GUILDFORD & WAVERLEY JOINT GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE
ADJOURNED MEETING FROM 09.10.23

Wednesday, 1 November 2023 at 9.30 - 11.30 am

Council Chamber, Council Offices, The Burys, Godalming

Members:

Cllr Paul Follows, Leader, Waverley Borough Council (Joint Chair) (Joint Chair)
Cllr Julia McShane, Leader, Guildford Borough Council (Joint Chair) (Joint Chair)
Cllr Joss Bigmore, Guildford Borough Council
Cllr Brooker, Guildford Borough Council
Cllr Peter Clark, Deputy Leader, Waverley Borough Council
Cllr Fenwick, Guildford Borough Council
Cllr Victoria Kiehl, Waverley Borough Council
Cllr Peter Martin, Waverley Borough Council
Cllr Newson, Guildford Borough Council
Cllr Rehorst-Smith, Guildford Borough Councillor
Cllr John Robini, Waverley Borough Council
Cllr John Ward, Waverley Borough Council

A G E N D A

1 **Apologies for absence and notification of substitutes**

2 **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.

3 **Adoption of Minutes of the previous meeting** (Pages 5 - 8)

To agree the Minutes of the meeting held on 17 March 2023.

The meeting on the 9 October was adjourned before item 1 on the agenda, this was due to the committee not being quorate.

4 **Collaboration Risk Register Review** (Pages 9 - 32)

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 March 2023. Since then, it has been updated by officers, including the assessment of scores and updates to mitigations.

Recommendation to Committee

1. That the Committee reviews the collaboration risk register and the changes to the risk ratings suggested by officers and agrees any further changes.

2. That the Committee ask officers to undertake a comprehensive review of the register, including risks; mitigations and scoring, with a view to making it more succinct and focused on the key threats to success of the collaboration.

5 **Update: On the Inter Authority Agreements (IAA's)** (Pages 33 - 38)

The Joint Governance Committee's terms of reference includes a requirement to undertake periodically a formal review (at least once every 12 months) of the inter-authority agreement (IAA) in respect of the Joint Management Team (JMT), ensuring it continues to be fit for purpose and recommending to both Full Councils any changes required.

This report provides the Committee with an update on the IAA and relating matters since its last meeting on the 17 March 2023.

Recommendations to Committee

That the Committee notes the report and the updates on both IAA's between Guildford Borough Council and Waverley Borough Council.

6 **Refreshed Report: Amendments to the Guildford and Waverley Joint Governance Committee's Terms of Reference (TOR)** (Pages 39 - 54)

The Joint Governance Committee was created in April 2022 and its Terms of Reference (TOR) can be found in Part 3 (Appendix 2) of the Waverley Borough Council's Constitution and Part 3 (Terms of Reference of the Council) of the Guild Borough Council's Constitution.

At the request of the new Joint Executive Head of Legal & Democratic Services, the TOR for the Joint Governance Committee were reviewed to ensure they remained, relevant, fit for purpose and included any collaboration arrangement updates.

This report is for information only, it asks that the Joint Governance Committee note that the Joint Constitutional Review Group (JCRG) will be asked to consider the amendments to the TOR at its meeting on the 30 November. It will be recommended that the JCRG recommend the amendments to WBC Standards & GP committee and GBC Governance & Standards Committee, with a recommendation that each committee recommends the amended TOR to their full Council for adoption.

Recommendations to Committee

1. That the Joint Governance Committee resolves to noting the report and the proposed amended TOR.

2. That the Committee provides comments and feedback by way of consultation so that Officers can put those comments to the JCRG.

7 **Date of the next meeting**

This page is intentionally left blank

MINUTES OF THE GUILDFORD & WAVERLEY JOINT GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE - 17 MARCH 2023

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

Present

Cllr Paul Follows (WBC), Chair
Cllr Julia McShane (GBC), Co-Chair
Cllr Peter Clark (WBC)
Cllr Michael Goodridge (WBC)
Cllr Peter Marriott (WBC)
Cllr Stephen Mulliner (WBC)
Cllr Ramsey Nagaty (GBC)
Cllr John Redpath (GBC)
Cllr John Rigg (GBC)
Cllr John Robini (WBC)
Cllr Keith Witham (GBC)

Apologies

Cllr Joss Bigmore (GBC), Cllr Graham Eyre (GBC) and Cllr George Potter (GBC)

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

Apologies for absence had been received from Cllrs Joss Bigmore, Graham Eyre and George Potter (all GBC).

Cllr John Rigg and Cllr Keith Witham attended as substitutes.

8 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (Agenda item 2)

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 December 2022 were agreed.

9 DISCLOSURES OF INTERESTS (Agenda item 3)

There were no disclosures of interests in relation to items on the agenda.

10 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE FORMAL REVIEW OF THE INTER-AUTHORITY AGREEMENT AND THE COLLABORATION RISK REGISTER (DECEMBER 2022) (Agenda item 4)

The Committee noted that the report responded to the review of the Inter-Authority Agreement at the meeting on 9 December 2022, and

RESOLVED to recommend to Guildford and Waverley Councils that clause 21.1 of the Inter-Authority Agreement be amended to read:

"21 TERMINATION FOR CLAUSE

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."

11 COLLABORATION RISK REGISTER REVIEW (Agenda item 5)

The Joint Executive Head of Organisational Development, Robin Taylor, introduced the report and collaboration risk register, which had been updated to reflect the discussion at the 9 December 2022 meeting, updated assessment of scores and updates to mitigations, and proposed target risk scores as at January 2027.

The Committee asked that in future a separate table is provided to show which risks have been changed since the previous report, including by how much and the reason(s) for the change.

The Committee also asked that a timeframe be provided for further planned actions, and a commentary on how planned actions are expected to reduce the risk score to residual score.

The Committee noted that the Head of Finance considered that the financial thresholds for risk impact were appropriate in terms of budgets and reserves of the councils.

During their consideration of the Risk Register, the Committee requested a number of presentational changes to the Risk Register, including:

- Column headings to be repeated on each page.
- More care on use of colour to ensure that the risk register is accessible for all.
- A column to be added to show related risks.

Capacity/Resources & Culture
The Committee discussed the risks relating to the capacity of JMT to manage across both councils (#8), and the impact of low staff morale on turnover with potential loss of knowledge and expertise (#10).

Noted that the Head of Service team was bigger than had previously been in place at Guildford and Waverley, so Heads of Service now had a smaller area of responsibility remit but across two councils. Some of what Heads of Service worked on was common to both councils, whilst some activity would be specific to one or the other council. It would take time to get used to working across two councils and finding a sustainable way of working, but a collaborative environment was not necessarily more stressful than an individual council, depending on the circumstances.

The restructure of the Business Support Team, comprising the Executive and Personal Assistants, to the JMT was almost finalised. The costs of this review had been included in the JMT savings already reported.

Joint working across the councils at the next managerial level down, or at the operational level, would be considered on a case-by-case basis after the elections, once the direction of travel of the collaboration had been confirmed. It was not

intended that joint working would automatically cascade down, and there were considerable challenges to this approach as the councils had different ways of working.

Staff turnover varied by profession, and was impacted by other factors besides the collaboration. The collaboration presented a range of threats and opportunities for staff at all levels and these were recognised and being actively managed.

A joint staff survey had been commissioned via the Health & Safety Executive and the outcomes of that were awaited. Joint Governance Committee at September 2023 meeting to consider outcomes of the HSE Staff Survey.

Agreed that the Residual likelihood and impact of **#22 (risk that employees will become increasingly anxious)** should both increase by 1 ie Likelihood goes from 2 (Very Low) to 3 (Low) and Impact goes from 2 (Small) to 3 (Critical).

Financial
Agreed that the Residual likelihood and impact of **#13 (risk that expected savings, beyond that of the JMT, cannot be realised at one or both councils)** should both increase by 1 ie Likelihood goes from 3 (Low) to 4 (Medium) and Impact goes from 3 (Critical) to 4 (Devastating).

In response to a question from Cllr Witham regarding the costs incurred in implementing the JMT, the Committee agreed that it was important to be transparent about the gross and net savings.

Agreed that the Residual likelihood of **#14 (risk of costs of collaboration are prohibitively high) should increase from 2 (Very Low) to 3 (Low)**.

Governance
A number of the risks had the mitigation “Achieve political direction across both councils on single officer structure.” The Committee felt there needed to be a common understanding of what this meant for the councils as individual councillors had interpreted it in different ways.

Noted that without a single officer structure the progress of the partnership would be limited.

It would be important to brief the new councils following the election so that all councillors were clear about the nature of the collaboration. There would need to be a re-set of the partnership and its direction of travel after the elections in light of the aspirations of the new administrations, including consideration of the need for further joint committees or sub-committees

September 2023 meeting to consider how new arrangements are being scrutinised and whether additional joint committees might be needed.

Systems
The Committee discussed risks related to IT systems and the cost and complexity of aligning systems to enable closer collaboration. Both councils had very complex IT architectures that had grown organically, and were costly to maintain. There was

an opportunity to have a better structure in the future that would be less costly, but the journey would be extremely complex. An ICT Strategy Board was being set up to address these issues, and proposals would come forward as discrete business cases as these were identified.

The Committee considered that both #17 and #27 should have a Residual Risk of High, and that false optimism about IT risks should be avoided.

Noted that a Service Review and Budget Challenge was underway at Guildford and the same process would follow at Waverley and these would consider each service in the context of budget, HR and IT systems needed to support service delivery.

The Committee concluded its discussions, and agreed that officers make the further revisions to the Collaboration Risk Register identified during the meeting for the next review in September 2023.

12 DATE OF NEXT MEETING (Agenda item 6)

Noted that the next scheduled meeting would take place on Friday 22 September 2023 at 10.00am, at Guildford Borough Council Offices, Millmead.

The meeting commenced at 10.00 am and concluded at 11.15 am

Chairman

Guildford Borough Council and Waverley Borough Council

Report to: Joint Governance Committee

Date: 9 October 2023

Ward(s) affected: All

Report of Director: Transformation & Governance

Author: Robin Taylor

Tel: 01483 523108

Email: robin.taylor@waverley.gov.uk

Executive Portfolio Holder/ Lead Councillor responsible: Cllr Morson (GBC) and Cllr Kiehl (WBC)

Email: Carla.morson@guildford.gov.uk; Victoria.kiehl@waverley.gov.uk

Report Status: Open

Collaboration Risk Register Review

1. Executive Summary

1.1 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 March 2023. Since then, it has been updated by officers, including the assessment of scores and updates to mitigations.

2. Recommendation to Committee

1. That the Committee reviews the collaboration risk register and the changes to the risk ratings suggested by officers and agrees any further changes.
2. That the Committee ask officers to undertake a comprehensive review of the register, including risks; mitigations and scoring, with a view to making it more succinct and focused on the key threats to success of the collaboration.

3. Reason(s) for Recommendation:

3.1 The Committee's role is to undertake a formal review of the risk register and make any changes.

3.2 Over time the register has grown and become more detailed in terms of mitigations. Whilst officers are happy to provide detail on the work going on to mitigate risks, the document has become onerous to manage and would benefit from a significant refresh.

4. Exemption from publication

4.1 No

5. Purpose of Report

5.1 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.

6. Strategic Priorities

6.1 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.

7. Background

7.1 In July 2021 both Guildford Borough Council and Waverley Borough Council agreed to explore collaboration beyond a joint management team. An initial analysis of strategic risks related to the collaboration was developed into a collaboration risk register. Since its review by this Committee in March 2023, the risk register has been updated by officers and is presented alongside this report for review by the Committee.

7.2 It is important to remember not all risks are able to be fully mitigated, sometimes due to external influences and other times due to level of impact if the risk were to materialise, regardless of likelihood. For some risks the likelihood may be low or very low but the impact will remain high regardless of mitigating action. The scoring of the risk will therefore remain high, despite it being unlikely.

8. Consultations

8.1 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, Business Transformation Manager (WBC) and Graduate Management Trainee (WBC).

8.2 The risk register was presented to Joint Management Team (JMT) 6 September 2023 and Corporate Management Team (CMB) 19 September 2023.

9. Key Risks

9.1 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.

9.2 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.

10. Financial Implications

10.1 The financial risks to the collaboration and actions to mitigate these risks are listed in the register (appendix 1).

10.2 Some of the further mitigations in appendix 1 will require financial investment. Requests for funding will be submitted where budget or resource is required beyond current provision.

10.3 Business cases for specific collaboration projects will provide detail on costs and savings through the financial business case.

11. Legal Implications

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

12. Human Resource Implications

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

13. Equality and Diversity Implications

13.1 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.

14. Climate Change/Sustainability Implications

14.1 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.

14.2 This report and appendix 1 have no direct climate change implications.

15. Summary of Options

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

16. Background Papers

16.1 None

17. Appendices

17.1 Appendix 1 – Collaboration Risk Register
17.2 Appendix 2 – Risk register table of changes 27.09.23

Service	Sign off date
Finance / S.151 Officer	1 September 2023

Legal / Governance	19 September 2023
HR	N/A (updated register)
Equalities	N/A (updated register)
Lead Councillor	27 September 2023
CMB	19 September 2023
Committee Services	

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	Other related risks
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**: scoping of shared staff and shared HQ projects; clear road map of actions with milestone dates/goals to be put together; programme plan drafted but not yet agreed; business cases for big ticket items in development; maps of both organisations being drafted for the 'as is' in order to develop the 'to be'. Current pause in light of Guildford financial situation	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	3,7
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 councils' financial challenge, service sustainability and pressure on the staff that are already joint. Cost and reputational damage. Impact on efficiency, workload, morale, reputation and service delivery.	Completed: JMT now in place, first stage of collaboration complete. Ongoing: programme plan drafted but not yet agreed; business cases for big ticket items in development; 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 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. SEMs (Simultaneous Executive Meetings) being considered.	4 - Medium	2 - Significant	Medium	3 - Low	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	2 - Significant	Low	3
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. Options analyses being drafted	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	1,2,7

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	Other related risks
GOVERNANCE	There is a risk that costs and savings of projects 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 e.g. JMT; regular clear accounting of savings and costs to the relevant committees. **Ongoing**: cost and savings apportionment set out within business cases	Joint S151 Officer	Business case development for opportunities identified and agreed by both councils.	2 - Very Low	2 - Significant	Low	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low	5,11
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	Action plans implemented where significant issues arise. CMB and senior officers to decide if one off/shorter term issue or requires change to cost allocation with the option of rebalancing costs - keep this under review in budget planning. Further development of partnership working mitigates this risk further. Regular review and communication, to raise concerns, between lead members and CMB. Recognise ebb and flow to respond to needs of orgs and priorities. Regular appraisals and one to one discussions between officers, ensuring that objectives are being met and not compromised in each authority.	6 - Very High	2 - Significant	High	4 - Medium	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	2 - Significant	Low	4,9,11,19
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. SEMs (Simultaneous Executive Meetings) being considered. Interim shared staffing arrangements agreed by both councils	3 - Low	4 - Devastating	Medium	2 - Very Low	4 - Devastating	Medium	2 - Very Low	4 - Devastating	Medium	7,26

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	Other related risks
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; communications plan being drafted	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.	3 - Low	3 - Critical	Medium	2 - Very Low	3 - Critical	Low	2 - Very Low	3 - Critical	Low	1,6,3,18
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.	**Completed:** Created a single shared programme management team. **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) Appropriate business support to be put in place. Change to culture of councillors and officers to focus on prioritisation to support delivery of collaboration. Keep JMT structure change under review. 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	9,10,19,22
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; adjusted work progs to suit current priority; financial recovery plan for GBC to progress its priorities; GBC has clear programme reporting through EPB; WBC has agreed 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	3 - Low	3 - Critical	Medium	4 - Medium	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	2 - Significant	Low	4,8,23
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:** development of HR Workforce Strategy and plan, effective management of, and communication with, staff; maintain external contacts through Surrey networks	Joint Chief Executive	Continue to monitor the staff changes across the partnership particularly at management level. Proceed and deliver Programme at pace.	4 - Medium	2 - Significant	Medium	3 - Low	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	2 - Significant	Low	8,22

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	Other related risks
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 comms plan being drafted	Joint Chief Executive (JCX)	Action plan implemented where significant issues arise. CMB and senior officers to decide if one off/shorter term issue or requires change to cost allocation with the option of rebalancing costs - keep this under review in budget planning. Further development of partnership working mitigates this risk further. Shared annual business plans for each service agreed by the councils, clearly articulating the apportionment on planned projects. Transformation & Collaboration Programme to include actions to promote positive working culture in both orgs	5 - High	2 - Significant	High	3 - Low	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low	4,5
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; scheduling of committee calenders combined where possible; options analysis for single office for both councils underway	Joint Management Team	Standardised policies, approach and training to hybrid working across both authorities. Single location should be considered for any shared service and tools and systems harmonised. Consider further expanding electric vehicles within the fleet(s). 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	15
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	4 - Medium	4 - Devastating	High	2 - Very Low	3 - Critical	Low	14,23

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	Other related risks
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 (comms plan being drafted); cost and savings apportionment set out within business cases	Joint Management Team	Avoid pursuing prohibitively expensive projects. 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'.	3 - Low	3 - Critical	Medium	3 - Low	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	2 - Significant	Low	13,17,27
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. 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 (decision on options analysis)	4 - Medium	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low	12,16
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; mapping of 'as is' to devise the 'to be'	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	15,20,27

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	Other related risks
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 IT Way Forward Group meeting (GBC and WBC) to collaborate.	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. Cost/benefits analysis will be a key part of business cases for change, including for IT.	5 - High	3 - Critical	High	3 - Low	3 - Critical	Medium	2 - Very Low	3 - Critical	Low	14,23,27
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.	**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. **Ongoing**: regular communication with councillors, parish councils and the public; JMT attending regular committees and boards, as well as networking meetings in both councils, joint comms plan being drafted	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. SEMs (Simultaneous Executive Meetings) being considered. Consider need for further joint committees or sub-committees to make key decisions about collaboration activity. O&S will scrutinise prior to final options being put to Executives	4 - Medium	2 - Significant	Medium	3 - Low	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	2 - Significant	Low	7
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	**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 an SLA between councillors and officers; JMT attending regular committees and boards, as well as networking meetings in both councils. Interim shared staffing arrangements agreed by both councils	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 review and communication, to raise concerns, 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	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low	5,8

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	Other related risks
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.	**Completed**: recruitment of JMT clear direction from senior political and officer leadership. **Ongoing**: investment in engagement, communication, training and support through times of change; agreed initial staff sharing arrangements; aligning structures where possible in preparation for collaboration	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	16,21
CULTURE	There is a risk that officers may not trust those from the partner council	**21**	which results in failure to share key information and attrition, which results in delay and unhealthy cultures and behaviour.	**Completed:** Performance management meetings harmonised. **Ongoing**: clear direction from the political and senior management leadership as to the way forward; investment in engagement, communication, training and support through times of change; best practice sharing opportunities and investment in building new teams through collaboration and current working environments.	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. Consider data sharing agreement/terms to provide staff confidence in information sharing. 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	20,22
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. joint comms plan being drafted. Monitor exit interviews & recruitment data; investment in HR support, investment in engagement, communication, training and support through times of change.	JCX / HR Managers	Progress to be swift so period of uncertainty minimised. Costing will affect this. (related to JMT). Acknowledging time to progress collaboration Strong joint Organisational Development & Cultural framework. Promoting wellbeing activities Development of tier 4 manager development sessions	4 - Medium	2 - Significant	Medium	3 - Low	3 - Critical	Medium	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low	8,10,21

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	Other related risks
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	New business cases reviewed and 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	9,13,17
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. Joint comms plan being drafted, including proposed joint branding. Comms leads from GBC and WBC on T&CP Team	JCX / Comms Leads	Review customer service points of access at each stage of collaboration. ICT synchronisation so that customers notice no change.	3 - Low	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low	2 - Very Low	1 - Small	Low	
EXTERNAL	There is a risk that significant events impact the collaboration	**25**	leading to significant diversion of attention, which results in delays to the partnership transition	**Completed**: JMT recruited, T&CP Board established to manage and keep on track. **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 event.	5 - High	3 - Critical	High	4 - Medium	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	2 - Significant	Low	26
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)	4 - Medium	3 - Critical	High	3 - Low	3 - Critical	Medium	2 - Very Low	3 - Critical	Low	6,25

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	Other related risks
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	14,16,17
CAPACITY/RESOURCES	There is a risk that there is not sufficient expertise and knowledge regarding collaborative working currently within staffing	28	Which could result in slow progress, uninformed decision-making and unecessary risk		Joint Management Team	Request investment to bring in necessary expertise to inform collaboration	4 - Medium	2 - Significant	Medium	3 - Low	2 - Significant	Medium	2 - Very Low	2 - Significant	Low	

			Impact			
			Small	Significant	Critical	Devastating
			1	2	3	4
Likelihood	Very high	6	6	12	18	24
	High	5	5	10	15	20
	Medium	4	4	8	12	16
	Low	3	3	6	9	12
	Very low	2	2	4	6	8
	Almost impossible	1	1	2	3	4

Score	Likelihood	Indicators
1	Almost impossible	Less than 1% chance of occurring Has happened rarely/never before
2	Very low	1-10% change of occurring Only likely to happen once in three or more years May have happened in the past
3	Low	10-20% chance of occurring Reasonable possibility it will happen in the next three years Has happened in the past
4	Medium	20-50% chance of occurring Likely to happen at some point in the next one-two years Circumstances occasionally encountered
5	High	50-80% chance of occurring Almost certain to happen within next 12 months Regular occurrences frequently encountered
6	Very high	Above 80% chance of occurring Inevitable it will happen within the next 6 months No influence/control over event occurring

Score	Impact	Indicators
1	Small	Loss <£100k Trivial breach or non-compliance Insignificant injury (first aid) Negligible disruption/unnoticed by service users Insignificant damage
2	Significant	Loss from £100k-£250k Isolated legal action or regulatory breach Minor injury (medical attention) Small disruption/inconvenience to service One-off adverse local publicity
3	Critical	Loss >£250k- £500k Sustained legal action or (limited) regulatory fine Serious injury (not life threatening) Substantial, short-term disruption/inconvenience to service Short-term, but wide reaching adverse publicity
4	Devastating	Loss >£500k Major legal action or regulatory sanction Death(s) or multiple serious injuries Major, sustained disruption/serious inconvenience to service Major, long-term damage

This page is intentionally left blank

Risk Register - Table of Changes

Text in red added

Text in blue omitted

Between dates 17/03/2023 and 25/09/23

Risk number	Score Change	Description Change
1	N/A	**E2** **Now:** *[...]Ongoing: scoping of shared staff and shared HQ projects; clear road map of actions with milestone dates/goals to be put together; programme plan drafted but not yet agreed; business cases for big ticket items in development; maps of both organisations being drafted for the 'as is' in order to develop the 'to be'. Current pause in light of Guildford financial situation.*
2	Cell H3: Current likelihood changed from 3 - Low to 4 - Medium.	**D3** **Now:** *which results in foregoing any further benefits of partnership, which results in greater pressure on the councils' financial challenge, service sustainability and pressure on the staff that are already joint. Cost and reputational damage. Impact on efficiency, workload, morale, reputation and service delivery.* **E3** **Now:** *[...]Ongoing: programme plan drafted but not yet agreed; business cases for big ticket items in development; focus more aggressively on each council's individual transformation programme; identify more options for efficiency, income, savings and potentially service reductions.* **Previously:** *[...]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.* **G3** **Now:** *Inclusion of 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.* *SEMs (Simultaneous Executive Meetings) being considered.* **Previously:** *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	N/A	**E4** **Now:** *[...]Ongoing: quarterly progress updates to O&S at each authority on progress of the collaboration; CMB members in close contact with key councillors. Options analyses being drafted.*
4	Cell H5: Current likelihood changed from 3 - low to 2 - very low. Current rating changed from medium (amber) to low (green).	**E9** **Now:** *Completed: a clear, early and agreed mechanism for cost and savings apportionment, enshrined in the IAA e.g. JMT;* *regular clear accounting of savings and costs to the relevant committees.* *Ongoing: cost and savings apportionment set out within business cases.* **Previously:** *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.*
5	Cell H6: Curent likehlihood changed from 4 - medium to 6 - very high. Current rating changed from Medium (amber) to High (red)	**G6** **Now:** *Action plans implemented where significant issues arise. CMB and senior officers to decide if one off/shorter term issue or requires change to cost allocation with the option of rebalancing costs - keep this under review in budget planning. Further development of partnership working mitigates this risk further. Regular review and communication, to raise concerns, between lead members and CMB.* *Recognise ebb and flow to respond to needs of orgs and priorities.* *Regular appraisals and one to one discussions between officers, ensuring that objectives are being met and not compromised in each authority.*

Risk number	Score Change	Description Change
6	Cell H6: Current likelihood changed from 2 - very low to 3 - low. The current rating still remains the same (medium).	**G7** **Now:** *Ensure mechanism in governance arrangements for backbench councillor input.* *SEMs (Simultaneous Executive Meetings) being considered.* *Interim shared staffing arrangements agreed by both councils.* **Previously:** *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.*
7	Cell H8: Current likelihood changed from 4 - Medium to 3 - Low. Current rating changed from High (red) to Medium (amber).	**E8** **Now:** *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; communications plan being drafted.* **G8** **Now:** *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.*
8	N/A	**E9** **Now:** *Completed: Created a single shared programme management team.* *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.* **G9** **Now:** *[...]Change to culture of councillors and officers to focus on prioritisation to support delivery of collaboration. Keep JMT structure change under review.*
9	Cell H10: Current likelihood changed from 4 - medium to 3 - low. Cell K10: This changed the current rating from High (red) to Medium (Amber)	**E10** **Now:** *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; adjusted work progs to suit current priority; financial recovery plan for GBC to progress its priorities; GBC has clear programme reporting through EPB; WBC has agreed service plans.*
10	N/A	**E11** **Now:** *Ongoing: development of HR Workforce Strategy and plan, effective management of, and communication with, staff; maintain external contacts through Surrey networks.* **Previously:** *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.* **G11** **Now:** *Continue to monitor the staff changes across the partnership particularly at management level. Proceed and deliver Programme at pace.* **Previously:** *Continue to monitor the staff changes across the partnership particularly at management level.* *HR programme for management succession planning, recruitment, retention and reward.*

Risk number	Score Change	Description Change
11	Cell H12: Current likelihood changed from 4 - Medium to 5 - High. Cell K12: This changed the current rating from Medium (Amber) to High (Red). Cell L12: Residual likelihood changed from 2 - Very Low to 3 - Low. Cell M12: Residual impact changed from 1 Small to 2 - Significant. Cell O12: This changed the Residual rating from Low (Green) to Medium (Amber).	**E12** **Now:** *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 comms plan being drafted.* **G12** **Now:** *Action plan implemented where significant issues arise. CMB and senior officers to decide if one off/shorter term issue or requires change to cost allocation with the option of rebalancing costs - keep this under review in budget planning. Further development of partnership working mitigates this risk further. Shared annual business plans for each service agreed by the councils, clearly articulating the apportionment on planned projects.* *Transformation & Collaboration Programme to include actions to promote positive working culture in both orgs.* **Previously:** *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.*
12	N/A	**E13** **Now:** *Ongoing: encourage video-conferencing and home working ; scheduling of committee calenders combined where possible; options analysis for single office for both councils underway.* **G13** **Previously:** *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.*
13	Cell L14: Residual likelihood changed from 3 - Low to 4 - Medium. Cell M14: Residual impact changed from 3 - Critical to 4 - Devastating. Cell O14: This changed the Residual Rating from Medium (amber) to High (red)	N/A
14	Cell H15: Current likelihood changed from 4 - Medium to 3 - Low. Cell K15: This changed the current rating from High (red) to Medium (amber). Cell L15: Residual likelihood changed from 2 - Very low to 3 - Low. Cell O15: This changed the Residual rating from Low (green) to Medium (amber).	**E15** **Now:** *Ongoing: clear communication with councillors and the public throughout the partnership (comms plan being drafted); cost and savings apportionment set out within business cases.* **G15** **Now:** *Avoid pursuing prohibitively expensive projects. 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'.*

Risk number	Score Change	Description Change
15	N/A	**G16** **Now:** *Strong combined target operating model and cultural framework.* *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 (decision on options analysis).* **Previously:** *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.*
16	N/A	**E17** **Now:** *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; mapping of 'as is' to devise the 'to be'.*
17	N/A	**E18** **Now:** *Ongoing: review the costs and benefits of the current IT systems and their current contractual obligations; formation of IT Way Forward Group meeting (GBC and WBC) to collaborate.* **Previously:** *Ongoing: review the costs and benefits of the current IT systems and their current contractual obligations; formation of ICT Strategy Board.* **G18** **Now:** *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.* *Cost/benefits analysis will be a key part of business cases for change, including for IT.*
18	N/A	**E19** **Now:** *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.* *Ongoing: regular communication with councillors, parish councils and the public; JMT attending regular committees and boards, as well as networking meetings in both councils, joint comms plan being drafted.* **G19** **Now:** *Harmonisation of roles and terms of reference of key council committees across councils e.g., CGSC / Audit committee ToRs to be similar.* *SEMs (Simultaneous Executive Meetings) being considered.* *Consider need for further joint committees or sub-committees to make key decisions about collaboration activity.* *O&S will scrutinise prior to final options being put to Executives.*
19	N/A	**E20** **Now:** *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 an SLA between councillors and officers; JMT attending regular committees and boards, as well as networking meetings in both councils . Interim shared staffing arrangements agreed by both councils.*
20	N/A	**E21** **Now:** *Completed: recruitment of JMT clear direction from senior political and officer leadership.* *Ongoing: investment in engagement, communication, training and support through times of change; agreed initial staff sharing arrangements ; aligning structures where possible in preparation for collaboration.* **Previously:** *Completed: recruitment of JMT clear direction from senior political and officer leadership.* *Ongoing: investment in engagement, communication, training and support through times of change; formal agreements are being pursued for initial staff sharing arrangements.*

Risk number	Score Change	Description Change
21	N/A	**E22** **Now:** *Completed: Performance management meetings harmonised.* *Ongoing: clear direction from the political and senior management leadership as to the way forward; investment in engagement, communication, training and support through times of change; best practice sharing opportunities and investment in building new teams through collaboration and current working environments.* **G22** **Previously:** *Strong joint Organisational Development & Cultural framework along with performance management framework. Councillors to show leadership to support the collaboration.* *Harmonise performance management processes.* *Best practice sharing opportunities and investment in building new teams through collaboration and current working environments.* *Consider data sharing agreement/terms to provide staff confidence in information sharing* *Achieve political direction across both Councils on single officer structure*
22	Cell L23: Residual likelihood changed from 2 - Very Low to 3 - Low. Cell M23: Residual impact changed from 1 - Small to 3 - Critical. Cell O23: This changed the Residual Rating from Low (green) to Medium (amber)	**E23** **Now:** *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. joint comms plan being drafted.* *Monitor exit interviews & recruitment data; investment in HR support ,* *investment in engagement, communication, training and support through times of change.*
23	N/A	N/A
24	N/A	**E25** **Now:** *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.* *Joint comms plan being drafted, including proposed joint branding.* *Comms leads from GBC and WBC on T&CP Team.* **G25** **Previously:** *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.*
25	Cell H26: Current likelihood changed from 4 - Medium to 5 - High	**B26** **Now:** There is a risk that significant events impact the collaboration. **Previously:** There is a risk that unexpected external events impact the collaboration. **G26** **Previously:** An early and agreed plan for handling such an *unexpected external event, and a protocol for slowing or pausing the partnership.*
26	Cell H27: Current likelihood changed from 2 - Very Low to 4 - Medium Cell H27: This changed the Current rating from Low (green) to High (red)	N/A
27	N/A	N/A
28	N/A	N/A

This page is intentionally left blank

Waverley Borough Council

Report to: Guildford Borough Council and Waverley Borough Council Joint Governance Committee

Date: 9 October 2023

Ward(s) affected: All

Report of Director: Transformation and Governance

Senior Officer: Susan Sale, Joint Executive Head of Legal & Democratic Services

Author: Kisi Smith-Charlemagne, Senior Governance Officer

Tel: 01483 523027

Email: kisi.smith-charlemagne@waverley.gov.uk

Report Status: Open

Update: On the Inter-Authority Agreement(s)

1. Executive Summary

1.1 The Joint Governance Committee's terms of reference includes a requirement to undertake periodically a formal review (at least once every 12 months) of the inter-authority agreement (IAA) in respect of the Joint Management Team (JMT), ensuring it continues to be fit for purpose and recommending to both Full Councils any changes required.

1.2 At the Joint Governance Committee's last meeting on 17 March 2023, a report was presented by the previous Executive Head of Legal and Democratic Services (Interim) on the matters arising from the formal review of the Joint Management Team Inter-Authority Agreement

(December 2022). The Committee recommended to both Councils that clause 21.1 of the Inter-Authority Agreement be amended as detailed in the minutes of the meeting.

1.3 As part of the amendments, the JMT IAA was subject to review and the next formal review will take place early next year and be brought to the Committees next meeting in April.

1.4 On the 5 September 2023 the Executive agreed the principles of Temporary Shared Staffing (TSS) arrangements and delegated authority to the Joint Chief Executive, to approve, subject to a business case; and Joint Executive Head of Legal and Democratic Services to enter into an agreement a copy of the report can be found in the published agenda).

1.5 The TSS IAA will also be subject to a formal review at least every 12 months which will fall under the remit of the Joint Governance Committee in line with the JMT IAA.

1.6 There are now two IAAs between Guildford Borough Council and Waverley Borough Council that fall within the remit of the Joint Governance Committee to keep under review. The Terms of reference for the Committee have been updated to reflect this change.

2. Recommendations to Committee

2.1 That the Committee notes the report and the updates on both IAA's between Guildford Borough Council and Waverley Borough Council.

3. Reason(s) for Recommendation:

3.1 To ensure that any change to the inter-authority agreement(s) following a review is reported to the full Council meetings of both authorities.

3.2 To ensure that the Committee is informed of the new TSS IAA and is kept informed of any changes to both IAAs, recommended or otherwise.

4. Exemption from publication

4.1 No part of this report is exempt from publication.

5. Purpose of Report

5.1 This report asks the Committee:

(a) To note the amendments to the JMT IAA.

(b) To note the creation of the TSS IAA.

(c) To note the schedule for the next formal review of the IAA(s)

6. Strategic Priorities

6.1 The work of the Joint Governance Committee is to ensure both Guildford and Waverley Borough Councils adopt and exercise robust governance arrangements for inter-authority working. And as such assist in the delivery of both Guildford and Waverley Council's Corporate Plan priorities.

7. Background

7.1 The Joint Governance Committee was created in April 2022 by resolutions of both Council's following the Inter Authority Agreement Joint Working Group's consideration of and approval of the IAA Heads of Terms. The agreement was formally executed and sealed by both Councils in September 2022 under the delegated authority of Guildford's Lead Legal Specialist and Waverley's Borough Solicitor.

7.2 The first IAA is in respect of the joint management team (JMT). The JMT structure was implemented on 1st October 2022 and comprises

the Joint Chief Executive, three Joint Strategic Directors and twelve Joint Executive Heads of Service including the statutory roles of s.151 officer and Monitoring Officer.

7.3 The Joint Governance Committee have formally met on two occasions since it was established. On the 9 December 2022 where the Committee suggested an amendment to clause 21 of the JMT IAA; and on the 17 March 2023 where a formal recommendation was agreed to change clause 21. At both meetings it was the view of Officers' that the JMT IAA remained fit for purpose at the stage of the collaboration.

8. Equality and Diversity Implications

8.1 The Joint Governance Committee will be responsible for having due regard to the requirements of the Public Sector Equality Duty (Equality Act 2010) when making any recommendations concerning governance arrangements.

9. Financial Implications

9.1 There are no financial implications arising from this report. Any proposals, projects, or suggestions from the groups with financial implications will either be contained within approved budgets or considered as part of the Service and Financial Planning cycle.

10. Legal Implications

10.1 Section 113 of the Local Government Act 1972 provides that a local authority may enter into an agreement with another local authority for the placing at the disposal of the latter for the purposes of their functions, on such terms as may be provided by the agreement, of the services of officer employed by the former. Both the JMT IAA and the Temporary Staff Sharing IAA between GBC and WBC are made in accordance with this provision.

11. Human Resource Implications

11.1 Section 113 Local Government Act 1972 provides that no staff shall be shared with another local authority without having first been consulted. Any such temporary staff sharing arrangements between GBC and WBC will follow such consultation, will be approved by the Head of Paid Service, and will be formalised by a secondment agreement between the employing Council and the employee.

12. Background Papers

Waverley Borough Council Constitution: Joint Governance Committee TOR.

17 March 2023: Report of the Executive Head of Legal and Democratic Services (Interim) on the matters arising from the formal review of the Joint Management Team Inter-Authority Agreement (9 December 2022).

9 December 2022 Report of the Executive Head of Legal and Democratic Services (Interim) Formal review of the Joint Management Team Inter-Authority Agreement.

13. Appendices

There are no appendices to this report.

This page is intentionally left blank

Waverley Borough Council

Report to: Guildford Borough Council and Waverley Borough Council Joint Governance Committee

Date: 1 November 2023

Ward(s) affected: All

Report of Director: Transformation and Governance

Senior Officer: Susan Sale, Joint Executive Head of Legal & Democratic Services

Author: Kisi Smith-Charlemagne, Senior Governance Officer

Tel: 01483 523027

Email: kisi.smith-charlemagne@waverley.gov.uk

Report Status: Open

Refreshed Report: Amendments to the Guildford Borough Council and Waverley Borough Council Joint Governance Committee Terms of Reference

1. Executive Summary

1.1 The Joint Governance Committee was created in April 2022 and its Terms of Reference (TOR) can be found in Part 3 – (Appendix 2) of the Waverley Borough Councils Constitution, Part 3 – (Terms of Reference of the Council) of the Guildford Borough Council Constitution and in **Appendix 1** of this report.

1.2 At the request of the new Joint Executive Head of Legal & Democratic Services, the TOR for the Joint Governance Committee were reviewed to ensure they remained, relevant, fit for purpose and included any collaboration arrangement updates.

1.3 The amendments mainly focus on the inclusion of the Temporary Shared Staffing IAA, periodic review periods, frequency of meetings, quorum, and procedures for electing a chairperson (in the absence of a Co-Chair) and voting. The amendments also include the rephrasing of text for clarity and correcting some minor typos.

1.4 This report is for information only, it asks that the Joint Governance Committee note that the Joint Constitutional Review Group (JCRG) will be asked to consider the amendments to the TOR at its meeting on the 30 November. It will be recommended that the JCRG recommend the amendments to WBC Standards & GP committee and GBC Governance & Standards Committee, with a recommendation that each committee recommends the amended TOR to their full Council for adoption.

2. Recommendations to Committee

2.1 That the Joint Governance Committee resolves to noting the report and the proposed amended TOR.

2.2 That the Committee provides comments and feedback by way of consultation so that Officers can put those comments to the JCRG.

3. Reason(s) for Recommendation:

3.1 To ensure Guildford Borough Council and Waverley Borough Council continues to adopt and exercise strong governance arrangements for inter-authority working.

4. Exemption from publication

4.1 No part of this report is exempt from publication.

5. Purpose of Report

5.1 This report asks the Joint Governance Committee:

(a) To note the report and provide comments and feedback on the proposed amendments (**Appendix 2**) as outlined in the recommendations in section 2 of this report.

6. Strategic Priorities

6.1 The work of Councillor task or working groups assist in the delivery of the Council's Corporate Plan priorities.

7. Background

7.1 The Joint Governance Committee was created in April 2022 and its Terms of Reference (TOR) can be found in Part 3 – Appendix 2 of the Waverley Borough Councils Constitution, Part 3 – (Terms of Reference of the Council) of the Guildford Borough Council Constitution and **Appendix 1** of this report.

7.2 **Appendix 2** of this report shows the proposed amendments to the current TOR with tracked changes. The amendments mainly focus on the inclusion of the Temporary Shared Staffing IAA, periodic review periods, frequency of meetings, quorum, and procedures for electing a chairperson (in the absence of a Co-Chair) and voting. The amendments also include arrangements for working groups, sub-committees, the rephrasing of text for clarity and correcting some minor typos.

7.3 The TOR state (7) that the Joint Governance Committee frequency of meeting should be as and when required. The Joint Executive Head of Legal & Democratic Services has suggested that that the frequency of the meeting should be a formal arrangement and the meetings

should take place **as and when required but as least Biannually**, in line with the Committees responsibilities to review inter-authority working arrangements and risk assessments.

7.4 The TOR state (9) that the Joint Governance Committee include: '(i) To undertake periodically a formal review (at least once every 12 months) of the inter-authority agreement, ensuring it continues to be fit for purpose and recommending to both Full Councils any changes required.'

7.5 The Joint Executive Head of Legal & Democratic Services has suggested that the wording be amended to include the Temporary Shared Staff IAA '(i) To undertake periodically a formal review *(at least once every 12 months)* of the inter-authority agreement**(s)**, ensuring **they** continue to be fit for purpose and recommends to both Full Councils any changes required.'

7.6 At the meeting of the Executive on 5 September 2023, the Executive unanimously approved:

i. The principle of sharing staff between Guildford Borough Council and Waverley Borough Council, on a temporary basis, where appropriate to support the collaboration programme.

ii. Delegating authority to the Joint Chief Executive, to approve, subject to a business case, future temporary staff sharing arrangements between Guildford Borough Council and Waverley Borough Council, to support the collaboration and transformation programme.

iii. Delegating authority to the Joint Executive Head of Legal and Democratic Services to enter into an agreement between Guildford Borough Council and Waverley Borough Council for the sharing of their staff on a temporary basis.

8. Equality and Diversity Implications

8.1 The Joint Governance Committee will be responsible for having due regard to the requirements of the Public Sector Equality Duty (Equality Act 2010) when making any recommendations concerning governance arrangements.

9. Financial Implications

9.1 There are no financial implications arising from this report. Any proposals, projects, or suggestions from the groups with financial implications will either be contained within approved budgets or considered as part of the Service and Financial Planning cycle.

10. Legal Implications

10.1 Section 101(5) Local Government Act 1972 provides that two or more local authorities may discharge any of their functions jointly. The Joint Governance Committee is established by both Guildford Borough Council and Waverley Borough Council jointly to discharge their functions in accordance with the Committee terms of reference.

11. Human Resource Implications

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

12. Background Papers

12.1 Waverley Borough Council Constitution

12.2 5 September 2023: Report to Executive on Temporary Shared Staffing

13. Appendices

Appendix 1: Current JGC TOR (as of July 2023)

Appendix 2: Proposed amended TOR (with tracked changes October 2023)

Appendix 3: Proposed amended TOR (without tracked changes October 2023)

Part 3 - Appendix 2 – Joint Committee Terms of Reference

Guildford Borough Council and Waverley Borough Council Joint Governance Committee – Composition and Terms of Reference

1. This Joint Committee is to be established by Guildford Borough Council and Waverley Borough Council ("the councils") in accordance with Section 102 (1) (b) of the Local Government Act 1972 (Appointment of committees)
2. MEMBERS: 12
   (a) The Joint Governance Committee shall comprise the respective Leaders of both councils, plus five members appointed by Guildford Borough Council and five members appointed by Waverley Borough Council
   (b) Appointments shall be made in accordance with the Local Government (Committees and Political Groups) Regulations 1990
3. QUORUM: 7 (subject to each council being represented at a meeting by at least three members)
4. CHAIR: The Joint Governance Committee shall be chaired alternately between the councils by their respective Leaders.
5. PLACE OF MEETINGS: The venue for meetings of the Joint Governance Committee shall normally alternate between the two councils with the host Leader chairing the meeting. The venue for the first meeting shall be at Guildford Borough Council's offices.
6. GENERAL ROLE: Adopting and exercising such of the functions of the councils as can be delegated by those councils in respect of the governance arrangements for inter-authority working
7. FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS: As and when required
8. SUBSTITUTES: Substitutes may be appointed. Any appointed member of the Joint Governance Committee may be substituted by any other member of their political group on the Council they represent.
9. ROLE AND FUNCTION:
   (i) To undertake periodically a formal review (at least once every 12 months) of the inter-authority agreement, ensuring it continues to be fit for purpose and recommending to both Full Councils any changes required.
   (ii) To undertake 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.
   (iii) Notwithstanding (i) and (ii) above, to undertake a formal review of the inter-authority agreement or the collaboration risk assessment at such other time as may be determined by the Joint Committee.

(iv) To discharge any other functions that relate to the governance of the inter-authority working arrangements that may from time to time be delegated to the Joint Committee.

10. SERVICING THE JOINT GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE: The servicing of the Joint Governance Committee shall be agreed between the Councils' Democratic Services Managers.

11. MEETINGS OF THE JOINT GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE SHALL BE CONDUCTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE FOLLOWING PROCEDURE:

(a) A meeting of the Joint Governance Committee shall be summoned by the relevant Proper Officer of the Council who shall give a minimum of five clear working days' notice (or less in the case of urgency)

(b) Meetings of the Joint Governance Committee shall be held in public except in so far as the matters for decision relate to issues which can be dealt with in private in accordance with Section 100A (4) and (5) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended)

(c) The order of business at meetings of the Joint Governance Committee shall include the following:

(a) Apologies for Absence and notification of substitutes

(b) Disclosures of Interest

(c) Adoption of the Minutes of the previous meeting

(d) Matters set out in the agenda for the meeting

(e) Matters not set out in the agenda for the meeting but which the chairman agrees pursuant to Section 100B (4) (b) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) should be considered at the meeting as a matter of urgency

(d) Any matter will be decided by a simple majority of those members of the Joint Governance Committee present and voting at the time the question was put. A vote shall be taken either by show of hands or, if there is no dissent, by the affirmation of the meeting.

(e) The Joint Governance Committee shall have no function or power delegated to it in any circumstance where a majority decision cannot be made without the need for the chairman or person presiding having to exercise their second or casting vote.

Part 3 - Appendix 2 – Joint Committee Terms of Reference

JOINT GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

(Guildford Borough Council and Waverley Borough Council)

1. This Joint Committee is to be established by Guildford Borough Council and Waverley Borough Council ("the councils") in accordance with Section 101 (5)of the Local Government Act 1972 (Appointment of committees)

2. MEMBERS: 12

   (a) The Joint Governance Committee shall comprise the respective Leader of each councils, plus five members appointed by Guildford Borough Council and five members appointed by Waverley Borough Council

   (b) Appointments shall be made in accordance with the Local Government (Committees and Political Groups) Regulations 1990 in respect of each council.

3. QUORUM: 4 members in total, subject to each council being represented at a meeting by at least two of their members.

4. CHAIR: The Joint Governance Committee shall be chaired alternately between the councils by the Leader of the Council, hosting the meeting, or in their absence, the Leader of the Council not hosting the meeting, or in both Leaders absence, the Chair shall be appointed by a majority vote of those members present and voting.

5. PLACE OF MEETINGS: The venue for meetings of the Joint Governance Committee shall normally alternate between the two councils with the host Leader chairing the meeting, but the venue may be varied by the Joint Monitoring Officer following consultation with the Leader of each Council. .

6. GENERAL ROLE: Adopting and exercising such of the functions of the councils as may be delegated by those councils in respect of the governance arrangements for inter-authority working between Guildford Borough Counil and Waverley Borough Council.

7. FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS: As and when required, but at least bi-annually.

8. SUBSTITUTES: Substitutes may be appointed. Any appointed member of the Joint Governance Committee may be substituted by any other member of their political group on the council they represent.

9. ROLE AND FUNCTION:

   (i) To undertake periodically a formal review (at least once every 12 months) of all inter-authority agreements, between Guildford Borough Council and Waverley Borough Council, ensuring they continue to be fit for purpose and recommending to both Full Councils any changes required.

   (ii) To undertake 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.

(iii) Notwithstanding (i) and (ii) above, to undertake a formal review of the inter-authority agreements or the collaboration risk assessment at such other time as may be determined by the Joint Committee.

(iv) To discharge any other functions that relate to the governance of the inter-authority working arrangements that may from time to time be delegated to the Joint Committee.

(v) The Joint Governance Committee may arrange for the discharge of its functions by an Officer, of either Waverley Borough Council or Guildford Borough Council, and in doing so will set out clearly any limits upon such delegation.

(vi) The Joint Governance Committee may establish working groups to assist them in their work and in doing so will set clear terms of reference for them. Such working groups shall not be decision-making bodies.

(vii) The Joint Governance Committee may establish a Sub-Committee consisting solely of Members of one Council to consider matters solely relating to that Council.

10. SERVICING THE JOINT GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE: The servicing of the Joint Governance Committee shall be agreed between the councils' Democratic Services Managers.

11. MEETINGS OF THE JOINT GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE SHALL BE CONDUCTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE FOLLOWING PROCEDURE:

(a) A meeting of the Joint Governance Committee shall be summoned by the relevant Proper Officer of the Council who shall give a minimum of five clear working days' notice (or less in the case of urgency)

(b) Meetings of the Joint Governance Committee shall be held in public except in so far as the matters for decision relate to issues which can be dealt with in private in accordance with Section 100A (4) and (5) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended)

(c) The order of business at meetings of the Joint Governance Committee shall include the following:

(a) Apologies for Absence and notification of substitutes

(b) Disclosures of Interest

(c) Adoption of the Minutes of the previous meeting

(d) Matters set out in the agenda for the meeting

(e) Matters not set out in the agenda for the meeting but which the chairman agrees pursuant to Section 100B (4) (b) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) should be considered at the meeting as a matter of urgency

(d) Any matter will be decided by a simple majority of those members of the Joint Governance Committee present and voting at the time the question was put. A vote shall be taken either by show of hands or, if there is no dissent, by the

affirmation of the meeting. The chairman or person presiding shall have the casting vote.

This page is intentionally left blank

Part 3 - Appendix 2 – Joint Committee Terms of Reference

JOINT GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

(Guildford Borough Council and Waverley Borough Council)

1. This Joint Committee is to be established by Guildford Borough Council and Waverley Borough Council ("the councils") in accordance with Section 101 (5)of the Local Government Act 1972 (Appointment of committees)

2. MEMBERS: 12

   (a) The Joint Governance Committee shall comprise the respective Leader of each councils, plus five members appointed by Guildford Borough Council and five members appointed by Waverley Borough Council

   (b) Appointments shall be made in accordance with the Local Government (Committees and Political Groups) Regulations 1990 in respect of each council.

3. QUORUM: 4 members in total, subject to each council being represented at a meeting by at least two of their members.

4. CHAIR: The Joint Governance Committee shall be chaired alternately between the councils by the Leader of the Council, hosting the meeting, or in their absence, the Leader of the Council not hosting the meeting, or in both Leaders absence, the Chair shall be appointed by a majority vote of those members present and voting.

5. PLACE OF MEETINGS: The venue for meetings of the Joint Governance Committee shall normally alternate between the two councils with the host Leader chairing the meeting, but the venue may be varied by the Joint Monitoring Officer following consultation with the Leader of each Council. .

6. GENERAL ROLE: Adopting and exercising such of the functions of the councils as may be delegated by those councils in respect of the governance arrangements for inter-authority working between Guildford Borough Counil and Waverley Borough Council.

7. FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS: As and when required, but at least bi-annually.

8. SUBSTITUTES: Substitutes may be appointed. Any appointed member of the Joint Governance Committee may be substituted by any other member of their political group on the council they represent.

9. ROLE AND FUNCTION:

   (i) To undertake periodically a formal review (at least once every 12 months) of all inter-authority agreements, between Guildford Borough Council and Waverley Borough Council, ensuring they continue to be fit for purpose and recommending to both Full Councils any changes required.

   (ii) To undertake 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.

(iii) Notwithstanding (i) and (ii) above, to undertake a formal review of the inter-authority agreements or the collaboration risk assessment at such other time as may be determined by the Joint Committee.

(iv) To discharge any other functions that relate to the governance of the inter-authority working arrangements that may from time to time be delegated to the Joint Committee.

(v) The Joint Governance Committee may arrange for the discharge of its functions by an Officer, of either Waverley Borough Council or Guildford Borough Council, and in doing so will set out clearly any limits upon such delegation.

(vi) The Joint Governance Committee may establish working groups to assist them in their work and in doing so will set clear terms of reference for them. Such working groups shall not be decision-making bodies.

(vii) The Joint Governance Committee may establish a Sub-Committee consisting solely of Members of one Council to consider matters solely relating to that Council.

10. SERVICING THE JOINT GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE: The servicing of the Joint Governance Committee shall be agreed between the councils' Democratic Services Managers.

11. MEETINGS OF THE JOINT GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE SHALL BE CONDUCTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE FOLLOWING PROCEDURE:

(a) A meeting of the Joint Governance Committee shall be summoned by the relevant Proper Officer of the Council who shall give a minimum of five clear working days' notice (or less in the case of urgency)

(b) Meetings of the Joint Governance Committee shall be held in public except in so far as the matters for decision relate to issues which can be dealt with in private in accordance with Section 100A (4) and (5) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended)

(c) The order of business at meetings of the Joint Governance Committee shall include the following:

(a) Apologies for Absence and notification of substitutes

(b) Disclosures of Interest

(c) Adoption of the Minutes of the previous meeting

(d) Matters set out in the agenda for the meeting

(e) Matters not set out in the agenda for the meeting but which the chairman agrees pursuant to Section 100B (4) (b) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) should be considered at the meeting as a matter of urgency

(d) Any matter will be decided by a simple majority of those members of the Joint Governance Committee present and voting at the time the question was put. A vote shall be taken either by show of hands or, if there is no dissent, by the

affirmation of the meeting. The chairman or person presiding shall have the casting vote.

This page is intentionally left blank