

London Borough of Barnet
Environmental Service Options Appraisal:
Stage Two - options detail

Appendix C

3 October 2012

Introduction

- This document sets out the analysis and scoring for each of the six options considered:
 - Shared Outsource
 - Outsource
 - Outsource post in-house improvement
 - In-house stretch with support
 - In-house stretch delivered by a mutual
 - Current in-house MTFS with additional support
- In addition to this document, the financial models provide detailed workings for how the savings have been calculated.

Option 1: Outsource

- **Description:** An outsource option would mean that waste, recycling, streets and green space services would be delivered by an external provider or providers
- Services may be let under a single contract or by lots enabling both specialist and multi-disciplinary businesses to participate
- **Procurement option:** An external provider would be procured through either competitive dialogue (CD) or restricted procedure (RP). A soft market testing exercise was carried out through the WLA framework with nine contractors making presentations. RP is attractive due to shorter timescales, but to ensure the contract achieves more complex objectives (such as the implementation of demand management) a tailored CD process is likely to be the most appropriate option
- **Timescale:** CD could take around 12 months, RP could be completed in around 9 months
- **Cost:** The cost of CD could be significant (DRS was around £1.2m but significantly more complex) whereas RP would be significantly less (parking was approx. £200k). Over a long term deal, it is expected that any costs would be more than recouped in additional benefits if the CD option was taken
- **Risk/ mitigation:** The risk associated with an outsourcing model is that the council has less direct control over the services being delivered in its borough. Ensuring that the service objectives are achieved is dependent on a well planned and executed procurement process and strong contract management

High level advantages and disadvantages

Advantage:

- Savings will be built into the contract. This could include savings targets that may be perceived as more risky or challenging to deliver, such as recycling behaviour change impact on disposal costs
- Providers will bring innovation and learning from other clients
- More able to invest in and successfully deploy capital equipment and new technologies
- Potential to achieve savings through more flexible use of resources
- Outsourcing unlikely to move employment out of the borough - the service would continue to provide local jobs and have strong local ties.

Disadvantage:

- Costs of provider margin, procurement and contract management
- Potential for industrial relations issues during procurement exercise

Scoring option 1: Outsource

Theme	Score
A RELENTLESS DRIVE FOR EFFICIENCY: PRICE (50%)	5
A RELENTLESS DRIVE FOR EFFICIENCY: INVESTMENT (5%)	4
A RELENTLESS DRIVE FOR EFFICIENCY: RISK TRANSFER AND GUARENTEE OF DELIVERY (5%)	4
A ONE PUBLIC SECTOR APPROACH: PACE OF TRANSFORMATION (5%)	3
A ONE PUBLIC SECTOR APPROACH: FLEXIBILITY AND SUSTAINABILITY (5%)	3
A NEW RELATIONSHIP WITH CITIZENS: PERFORMANCE (10%)	4.5
A NEW RELATIONSHIP WITH CITIZENS: POTENTIAL FOR STAFF INCENTIVISATION (5%)	3
A NEW RELATIONSHIP WITH CITIZENS: CITIZEN FOCUS (10%)	3.5
A NEW RELATIONSHIP WITH CITIZENS: SUPER OUTCOMES (5%)	3.5
TOTAL	43.25/ 50

A relentless drive for efficiency: Price (50%)

- Potential for fleet transport to leverage economies of scale when purchasing or leasing vehicles
- Better able to exploit income opportunities if correctly incentivised
- Service KPIs are binding under a contract - reducing the risk out of achieving behaviour change
- Potential for flexible resourcing and economies of scale through service alignment and removal of duplication
- Access to innovative technology and leverage market experience
- Potential for guaranteed savings and risk sharing mechanisms to secure further benefits
- Potential to embed more effective performance management by combining the supervision of service areas.

5

A relentless drive for efficiency: Investment (5%)

- Ability to invest in new technology e.g. route planning optimisation software
- Investment in behaviour change initiatives could enable service improvement through changes in both staff and customer behaviour. This can generate longer term savings over the duration of the contract

4

A relentless drive for efficiency: Risk and guarantee of delivery (5%)

- Savings can be written into contract but delivery is reliant on a strong specification and robust contract management
- Service delivery standards can be incorporated into the contract. Minimisation of risk reliant upon strong contract management

4

A one public sector approach: Pace of transformation (5%)

- The contracting council's will choose the pace of change. Frontloaded savings could come at a price.

3

A one public sector approach: Flexibility and sustainability (5%)

- The specification will allow flexibility to be built into the contract
- For the contract to be sustainable it will need to be able to adapt to changes in the sector

3

A new relationship with citizens: Performance (10%)

- There is potential for demand management techniques to be built in to the contract, with the aim of changing citizen behaviour (e.g. to increase recycling rates and reduce volumes of residual waste)
- Customer satisfaction and performance levels could be written into the contract if this is a council priority.

4.5

A new relationship with citizens: Potential for staff incentivisation (5%)

- A new contract will involve the TUPE of staff to the provider organisation. This could cause staff to become demotivated if they feel unsecure in their jobs
- There is a risk that outsourcing the service might have a negative impact on staff motivation and performance. Once operational, staff motivation and engagement may vary
- Workforce satisfaction and performance should form part of procurement evaluation to minimise any negative impact on the service - workforce benefits and incentivisation can be built into the contract
- Need for effective HR and communication strategy to engage staff during the procurement process

3

A new relationship with citizens: Citizen focus (10%)

- Behaviour change KPIs can be built into the contract to ensure community engagement
- Potential to use local apprentices, especially in streets and green space service areas. For example sub contracting to companies such as Groundwork, who Brent have already worked with on a project at Tubbs Road Pocket Park

3.5

A new relationship with citizens: Super outcomes (10%)

- The strategic priority of the council to ‘use its powers, in partnership with the local public, private and third sectors, to create the right environment to promote economic growth, development and success’ could be written in to the specification as a KPI. The model would also aim to meet the super outcome of ‘a well designed place with sustainable infrastructure’. However, we should be aware that any profit made through commercial enterprises will have to be shared with the provider

3.5

Case Studies: Outsourced Provision

LB Haringey	
How is your waste and recycling service currently delivered?	Waste and recycling collection (inc. trade waste), street cleansing and fly tip removal, winter maintenance, graffiti and fly poster removal, fleet management/provision (for all council vehicles), engagement/comms (for recycling/waste min) is provided by Veolia. Commissioning Strategy undertaken to define scope of contract, possible inclusion of other services etc. - concluded the range of services was appropriate to secure VfM and suitably specialised contractor. 14 years with 7 year break option and 7 year extension option
What levels of customer satisfaction do you have?	09/10 Residents Survey - 73% satisfied with refuse collection; 71% recycling; 55% street cleansing. New contract to deliver increase to cleansing and recycling satisfaction rates.
If a procurement took place, what method was used?	Competitive Dialogue - flexibility to negotiate solution. Agreed on as part of Commissioning Strategy.
How long did the procurement take (from OJEU notice to contract signature)	20 months (OJEU 29 April 2009. Contract award 21 Dec 2010).
Are any savings expected from the procurement?	£1.9m per annum
Added extra's	They are offering a carbon neutral contract, which includes a Performance Framework Model. There is a partnership framework that allows for contract efficiencies to be realised and a fluid approach to advancements in methodologies and technologies. They are engaging neighbourhoods and monitor residents' perceptions both locally and borough wide. They have adopted a Village Approach to street sweeping across the borough where each existing neighbourhood will have a dedicated team with localised management and resource taking ownership and pride of their area. The employees will become ambassadors of Haringey and Veolia. The streets are cleaned twice per week over six day pattern, with satellite depots, multi purpose vehicles, a proactive commercial waste sales team, enhanced recycling opportunities for trade waste, a financial reward scheme to incentivise both parties for trade waste. In Year 1 of the contract refuse and recycling service will continue as it is while they concentrate on the street scene, apart from the introduction of free bulky waste collections for recyclable and reusable items. In year 2 refuse will switch to fortnightly collections in 240ltr bins or coloured sacks issued four times per year as appropriate. In year 2 recycling will be serviced weekly in new 240ltr bins.
Similarities to Barnet	Barnet plan to combine their street scene and green space services and deliver them on a localised basis, similar to the 'village' approach in Haringey.
Differences to Barnet	Resident satisfaction is higher in Barnet: 81% for residual waste collection, 73% for recycling and 57% for street sweeping. Barnet sweep their streets on a less frequent basis. They also still collect their waste on a weekly basis.
Lessons learnt and what Barnet could do differently	There is scope for Barnet to deliver their services in a similar way to Haringey with regards to partnership frameworks and reward/ incentivisation for local businesses to use trade waste facilities. Barnet have anticipated a greater saving could be achieved by outsourcing, however it is important to be aware of the timescales of a competitive dialogue as Barnet estimated that it could be done in less time.

Option 2: In House stretch – with support

- **Description:** This option looks at using the in-house MTFS as a baseline, supplemented with additional transformational support. At this stage it is envisaged that the support could come from the NSCSO contractors as a delivery unit. The additional support would identify extra saving and income opportunities which have not already been identified within the MTFS option. It would also support the delivery of some of the more challenging savings not achieved in house to date, such as technology enabled efficiency, use of customer insight and behaviour change initiatives.
- This option could take on characteristics of a mutual with regards to staff engagement and ownership of service improvements with an incentivisation/ reward process.
- **Procurement option:** There would be no need to engage in a procurement exercise, the additional transformational support could be called off from the NSO/ CSO partner or the current implementation partner framework that it is already in place at Barnet.
- **Timescale:** Internal rationalisation planning has started already with a view to be completed by October 2014 when the May Gurney contract expires. The stretch option would work within the same timeframes but look to release extra savings early on.
- **Cost:** There would be no cost incurred from a procurement process but there would be cost attached to the additional transformation support, in the region of £200k.
- **Risk:** The risk of the stretch model is that the savings have not already been identified and are not guaranteed. As a mitigating factor there may be potential to work under a risk/ reward approach with the Partner. There will be a need to deliver on-going improvement, for which the service must plan ahead.

High level advantages and disadvantages

Advantages

- The service is already performing well and has developed a good relationship with customers; retaining an in-house model carries the lowest risk of negatively affecting this.
- Should the model be successful, there is potential to develop it further in the future (for example developing a mutual organisation)
- Greatest flexibility to deliver to local needs

Disadvantages

- Requires up-front investment from the authority to enable change
- May not bring the economies of scale that could be achieved through the market or a shared approach
- May not be able to access innovation or new technology easily in the same way as an outsourced model

Option 2: In House stretch – with support

Theme	Score
A RELENTLESS DRIVE FOR EFFICIENCY: PRICE (50%)	4.5
A RELENTLESS DRIVE FOR EFFICIENCY: INVESTMENT (5%)	2.5
A RELENTLESS DRIVE FOR EFFICIENCY: RISK TRANSFER AND GUARENTEE OF DELIVERY (5%)	3
A ONE PUBLIC SECTOR APPROACH: PACE OF TRANSFORMATION (5%)	4
A ONE PUBLIC SECTOR APPROACH: FLEXIBILITY AND SUSTAINABILITY (5%)	4
A NEW RELATIONSHIP WITH CITIZENS: PERFORMANCE (10%)	4
A NEW RELATIONSHIP WITH CITIZENS: POTENTIAL FOR STAFF INCENTIVISATION (5%)	4
A NEW RELATIONSHIP WITH CITIZENS: CITIZEN FOCUS (10%)	4
A NEW RELATIONSHIP WITH CITIZENS: SUPER OUTCOMES (5%)	3.5
TOTAL	42/ 50

A relentless drive for efficiency: Price (50%)

In house stretch:

- Identify opportunities for income optimisation by increasing demand for chargeable services
- Extend the role of behaviour change to other areas of the service. Opportunities may include: optimising operational effectiveness at HWRCs; increasing community led participation; and reducing the need for street cleansing by tackling fly tipping and littering.
- Maximise the flexibilities within each service to create a streamlined management function, leading to a reduction in managers from 10 to 8. Additional potential to change shift patterns and introduce split shifts. Merging of street scene and green space management structure expected to release savings.
- Best practice suggests that there is potential to use technology to improve service delivery. This will require resource to scope what opportunities may be available and support with implementation. Delivery through in house option will likely be more challenging than through an external partner as the approach requires investment and expertise
- Exact scope of further efficiencies not yet identified, therefore reducing confidence in savings to 80%.

4.5

Additional transformational support :

- Achievement of savings will rely on the successful implementation of new technology and will require additional investment either through NSO/CSO provider or another contractor
- Additional support could focus on enabling the in-house team to progress and sustain the behaviour change programme
- Engagement of additional support will increase pace of change by identifying new efficiency savings and researching ways to implement them e.g. route optimisation. The additional support could also focus on tackling the cost pressure of agency staffing

A relentless drive for efficiency: Investment (5%)

In house stretch:

- There is little scope for internal investment in new technology or development of new software

2.5

Additional transformational support:

- Additional support will help the service to identify additional long term savings, which will generate additional funds that can be re-invested into the service

A relentless drive for efficiency: Risk and guarantee of delivery (5%)

In house stretch:

- Risk is in delivering savings is retained by the authority and is reasonably high because the resources available to support delivery may be limited. This approach will require effective performance management to ensure a successful transition to new ways of working

3

Additional transformational support:

- Able to support in house team through programme of change making it more sustainable long term and increase likelihood of delivery, mitigating the risk to the council

A one public sector approach: Pace of transformation (5%)

In house stretch:

- Internal change can commence straight away as it does not involve lengthy procurement timescales. Some long term savings will still take time to achieve, but quick wins can be accessed from the point of option approval and many are already underway

4

Additional transformational support:

- Additional support will increase the pace of transformation by having a dedicated focus on achievement of the change. The external support can be held to delivery of work by the specified deadlines

A one public sector approach: Flexibility and sustainability (5%)

In house stretch:

- Retaining the service in house enables the maximum flexibility as the council retains direct control over the service and its direction
- Sustainability over the long term might be more difficult if there are external pressures on the internal staff team to make additional savings

4

Additional transformational support:

- Additional external support can be used to set up the programme of change and put controls in place to ensure delivery and sustainability. There is however, a risk that momentum is lost and sustainability is affected once dedicated external support finishes

A new relationship with citizens: Performance (10%)

In house stretch:

- Potential to improve current customer satisfaction levels within street cleansing, parks and open spaces and retain satisfaction in waste and recycling. The stretch model will be more proactive than the current in house model and will use customer insight to develop new initiatives
- In house retention of the service will also enable closer working with the leisure service to align parks satisfaction

Additional transformational support:

- Additional support would be able to identify wider strategic opportunities across other departments in the council and offer support for joint strategic working
- Able to bring expertise of best practice from elsewhere to share with the in house team and suggest ways of increasing performance and satisfaction
- Introduce behaviour change techniques to change customer behaviour towards recycling and therefore increase performance figures

4

A new relationship with citizens: Potential for staff incentivisation (5%)

In house stretch:

- The stretch option may incorporate new performance management approaches to incentivise staff behaviour and encourage the generation of service innovation
- Undertaking the stretch option will be a significant challenge and will require significant commitment from the management team

4

Additional transformational support:

- The scale of change needed is large and additional support would assist in providing expertise to support new ways of working and business change. Behaviour change methods could be used internally to help with transformation

A new relationship with citizens: Citizen focus (10%)

In house stretch:

- Able to retain focus on Barnet citizens and ensure that local outcomes are central to service provision. Potential to incorporate citizen led models such as “adopt a street” and planned behaviour change opportunities for waste and recycling
- Able to set up local apprenticeship schemes or work with organisations such as Groundwork who have worked in boroughs all over the UK. Groundwork London worked with the Mayford Estate Tenants and Residents Association and Camden Council to manage, design and construct a new ball court on the estate, enhancing grassroots sports facilities for young people in the inner-city. This combines the use of apprentices as well as linking up green space with leisure facilities
- Able to engage proactively with members and get them involved in the transformation process within their communities

4

Additional transformational support:

- Provide support to the behaviour change agenda
- Share best practice ideas from across the sector with regards to citizen engagement

A new relationship with citizens: Super outcomes (10%)

In house stretch:

- The strategic priority of the council is to 'use its powers, in partnership with the local public, private and third sectors, to create the right environment to promote economic growth, development and success'. This would be at the forefront of the strategic direction of the model and would be incorporated into a service KPI. The model would also aim to meet the super outcome of 'a well designed place with sustainable infrastructure'

Additional transformational support:

- The additional support would enhance the capacity of the in house team, enabling them to achieve their maximum potential

3.5

Option 3: Outsource post internal transformation

- **Description:** This option would initially adopt the in-house MTFs and undergo a rationalisation process before the service is outsourced in 2014. An outsource option would include waste, recycling, streets and green space services
- **Procurement option:** An external provider would most likely be procured through restricted procedure (RP). After the service has been rationalised internally we will have a clear idea of what needs to be procured, making the RP suitable. A soft market testing exercise was carried out through the WLA framework and nine contractors that showed an interest
- **Timescale:** Internal rationalisation planning has started already with a view to be completed by 2014. A RP process would start during the internal rationalisation phase and could take between 9 and 12 months. In order for it be ready for Oct 2014 this process would need to start in Autumn 2013
- **Cost:** The cost of a RP would be approx. £200k (based on parking and transport with WLA). Significant internal resources would need to be provided at the start of the process to ensure the specification reflects the service needs.
- **Risk:** A key risk associated with internal rationalisation prior to outsourcing is the impact on staff morale. Staff motivation to deliver transformation is likely to be low where outsourcing is the ultimate outcome. With an outsourcing model the council has less control over the services being delivered in its borough. There is also a risk that the pace of change would be too slow and fragmented by doing it in two stages.

High level advantages and disadvantages

Advantages:

- May enable the council to remove cost prior to delivery by an external partner, releasing quick win savings earlier
- Enables the council to test the ability of the service to transform prior to committing to an outsource
- Provides time and experience to apply to developing the output specification that will meet the council's needs
- Outsourcing unlikely to move employment out of the borough - the service would continue to provide local jobs and have strong local ties.

Disadvantages

- May be simpler to outsource from the outset in order to access savings. This would also transfer the risk of achieving savings to the provider
- Outsourcing may not be necessary if internal transformation is successful. However, efforts to transform may have been affected by the expectation that outsourcing is the ultimate outcome
- Expected negative impact on staff motivation

Option 3: Outsource post internal transformation

Theme	Score
A RELENTLESS DRIVE FOR EFFICIENCY: PRICE (50%)	4.5
A RELENTLESS DRIVE FOR EFFICIENCY: INVESTMENT (5%)	1
A RELENTLESS DRIVE FOR EFFICIENCY: RISK TRANSFER AND GUARENTEE OF DELIVERY (5%)	3
A ONE PUBLIC SECTOR APPROACH: PACE OF TRANSFORMATION (5%)	4
A ONE PUBLIC SECTOR APPROACH: FLEXIBILITY AND SUSTAINABILITY (5%)	3
A NEW RELATIONSHIP WITH CITIZENS: PERFORMANCE (10%)	4.5
A NEW RELATIONSHIP WITH CITIZENS: POTENTIAL FOR STAFF INCENTIVISATION (5%)	2.5
A NEW RELATIONSHIP WITH CITIZENS: CITIZEN FOCUS (10%)	3.5
A NEW RELATIONSHIP WITH CITIZENS: SUPER OUTCOMES (5%)	3.5
TOTAL	39.5/50

A relentless drive for efficiency: Price (50%)

In house MTFS:

- Able to maximise internal efficiency prior to outsource, allowing the council to reduce the cost of services which should result in a more competitive contract , for example increasing income or increasing recycling rates

Outsource:

- Potential for fleet transport to leverage economies of scale when purchasing or leasing vehicles
- Better able to exploit income opportunities, if correctly incentivised
- Potential for flexible resourcing and economies of scale through service alignment and removal of duplication
- Access to new and innovative technology and keep up to date with changes in technology
- Scope to learn best practice from the provider
- Reductions in costs of overheads from service alignment
- Potential to combine supervision of service areas to allow for greater efficiency of performance management

4.5

A relentless drive for efficiency: Investment

In house MTFS

- Any short term investment in service improvement would have to be found internally. However, this should reduce the cost of the service when outsourced

1

Outsource

- Ability to invest in new technology e.g. route planning optimisation based on GPS tracking technology
- Investment in behaviour change initiatives could enable service improvement through changes in staff and customer behaviour. This can generate longer term savings over the duration of the contract

A relentless drive for efficiency: Risk and guarantee of delivery (5%)

In house MTFS

- Internal transformation prior to outsource requires effective performance management to support the transition. It is important that change is owned within the service in order that delivery is sustainable in the longer term. This may be difficult to achieve if staff know the service is eventually going to be externalised

3

Outsource

- Delivery of savings will be written in to the contract but is reliant on strong contract management and specification

A one public sector approach: Pace of transformation (5%)

In house MTFS

- Undertaking internal transformation before outsourcing will allow efficiencies to be released prior to externalisation, increasing the pace of savings realisation

4

Outsource

- Once procurement is completed the pace of change will increase significantly, for example through the introduction of new technologies

A one public sector approach: Flexibility and sustainability (5%)

In house MTFS

- During the period of internal transformation there will be scope to test future service approaches. This would inform the outsource specification and will help ensure a more sustainable outsourced model

3

Outsource

- Specification would need to be robust in order to allow for flexibility within the contract
- For the contract to be sustainable it would need to be able to develop in line with progress in the sector and against market competitors

A new relationship with citizens: Performance (10%)

In house MTFS

- During the initial period of transformation there is potential to use demand management techniques to change citizen behaviour (e.g. to increase recycling rates and reduce residual waste collection)
- By combining streets and green spaces the service will be more efficient and resident satisfaction may increase. Dedicated locality teams may mean that services such as picking up litter and removing graffiti will happen more efficiently

Outsource

- There is potential for demand management techniques to be built in to the contract, with the aim of changing citizen behaviour (e.g. to increase recycling rates and reduce volumes of residual waste)
- Customer satisfaction and performance levels could be written into the contract if this is a council priority.

4.5

A new relationship with citizens: Potential for staff incentivisation (5%)

In house MTFS

- During the initial period of transformation there is a reliance on the in house team to deliver the change programme but they may lack in motivation due to the impending externalisation. This may slow the process down if there is not co-operation from the in house team

Outsource

- A new contract will involve the TUPE of staff to the provider organisation. This could cause staff to become demotivated if they feel unsecure in their jobs
- There is a risk that outsourcing the service might have a negative impact on staff motivation and performance. Once operational, staff motivation and engagement may vary
- Workforce satisfaction and performance should form part of procurement evaluation to minimise any negative impact on the service - workforce benefits and incentivisation can be built into the contract
- Need for effective HR and communication strategy to engage staff during the procurement process

2.5

A new relationship with citizens: Citizen focus (10%)

In house MTFS:

- There is the potential to use behaviour change techniques to increase community engagement and ensure citizen focus in the service
- There is also the potential to use local apprentices, especially in the locality hubs for streets and green spaces, this could then be written in to the contract specification
- Members could be involved in the demand management work and become enablers of behaviour change, undertaking targeted projects in their local areas

Outsource:

- There is the potential to use behaviour change to increase community engagement
- Local apprentices can be used in all service areas, especially in streets and green spaces. For example, sub contracting to companies such as Groundwork who Brent have already worked with on a project at Tubbs Road Pocket Park

3.5

A new relationship with citizens: Super outcomes (10%)

In house MTFS:

- The strategic priority of the council is to ‘use its powers, in partnership with the local public, private and third sectors, to create the right environment to promote economic growth, development and success’. This would be at the forefront of the strategic direction of the model and be built into the KPIs. The model would also aim to meet the super outcome of ‘a well designed place with sustainable infrastructure’

Outsource:

- The strategic priority of the council to ‘use its powers, in partnership with the local public, private and third sectors, to create the right environment to promote economic growth, development and success’ could be written into the specification as a KPI. The model would also aim to meet the super outcome of ‘a well designed place with sustainable infrastructure’. However we should be aware that any profit made through commercial enterprises will have to be shared with the provider

3.5

Option 4: Shared outsource

- **Description:** Waste, recycling, street scene and green space services would be delivered by an external provider through a shared outsource arrangement between four boroughs (Barnet, Brent, Richmond and Hounslow). The procurement would be delivered through the WLA framework which all four boroughs are members of. The model would be a 2 + 2 approach, whereby all four boroughs would have a contract for the waste and recycling services but Brent and Barnet would also have a shared contract for streets and green space
- There is an option for services to be let under a single contract or by lots enabling specialist and multi-disciplinary businesses to participate. Management will make a decision on which approach is preferable.
- **Procurement option:** An external provider would be procured through a competitive dialogue (CD) process which will allow the four authorities to develop the detail of the specification with the provider. A soft market testing exercise through the WLA framework resulted in nine contractors making presentations. The CD will focus on key areas of negotiation; many aspects of the contract will require minimal time in dialogue.
- **Timescale:** Brent are working to a restricted timescale as their current contract with Veolia ends in April 2014. The suggested timeframe is that pre- procurement and procurement period will take up to 12 months to give the boroughs sufficient time to align themselves and agree what the future service will look like
- **Cost:** The cost of CD for these services is estimated at £600k-£1m, dependent on the extent of dialogue. This cost would be shared across all boroughs involved, with each borough retaining their own project resource.
- **Risk/ mitigation:** There is greater risk with a shared outsource given the additional governance and commercial complications. The main risk associated with an outsourcing model is that the council has less direct control over the services being delivered in its borough. Ensuring the service objectives are achieved is dependent on a well planned and executed procurement process and strong contract management. Barnet would have a central input on the governance of the process

High level advantages and disadvantages

Advantage:

- Savings will be built into the contract. This could include savings targets that may be perceived as more risky or challenging to deliver, such as recycling behaviour change impact on disposal costs
- Providers will bring innovation and learning from other clients
- More able to invest in and successfully deploy capital equipment and new technologies
- Potential to achieve savings through more flexible use of resources
- Potential for economies of scale between the boroughs
- One public sector approach through sharing best practice and joint working across the boroughs
- The proposed shared outsource arrangement would create one of the largest street scene contracts in the country, making it very attractive to providers
- Outsourcing unlikely to move employment out of the borough - the service would continue to provide local jobs and have strong local ties.

Disadvantage:

- Costs of provider margin, procurement and contract management
- Less control and flexibility over outcomes or ability to make changes to the contract
- Potential for industrial relations issues during procurement exercise
- Operational and cultural challenge of bringing together different organisations
- Desired timescales of potential partners might be different

Scoring option 4: Shared outsource

Theme	Score
A RELENTLESS DRIVE FOR EFFICIENCY: PRICE (50%)	4
A RELENTLESS DRIVE FOR EFFICIENCY: INVESTMENT (5%)	4.5
A RELENTLESS DRIVE FOR EFFICIENCY: RISK TRANSFER AND GUARENTEE OF DELIVERY (5%)	3
A ONE PUBLIC SECTOR APPROACH: PACE OF TRANSFORMATION (5%)	3
A ONE PUBLIC SECTOR APPROACH: FLEXIBILITY AND SUSTAINABILITY (5%)	2.5
A NEW RELATIONSHIP WITH CITIZENS: PERFORMANCE (10%)	4.5
A NEW RELATIONSHIP WITH CITIZENS: POTENTIAL FOR STAFF INCENTIVISATION (5%)	3
A NEW RELATIONSHIP WITH CITIZENS: CITIZEN FOCUS (10%)	3.5
A NEW RELATIONSHIP WITH CITIZENS: SUPER OUTCOMES (5%)	3.5
TOTAL	39/ 50

A relentless drive for efficiency: Price (50%)

Outsource:

- Potential for fleet transport to leverage economies of scale when purchasing or leasing vehicles
- Better able to exploit income opportunities if correctly incentivised
- Service KPIs are binding under a contract - reducing the risk out of achieving behaviour change
- Potential for flexible resourcing and economies of scale through service alignment and removal of duplication
- Access to innovative technology and leverage market experience
- Potential for guaranteed savings and risk sharing mechanisms to secure further benefits
- Potential to embed more effective performance management by combining the supervision of service areas.

Shared Outsource:

- Greater savings through shared fleet, vehicle utilisation and maintenance costs
- Consolidation of management structures
- Economies of scale through route optimisation, sharing equipment and labour costs

A relentless drive for efficiency: Investment (5%)

Outsource:

- Ability to invest in new technology e.g. route planning optimisation software
- Investment in behaviour change initiatives could enable service improvement through changes in both staff and customer behaviour. This can generate longer term savings over the duration of the contract

4.5

Shared outsource:

- Investment needed to successfully align services

A relentless drive for efficiency: Risk and guarantee of delivery (5%)

Outsource:

- Savings can be written into contract but delivery is reliant on a strong specification and robust contract management
- Service delivery standards can be incorporated into the contract. Minimisation of risk reliant upon strong contract management

Shared outsource :

- Differing procurement timeframes represent the key risk. Brent are constrained to a tight deadline due to their current contract coming to an end in April 2014 and have suggested an optimistic timeframe of 10 months to complete a CD procurement. If the procurement is completed in haste, there is a risk that there will not be enough time for each borough to get the best deal from the bidders during the process. Compromises might have to be made around innovation and local initiatives. Barnet would prefer Brent to either extend their current contract or have a shorter lead in time for the new contract, to allow for more time to conduct a thorough CD process
- Aligning differences in cultures and service delivery needs strong governance structures to be deployed successfully

3

A one public sector approach: Pace of transformation (5%)

Outsource:

- The contracting council's will choose the pace of change. Frontloaded savings could come at a price.

Shared outsource :

- Pace of change can be managed and maintained if one borough leads the procurement process
- To ensure that the authorities proceed at the same pace there should be one joint project team delivering and a plan to align key project activities (e.g. communications plans, discussions with HR etc.) There should also be a robust governance structure in place

3

A one public sector approach: Flexibility and sustainability (5%)

Outsource:

- The specification will allow flexibility to be built into the contract
- For the contract to be sustainable it will need to be able to adapt to changes in the sector

Shared outsource :

- The creation of localised hubs within green space and street scene service areas, could ensure that the service is able to respond to local needs.

2.5

A new relationship with citizens: Performance (10%)

Outsource:

- There is potential for demand management techniques to be built in to the contract, with the aim of changing citizen behaviour (e.g. to increase recycling rates and reduce volumes of residual waste)
- Customer satisfaction and performance levels could be written into the contract if this is a council priority.

Shared outsource :

- Resident satisfaction in Brent for residual waste collection in 2009 was 80%, recycling was 81% and street sweeping 79%. This is in comparison to Barnet who have a satisfaction level of 81% for residual waste collection, 73% for recycling and 57% for street sweeping
- Levels of customer satisfaction might decrease at the start of the contract as ways of working are aligned. However, customer satisfaction levels can be built into the KPIs to ensure that they meet minimum standards and increase over the duration of the contract
- Different ways of working may also impact on operational performance levels, as different services get brought together and have to adjust to a new way of working

4.5

A new relationship with citizens: Potential for staff incentivisation (5%)

Outsource:

- A new contract will involve the TUPE of staff to the provider organisation. This could cause staff to become demotivated if they feel unsecure in their jobs
- There is a risk that outsourcing the service might have a negative impact on staff motivation and performance. Once operational, staff motivation and engagement may vary
- Workforce satisfaction and performance should form part of procurement evaluation to minimise any negative impact on the service - workforce benefits and incentivisation can be built into the contract
- Need for effective HR and communication strategy to engage staff during the procurement process

Shared outsource:

- Local teams need to be aligned
- Joint working and collaboration should be in place from the start of procurement
- There needs to be cultural integration between the local teams. This may work best if facilitated by the external provider as they can bring teams on board with their ways of working at the same time

3

A new relationship with citizens: Citizen focus (10%)

Outsource:

- Behaviour change KPIs can be built into the contract to ensure community engagement
- Potential to use local apprentices, especially in streets and green space service areas. For example sub contracting to companies such as Groundwork, who Brent have already worked with on a project at Tubbs Road Pocket Park

Shared outsource:

- It could be more difficult for communities to take ownership of their local environment under a shared contract. However, introducing specialised local hubs would help to mitigate this
- It is harder to manage the localism agenda with members across multiple boroughs. This may make it difficult to manage local expectations and will put extra pressure on the governance structure
- Aligning services across both boroughs will involve compromise and change, which may have a negative impact on customers who will be accustomed to the way their service has previously been delivered

3.5

A new relationship with citizens: Super outcomes (10%)

Outsource:

- The strategic priority of the council to 'use its powers, in partnership with the local public, private and third sectors, to create the right environment to promote economic growth, development and success' could be written in to the specification as a KPI. The model would also aim to meet the super outcome of 'a well designed place with sustainable infrastructure'. However, we should be aware that any profit made through commercial enterprises will have to be shared with the provider

Shared outsource:

- Due to the geographical scale and number of boroughs involved, it is less likely that smaller, local bidders will be able to take on the contract. This makes it harder to support the local economy and promote the use of local SMEs, which goes against the strategic priority of the council

3.5

Example of shared services

Somerset Waste Partnership:

- Somerset Waste Partnership manages waste and recycling services for Mendip, Sedgemoor, South Somerset and West Somerset District Councils, Taunton Deane Borough Council and Somerset County Council
- As a single team of officers, the partnership is the executive arm of Somerset Waste Board, which consists of two representatives from each of the six local authorities in Somerset
- Local authorities in Somerset have been working together to develop waste services since 1992 through a joint forum called Somerset Waste Partnership
- In October 2007 this co-operation was taken a major step further when Somerset became the first county-wide area to combine waste service functions under a single joint committee of Councillors from all Somerset local authorities
- Funding continues to be provided by each local authority partner for their services, with district councils responsible for kerbside collections and the county council for recycling sites and waste disposal
- Moving to the new Somerset Waste Partnership was a big step in improving and harmonising recycling and waste services across Somerset and making significant efficiency savings – worth over £1.5m every year – through working as a partnership

Option 5: In House stretch – delivered by a mutual

- **Description:** This option would use the in-house MTFs model as a baseline to be supported by additional transformational support. The additional support would identify extra saving and income opportunities which have not already been identified within the MTFs option. In this scenario the future service will be externalised as a mutual which would be based on co-operative principles to incentivise and engage both staff and service users. The form of the mutual would be developed should the option proceed to business case
- **Procurement option:** There would be no need to engage in a procurement exercise, the additional transformational support could be called off from the current framework that it is already in place at Barnet, this includes legal advice
- **Timescale:** Internal rationalisation planning has started already with a view to be completed by October 2014 when the May Gurney contract expires. The stretch option would work within the same timeframes but look to release extra savings early on and the set up of the mutual would run in conjunction with this
- **Cost:** There would be no cost incurred from a procurement process but there would be cost attached to the additional transformation support, in the region of £100k. There would be an extra £200k of associated costs incurred to set up a mutual. There may also be a requirement upon the Council to support the mutual in its initial stages through financial guarantee
- **Risk:** Mutuals are so far untested in the field of environmental services and is a relatively new concept in Barnet, with the only other example being in a small service area of children's services. Set up of a mutual requires clear staff buy in and leadership. Set up of a mutual is as risky as the set up of a business

High level advantages and disadvantages

Advantages:

- This option represents the best opportunity to integrate behaviour change work and empower customers to change by involving them in the running of the service. There would be a common shared purpose and clear direction of travel. Ability to learn from customer insight and generate income by making service more commercial in nature

Disadvantages:

- It is an unknown delivery model that has not been used in Barnet and environmental examples are limited. Costs would be incurred from legal fees and external assistance. It would take time to engage and mobilise staff before benefits can be realised
- For the mutual to be successful it needs a leader to progress it to ensure its success. The leader needs to be a natural selection, someone who believes in the approach and has the capabilities to drive it forward. There is the risk that there is no one suitable to do this from within the current service

Option 5: In House stretch – delivered by a mutual

Theme	Score
A RELENTLESS DRIVE FOR EFFICIENCY: PRICE (50%)	3.5
A RELENTLESS DRIVE FOR EFFICIENCY: INVESTMENT (5%)	0
A RELENTLESS DRIVE FOR EFFICIENCY: RISK TRANSFER AND GUARENTEE OF DELIVERY (5%)	2
A ONE PUBLIC SECTOR APPROACH: PACE OF TRANSFORMATION (5%)	3
A ONE PUBLIC SECTOR APPROACH: FLEXIBILITY AND SUSTAINABILITY (5%)	3.5
A NEW RELATIONSHIP WITH CITIZENS: PERFORMANCE (10%)	4
A NEW RELATIONSHIP WITH CITIZENS: POTENTIAL FOR STAFF INCENTIVISATION (5%)	4.5
A NEW RELATIONSHIP WITH CITIZENS: CITIZEN FOCUS (10%)	4.5
A NEW RELATIONSHIP WITH CITIZENS: SUPER OUTCOMES (5%)	4.5
TOTAL	34.75/ 50

A relentless drive for efficiency: Price (50%)

In house stretch:

- Ability to drive forward income generation opportunities
- Extend the role of behaviour change to other areas of the service. Opportunities may include: optimising operational effectiveness at HWRCs; increasing community led participation; and reducing the need for street cleansing by tackling fly tipping and littering
- Maximise the flexibilities within each service to create an inclusive response and management function, leading to a reduction in managers from 10 to 8. Further opportunity to change shift patterns to split shifts. Combination of street scene and green space management structure expected to release savings
- Learning from best practice elsewhere there may be potential to apply technology to improve service delivery. This will require resource to scope what opportunities may be available and support through implementation. Delivery through in house option will likely be more challenging than through an external partner as the approach requires development
- Exact scope of further efficiencies not yet identified, therefore reducing confidence in savings

3.5

Mutual:

- Income generation will be essential if the mutual is to continue to generate savings for the council. Income generation will enable the service to operate at a lower net cost and allow for incentives to be passed to staff and service users. In turn these incentives will encourage efficiency. Income generation is expected to occur as the mutual takes a more commercial approach to service delivery, developing the market in trade waste and stimulating demand for income generating activity in areas such as parks, tree management as well as commercial waste
- The mutual would operate in a manner that creates incentives for service users to change their behaviour. Application of co-operative principles may support citizen share of benefits. This option is expected to have the greatest impact on savings arising from behaviour change
- In order to deliver a mutual that achieves the level of savings required, it is important to address resource efficiencies prior to the externalisation taking place. Expectation is that the mutual will use the existing asset base.

A relentless drive for efficiency: Investment (5%)

In house stretch:

- There is little scope for internal investment in new technology or development of new software

0

Mutual:

- The mutual will require greater up front investment and potential guarantees from the council. Unlike other options the council will need to provide investment support.

A relentless drive for efficiency: Risk and guarantee of delivery (5%)

In house stretch:

- Risk is retained by the authority and is reasonably high as it is a more challenging model to deliver than the MTFS

Mutual:

- Riskier due to new organisational set up without the supporting infrastructure that exists as a service within the Council. Risk is ultimately retained by the authority. There is a shorter term risk for the Council if the mutual does not meet performance levels. There are no other examples of mutuals in this service area from other Councils, however, the practice of setting up co-operative and mutual models is becoming more common
- Risk is mitigated in part due to the provision of external support and legal advice. As the organisation matures it is likely to become less risky for the Council
- Requires contract management in line with other externalised options

2

One public sector approach: Pace of transformation (5%)

In house stretch

- Internal change can commence straight away as it does not involve lengthy procurement timescales. Long term savings will take longer to achieve, but quick wins can be accessed from the point of option approval and many are already underway

3

Mutual

- Internal change can commence straight away as the service prepares for transition. Transition to a mutual will require detailed planning and set up but can be delivered in time for the expiry of the May Gurney contract
- Additional support to set up the mutual will increase the pace of change by having a dedicated focus of achievement of the change

One public sector approach: Flexibility and sustainability (5%)

In house stretch

- Retaining the service in house enables the maximum flexibility as the council retains direct control over the service and its direction
- Sustainability over the long term might be more difficult if there are external pressures on the internal staff team to make further savings

3.5

Mutual

- Once externalised the mutual will have flexibility to develop, in particular with regards to customer led design and the local agenda.
- The separation from the council will give the mutual greater freedom to act and develop
- There is less certainty over the sustainability of this option due to it being an unknown model

A new relationship with citizens: Performance (10%)

In house stretch:

- Able to explore means to improve current customer satisfaction levels within street cleansing and parks and open spaces and retain satisfaction in waste and recycling. This will be achieved through use of customer insight in developing the service and additional scoping of potential opportunities. It is assumed that the stretch model will be more proactive in this regard than the current in house model
- In house retention of the service will also enable closer working with the leisure service to align parks satisfaction, the stretch option will work to scope these opportunities

Mutual:

- The mutual model is expected to be strong on customer satisfaction. Mutual models are designed to have significant input from communities and service users in shaping service design and delivery
- Once a mutual has reached operational maturity it is expected that high performance levels will be incentivised for staff within the mutual
- The mutual should also be contract managed by the Council through key KPIs

4

A new relationship with citizens: Potential for staff incentivisation (5%)

In house stretch:

- The stretch option may incorporate new performance management approaches in order to incentivise staff behaviour and the generation of service innovation
- Undertaking the stretch option will be a significant challenge and required the commitment of management

Mutual:

- Strongest option in terms of employee engagement. For example, management buy out options can directly incentivise staff to achieve savings and deliver service improvement
- In order to achieve the financial incentives for the staff within the mutual it will be necessary to continue to generate innovation in service delivery and grow the business on a commercial basis
- For the mutual to be successful there needs to be a management team in place that has the skills to deliver the service and support the running of a company
- At this stage a staff consultation is yet to be carried out with regards to appetite to develop a mutual. The option is not naturally emerging from staff and therefore a lower confidence level must be applied to the expected benefits

4.5

A new relationship with citizens: Citizen focus (10%)

In house stretch:

- Able to retain focus on Barnet citizens and will have local outcomes central to the service provision. Incorporating citizen led models such as “adopt a street” and planned behaviour change opportunities for waste and recycling. Optimise these opportunities and scale up their role within service provision.
- Able to set up local apprenticeship schemes or work with organisations such as Groundwork who have worked in boroughs all over the UK. Groundwork London worked with the Mayford Estate Tenants and Residents Association and Camden Council to manage, design and construct a new ball court on the estate, enhancing grassroots sports facilities for young people in the inner-city. This combines the use of apprentices as well as linking up green space with leisure facilities
- Able to engage proactively with members and get them involved in the transformation process within their communities

4.5

Mutual:

- The mutual option is expected to have the strongest citizen focus and the service provision most tailored to localised provision
- Expected to build on citizen led engagement through involvement in service design as well as delivery models such as “adopt a street” and planned behaviour change opportunities for waste and recycling
- The mutual model may also engage the community within the incentive model, sharing gains with the community through options such as rewards for recycling, maintaining clean streets or using parks and green spaces
- Citizens as users may be engaged within the governance structure of the Mutual

A new relationship with citizens: Super outcomes (10%)

In house stretch:

- The strategic priority of the council is to 'use its powers, in partnership with the local public, private and third sectors, to create the right environment to promote economic growth, development and success'. This would be at the forefront of the strategic direction of the model and would inform the service KPIs. The model would also aim to meet the super outcome of 'a well designed place with sustainable infrastructure'

4.5

Mutual:

- The design of the mutual would stretch option would be scoped to align closely to the defined super outcomes. These could be placed at the centre of the performance metrics for the mutual

Option 6: Current In House MTFs with additional support

- **Description:** This option would adopt the in-house MTFs model and would be supported by additional transformational support to ensure it meets the planned deliverables. The MTFs model considers waste, recycling, streets and green space services
- **Procurement option:** There would be no need to engage in a procurement exercise, the additional transformational support could be called off from the current framework that it is already in place at Barnet
- **Timescale:** Internal rationalisation planning has started already with a view to be completed by October 2014 when the May Gurney contract expires
- **Cost:** There would be no cost incurred from a procurement process but there would be cost attached to the additional transformation support, in the region of £100k
- **Risk:** Pace of change is expected to be lower without dedicated resource focused on its delivery. Introduction of additional support mitigates this

High level advantages and disadvantages

Advantage:

- The staff are experts in the service area and understand the variables and impacts of staffing and resources such as vehicles
- New management structure for street scene provides capacity for business improvement and contract management that should be able to lead the transformation
- Improved support services (especially IT) from the NSO provider could better enable change delivery from April 2013

Disadvantage:

- Savings are not guaranteed and there are limitations to in-house delivery capacity
- Internal improvement plans are limited in scope - e.g. income generation
- Risk that improvement is not joined up between service areas and a silo mentality will continue to exist

Option 6: Current In House MTFs with additional support

Theme	Score
A RELENTLESS DRIVE FOR EFFICIENCY: PRICE (50%)	3.5
A RELENTLESS DRIVE FOR EFFICIENCY: INVESTMENT (5%)	0
A RELENTLESS DRIVE FOR EFFICIENCY: RISK TRANSFER AND GUARENTEE OF DELIVERY (5%)	3.5
A ONE PUBLIC SECTOR APPROACH: PACE OF TRANSFORMATION (5%)	4
A ONE PUBLIC SECTOR APPROACH: FLEXIBILITY AND SUSTAINABILITY (5%)	4
A NEW RELATIONSHIP WITH CITIZENS: PERFORMANCE (10%)	3
A NEW RELATIONSHIP WITH CITIZENS: POTENTIAL FOR STAFF INCENTIVISATION (5%)	4
A NEW RELATIONSHIP WITH CITIZENS: CITIZEN FOCUS (10%)	3.5
A NEW RELATIONSHIP WITH CITIZENS: SUPER OUTCOMES (5%)	2.5
TOTAL	33/ 50

A relentless drive for efficiency: Price (50%)

In house MTFS

- Able to optimise income streams prior to outsource. In doing so it can use the generation of income as an incentive for future provider to reduce the overall cost of the contract. However, future income generation opportunity will be lost to the provider unless a gain share agreement is put in place
- In the interim period where in-house transformation is taking place the Council can gain momentum on embedding behaviour change approaches and gain earlier benefits.
- They will retain the current level of resource until point of externalisation. Whilst known that a longer term plan is to externalise, the service will be challenged to achieve the optimum resourcing within short term timescales
- Able to develop internal efficiency prior to outsource. The financial benefit of this is that the provider is not achieving a margin on the efficiencies available and the package outsourced. The Council is able to reduce the cost of the services prior to the provider
- Current MTFS figures for Street scene are 2013/14 - £882,000, 2014/15 - £1,211,000

3.5

Additional transformational support

- Achievement of savings will rely on the successful implementation of software and new technology that will require additional investment either through NSO/CSO provider or another contractor
- Additional support could focus on enabling the in-house team to progress and sustain the behaviour change programme
- Engagement of additional support will increase pace of change by identifying new efficiency savings and researching ways to implement them e.g. route optimisation. The additional support could also focus on tackling the cost pressure of agency staffing

A relentless drive for efficiency: Investment (5%)

In house MTFS

- The investment in service improvement would have to come from internal resource or procured support. This is less financially attractive, it would be beneficial to wait until it is externalised for the new provider to invest in the service change. However, this delays the transformation process and release of savings

0

Additional transformational support

- Investment in support assists the service to identify further long term savings and thus generating income to be re-invested in to the service in areas such as new technology

A relentless drive for efficiency: Risk and guarantee of delivery (5%)

In house MTFS

- Internal transformation prior to outsource requires effective performance management to support the transition. It is important that change is owned within the service in order that delivery is sustainable in the longer term. This may be difficult to achieve if staff know the service is eventually going to be externalised.

3.5

Additional transformational support

- Additional external support can be used to set up the programme of change and put controls in place to ensure delivery and sustainability. There is however, a risk that momentum is lost and sustainability is affected once dedicated external support leaves.

A one public sector approach: Pace of transformation (5%)

In house MTFS

- Undertaking internal transformation first enables savings to be accessed prior to externalisation, increasing the pace of savings achievement.
- The profile of savings would need to be mapped to take in to consideration immediate in house savings, followed by a lull during the procurement process, with the view to an increased pace of savings once completed

4

Additional transformational support

- Additional support will increase the pace of change by having a dedicated focus on achievement of the change. The external support can be held to delivery of work by the specified deadlines.

A one public sector approach: Flexibility and sustainability (5%)

In house MTFS

- During the period of internal transformation there would be scope to test the approach of the service going forward to inform the specification ready for externalisation. This would allow a more robust and sustainable outsourced model long term

4

Additional transformational support

- Additional external support can be used to set up the programme of change and put controls in place to ensure delivery and sustainability. There is however, a risk that momentum is lost and sustainability is affected once dedicated external support leaves

A new relationship with citizens: Performance (10%)

In house MTFS

- During the initial period of transformation there is potential to use demand management techniques to change behaviours of citizens, increasing recycling rates and reduce residual waste.
- By combining streets and green services the service will be more efficient which may increase resident satisfaction. As there will be dedicated locality teams it is more likely that services such as cleaning litter and removing graffiti will happen more efficiently.

Additional transformational support

- Additional support would be able to identify wider strategic opportunities across other departments in the council and offer support for joint strategic working
- Able to bring expertise of best practice from elsewhere to share with the in house team and suggest ways of increasing performance and satisfaction
- Introduce behaviour change techniques to change customer behaviour towards recycling and therefore increase performance figures

3

A new relationship with citizens: Potential for staff incentivisation (5%)

In house MTFS

- During the initial period of transformation there is a reliance on the in house team to deliver the change programme but they may lack in motivation due to the impending externalisation. This may slow the process down if there is not co-operation from the in house team.

Additional transformational support

- The scale of change required is significant and additional support would assist in providing expertise and experience to support new ways of working and business change. Behaviour change methods could be used internally to help with transformation.

4

A new relationship with citizens: Citizen focus (10%)

In house MTFS:

- There is the potential to use behaviour change techniques to increase community engagement and citizen focus can be established prior to transfer
- There is also scope to use local apprentices, especially in the locality hubs for streets and green spaces, this could then be written in to the contract specification
- Members could be involved through the behaviour change work, to support them to become enablers of behaviour change to increase recycling rates, specifically around flats

3.5

Additional transformational support:

- Provide support to the behaviour change agenda
- Share best practice ideas from across the sector with regards to citizen engagement

A new relationship with citizens: Super outcomes (10%)

In house MTFS:

- The strategic priority of the council is to 'use its powers, in partnership with the local public, private and third sectors, to create the right environment to promote economic growth, development and success'. This would be at the forefront of the strategic direction of the model and inform the KPIs in the service plan. The model would also aim to meet the super outcome of 'a well designed place with sustainable infrastructure'

Additional transformational support:

- The additional support would assist with the capacity of the in house team to enable them to achieve the maximum scale of impact in line with the super outcomes

2.5