	4 - Medium	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	2 - Significant	Low	2 - Very Low	2 - Significant	Low
SYSTEMS	There is a risk of failure to address the different legacy IT platforms	17	Which would lead to duplication/ conflict in system usage within a shared service, resulting in inefficiency, anxiety and increased cost and increased risks in case management/ audits, customer service	Ongoing: review the costs and benefits of the current IT systems and their current contractual obligations; formation of ICT Strategy Board	Joint Management Team	Prioritise the transition programme based on the cost/benefit analysis. Develop and implement a new shared IT strategy that is focused on supporting the partnership and identify the resources required and return-on investment that is possible	5 - High	3 - Critical	High	3 - Low	3 - Critical	Medium	2 - Very Low	3 - Critical	Low

CULTURE	There is a risk that councillors do not feel ownership of the collaboration	18	which results in mistrust and concerns about sovereignty, which results in destabilisation of the partnership.	<p>Completed: clear and agreed governance principles and processes, including how councillors will be engaged in decision-making and scrutiny via existing committees or, if desired, shared committees.</p> <p>Ongoing: regular communication with councillors, parish councils and the public; JMT attending regular committees and boards, as well as networking meetings in both councils</p>	Joint chief Executive/Leaders	Harmonisation of roles and terms of reference of key council committees across councils e.g., CGSC / Audit committee ToRs to be similar. A joint comms strategy. Consider need for further joint committees or sub-committees to make key decisions about collaboration activity	4 - Medium	2 - Significant	Medium	3 - Low	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	2 - Significant	Low
CULTURE	There is a risk that councillors will perceive that officers are less available to them	19	which results in delays and dissatisfaction, which results in harm to the how councillors perform in their role	<p>Ongoing: clear expectations to be agreed, acknowledging that shared staff serving two councils may sometimes not be available; ensure that support to affected senior managers, via technology and assistants, is in place and supported adequately; consider developing a SLA between councillors and officers; JMT attending regular committees and boards, as well as networking meetings in both councils</p>	Joint chief Executive/Leaders	Guidance to be issued to councillors on how to make contact. Clear protocols on accessibility and building of resilience across officer tiers, so that the critical ward councillor role is prioritised throughout any transitions. Regular communication and concerns raised between lead members and CMB. Ensuring through regular appraisals and one to one discussions between officers that objectives are being met and not compromised in each authority	4 - Medium	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low
CULTURE	There is a risk that different officer cultures and organisational structures may hinder collaboration	20	which results in lack of prioritisation for the changes required, which results in delay, inefficiency and dissatisfaction.	<p>Completed: recruitment of JMT clear direction from senior political and officer leadership.</p> <p>Ongoing: investment in engagement, communication, training and support through times of change; formal agreements are being pursued for initial staff sharing arrangements</p>	Joint Management Team	Strong joint Organisational Development & Cultural framework along with performance management framework. Councillors to show leadership to support the collaboration. Recruitment of joint officers to reflect the required culture subject to business cases An articulated change strategy including expected behavioural norms. Achieve political direction across both Councils on single officer structure	3 - Low	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low

CULTURE	There is a risk that officers may not trust those from the 'other' council	21	which results in failure to share key information and attrition, which results in delay and unhealthy cultures and behaviour.	Ongoing: clear direction from the political and senior management leadership as to the way forward; good communication and support/training for employees on how to work well during change and transition.	Joint Chief Executive	Strong joint Organisational Development & Cultural framework along with performance management framework. Councillors to show leadership to support the collaboration. Harmonise performance management processes. <i>Best practice sharing opportunities and investment in building new teams through collaboration and current working environments.</i> <i>Consider data sharing agreement/terms to provide staff confidence in information sharing</i> <i>Achieve political direction across both Councils on single officer structure</i>	3 - Low	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low
CULTURE	There is a risk that employees will become increasingly anxious	22	which results in negative impacts on morale, which results in impact on service delivery, mental health concerns and loss of staff	Ongoing: a clear direction of travel from the political leaderships, with messages delivered consistently and clearly; regular communication from senior management and transparency with employees and unions about the plans, progress and impact on affected staff; review regularly the impact on service performance and be prepared to support and resource accordingly; continue with effective communication and briefing of staff and Councillors. Monitor exit interviews & recruitment data; investment in HR support	JCX / HR Managers	Progress to be swift so period of uncertainty minimised. Costing will affect this. (related to JMT) <i>Acknowledging time to progress collaboration</i> <i>Strong joint Organisational Development & Cultural framework.</i> <i>Promoting wellbeing activities</i> <i>Development of tier 4 manager development sessions</i>	4 - Medium	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low
CULTURE	There is a risk that current programmes, project or systems , or past decisions are being implemented in a fixed way which constrains partnership options	23	Which results in compromises in the short term and failure to achieve the collaboration aims.	Ongoing: clear communication with the Executives; be prepared to be bold if the business case holds, with an agreed process for cost-sharing if necessary; phase the partnership accordingly; assessing partnership risk of collaboration opportunities	Joint Management Team	<i>New business cases reviewed and</i> clearly assessed how far there are new opportunities, as well as constraints, arising from legacy decisions; whether they permit or block a 'best of breed' approach and for how long.	3 - Low	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low

EXTERNAL	There is a risk that residents/businesses will be confused between the two councils' services	24	Leading to miscommunication, which results in inefficiency	Ongoing: clear communication on the nature and extent of the partnership, and the continuing importance of the role of ward councillors; points of access to access services need to be clear - e.g., Guildford residents can still access via GBC website and same for Waverley.	JCX / Comms Leads	Review customer service points of access at each stage of collaboration . ICT synchronisation so that customers notice no change. A clear branding strategy to reflect the Councils' agreed priorities and approach. Comms lead on transformation and collaboration board/project team	3 - Low	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low
EXTERNAL	There is a risk that unexpected external events impact the collaboration	25	leading to significant diversion of attention, which results in delays to the partnership transition	Completed: JMT recruited. Ongoing: clearly documented progress of the partnership; other collaboration agreements are being considered	Joint Management Team	An early and agreed plan for handling such an unexpected external event, and a protocol for slowing or pausing the partnership. Transformation and collaboration board established to manage and keep on track	4 - Medium	3 - Critical	High	4 - Medium	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	2 - Significant	Low
EXTERNAL	There is a risk that the Government will restart 'local government reorganisation' leading to structural uncertainty and diversion from the collaboration's priorities	26	Which results in the abolition of the two councils and disruption to service delivery.	Ongoing: given that any future model is likely to include Guildford and Waverley within the same structure, plan the current collaboration so that it could also adapt to and be a strong voice within a new enforced unitary; regular communication with other government stakeholders (councils, DULHC, MPs) on the progress of this partnership.	JCX / Leaders	Ensuring work to design operating model and creating transformation creates a strong foundation for discussions about future LG reorg (relates to vision statement)	2 - Very Low	3 - Critical	Low	3 - Low	3 - Critical	Medium	2 - Very Low	3 - Critical	Low
SYSTEMS	There is a risk that there is not an appropriate IT solution to enable the collaboration	27	Which would result in a threat to benefits realisation, operational service delivery and decision making, in addition to impacts on service delivery and inefficient working, especially as the collaboration progresses to realise the expected benefits	Ongoing: Formation of ICT board to consider plans moving forward for a harmonised/reconciled ICT platform or working with both current platforms	Joint Management Team	To confirm and document how both authorities will function, in terms of people, processes and technology, so that further change, transformation and collaboration activity in both councils will strategically align with that planned approach	5 - High	3 - Critical	High	4 - Medium	3 - Critical	High	3 - Low	3 - Critical	Medium

This page is intentionally left blank