

Cabinet 21st September 2010
Joint Working in Waste Services
Appendix 3

Project Initiation Form (PIF)

Project Title Direct Services Shared Service Project **Project Ref. No.**

FORM COMPLETED BY	Rob Bell			ESTIMATED START DATE	October 2010	
DATE COMPLETED	26 th August 2010.			ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE	April 2012	
PROJECT MANAGER	Rob Bell (plus support)			REVENUE BUDGET ALLOCATION	None	
PROJECT SPONSOR	Verna Green / Grahame Lewis			CAPITAL BUDGET ALLOCATION	None	
PROJECT SCALING SCORE	12	<8 MIN	<8>13 MED	>13 FULL	OPPORTUNITY COST	None

PROJECT SUMMARY / STATEMENT OF NEED

Increasing financial pressure on the public sector has accelerated the spread of shared service arrangements within the local authorities. As a member of the Gloucestershire Waste Partnership this authority has been looking at the case for joint working for some time. This project will bring the depot based direct service units of Tewkesbury Borough Council and Cheltenham Borough Council into a single shared service delivery unit, thereby delivering cashable savings and increasing management and operational resilience in the short term. This project will run in parallel with and contribute to the Gloucestershire Joint Waste Programme which has the potential to deliver further efficiency savings in the medium to long term.

The services in scope are the operational delivery of waste and recycling, street cleaning and grounds maintenance. Strategic and policy decisions remain with the respective client authority.

PROJECT MANAGER	NAME	SIGN	DATE
PROJECT SPONSER	NAME	SIGN	DATE
APPROVED CORP DIRECTOR	NAME	SIGN	DATE

No.	Criteria	Comments	Verified / evidence
-----	----------	----------	---------------------

1. SCOPE, OBJECTIVES, SUCCESS CRITERIA, BENEFITS & DELIVERABLES			
--	--	--	--

1.1	<p>Project objectives. <i>Please state clear, measurable objectives for the project.</i></p>	<p>To develop a robust business case for shared services between Tewkesbury BC and Cheltenham BC that compliments the work of the Gloucestershire Joint Waste Programme.</p> <p>To have a shared service arrangement in place by April 2011.</p> <p>To deliver cashable savings of £100k between the two partner authorities in 2011/12 and a further £100k in 2012/13. This will be shared equitably and proportionately between the two authorities. (Note, this is based on current budgets and service levels and does not take into account any growth due to new development)</p> <p>Provide a VFM benchmark for a county wide joint service arrangement.</p>	
------------	--	---	--

1.2	What are the project success determinants?	<p>Target cashable savings – both authorities have the need to deliver cashable savings in the short term.</p> <p>Income generation – both authorities provide a commercial waste collection service and joint working presents opportunities to increase market share.</p> <p>Service design and quality standards - already set for both authorities and will be maintained as a minimum</p> <p>Prior collaborative working – the partner authorities already share building control, legal services and an operational depot.</p> <p>Managed risk – both authorities have direct service provision which reduces the risks of merging.</p> <p>Optimum size – a two authority partnership has a greater chance of success and will facilitate effective decision making.</p> <p>Staff – there is a considerable pool of knowledge and experience in both direct service teams with access to expertise in both authorities. There will also be increased opportunity for personal development.</p> <p>Performance – both authorities are already high</p>	

		<p>performers in the services in scope.</p> <p>Culture – the depot sub culture is very similar and will facilitate joint working in this area.</p> <p>Motivation and commitment – both management teams are committed and the project is supported by the trades unions.</p>	
1.3	What benefits will the project bring to the organisation or wider Community?	<p>Cashable savings to meet budget targets.</p> <p>Increased service resilience and improved service reliability.</p> <p>Local employment opportunities</p> <p>Carbon reduction through rationalisation of collection schedules.</p>	
1.4	Who will benefit from this project and by how much?	<p>The project has the potential to deliver cashable savings to the partner authorities of £900k over 5 years. This will be shared equitably and proportionately by partners through a transparent mechanism which will be agreed by both partners and detailed in the business case.</p>	
1.5	Over what period can these improvements be expected or realised.	<p>Limited efficiencies and improvements will be delivered in 2011/12 with the full range of benefits</p>	

		realised in 2012/13 and beyond.	
1.6	What constraints are there on this project?	<p>The scope of the project is limited to operational service delivery.</p> <p>Both partners wish to retain full control over service outcomes, strategy development and service policies. There will be no change to service design or standards as a result of this project.</p>	
1.7	What other options have been considered and why this one?	<p>The status quo will not facilitate the generation of cashable savings and the respective management / administration teams have been reduced to a level where service resilience is being compromised.</p> <p>This project will advance short term cashable savings identified in the Gloucestershire Joint Waste Programme and can be viewed as an incremental step towards further efficiencies in the medium to long term.</p>	
1.8	Is there any potential political impact?	Political impact should be minimal as the project scope is limited to operational service delivery.	
1.9	Under which cabinet member's portfolio is this project?	Councillor Roger Whyborn Cabinet Member for Sustainability.	

1.10	Has an Equality Impact Assessment been carried out?	To be completed as part of the business case. As there are no changes to service policies or service design there will be little or no equality impact.	
1.11	What Corporate Priorities will this project address?	CLEAN & GREEN	✓
		HEALTHY	
		EXCELLENT	✓
		STRONG & SAFE	

2. STRATEGY / APPROACH			
2.1	Specify who will be involved in the project. (Outside agencies and CBC departments)	Lead members and officers of CBC. Tewkesbury Borough Council Gloucestershire County Council One Legal. Finance HR H&S advisory support	
2.2	Will any consultation be required? If so, what and with whom?	Elected members, staff and the trades unions will be fully consulted when the business case is developed.	

<p>2.3</p>	<p>Will any outside agencies or authorities will be involved and, if so, how?</p>	<p>Tewkesbury Borough Council.</p> <p>Gloucestershire County Council.</p> <p>Printwaste Limited as the recycling reception contractor for both authorities.</p> <p>Pure Recycling as the MRF contractor for TBC.</p> <p>CP Davidson as fleet provider for TBC.</p> <p>All will be engaged via formal project management meetings.</p>	
<p>2.4</p>	<p>Specify any outside consultants required and define their terms of reference.</p>	<p>Eunomia Research and Consulting may provide support in accordance with the current arrangement with Gloucestershire Waste Partnership.</p> <p>If, however, it is determined that this project does not form part of the Joint Waste Programme there may be a requirement to appoint other independent support and divert funding provisionally allocated to the programme.</p>	

2.5	Define the proposed stages of the project. Try to estimate approximate dates for these stages.	<p>Sept 2010 – project set up and interim management arrangements.</p> <p>Nov 2010 – joint stakeholder focus group to gain clear member steer on shared service outcomes.</p> <p>Mar 2011 – approval of detailed business case</p> <p>Apr 2011 – stage 1 phased implementation of cashable savings</p> <p>Apr 2012 – stage 2 implementation of cashable savings.</p>	
2.6	Who are the project stakeholders?	<p>TBC</p> <p>CBC</p> <p>Householders</p> <p>Commercial customers</p>	
2.7	Project team members.	<p>Project Sponsor – Verna Green / Grahame Lewis</p> <p>Project Manager – Rob Bell (with support)</p> <p>Senior user – Grahame Lewis</p> <p>Technical and Operational Support -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Beth Boughton - Malcolm Carruthers - John Rees 	

2.8	Project reporting structure.	<p>Project Sponsor briefings - Fortnightly</p> <p>Project Highlight reports (incl members) - Monthly</p> <p>Corporate programme board reports. - Monthly</p>	
2.9	Project major risks.	<p>If the majority of management resource is targeted at this project then operational service quality could deteriorate with subsequent reduction in customer satisfaction. Mitigating actions – Joint working will release capacity which can be invested in the project. External support and project management support will also be utilised where appropriate. Front line service quality to take priority.</p> <p>If delays occur in authorisation and implementation then target cashable savings may not be achieved within identified timescale. Mitigating actions – deliver stage 1 cashable savings through interim arrangements whilst project is completed.</p> <p>If stakeholders are not aligned behind shared service outcomes then the project will fail and no cashable savings will be delivered. Mitigating actions – arrange a facilitated focus group with key members of each authority to gain joint agreement on priorities and outcomes.</p>	

2.10	Environmental or social impacts to the project.	<p>A successful shared service DSO will provide local jobs for the community and improve environmental standards.</p> <p>Improved vehicle routing and cross boundary working will contribute to fuel and carbon reduction.</p>	
2.11	Procurement strategy to be used.	N/A	
2.12	List any other related projects.	Gloucestershire Joint Waste Programme.	

3. RESOURCES (BUDGET / FUNDING STREAM / INVESTMENT APPRAISAL / WHOLE LIFE COST MODEL / RESOURCE PLAN)			
3.1	Rough estimate of how much officer time will be required	Project sponsor – 2 hours per week Project manager – 10 hours per week Operational staff / stakeholders – 5 hours per week Director/client – 2 hours per week.	
3.2	Are there any external people costs (consultants / temporary staff)?	No additional costs at this stage.	
3.3	Have you considered whether there are any VAT implications associated with this project? These issues could be complex and you need to seek guidance from colleagues in finance.	Both partners are local authorities so there should be no VAT implications for this project.	
3.4	Are necessary outside purchases defined and budgeted for?	None identified at this stage.	
3.5	What skills are required and do we have them in the project team? If not, define and cost the acquisition.	Project management skills are available within both partner authorities. Technical knowledge exists within both partner authorities. Legal advice will be delivered via One Legal. Financial and HR support will be required from both partner authorities.	

3.6	Is the source of funding for the project identified?	The project is to be funded from within existing resources.	
3.7	Are contingencies specified?	If the business case for a shared service arrangement is not approved then both partners will re-establish existing management and operational arrangements.	
3.8	What is the payback period for this investment?	N/A	
3.9	What are the whole life costs?	N/A	
3.10	Has the impact of the project (during and after) on all departments involved been defined? Are normal workloads sustainable? Are any other activities or projects having to be delayed or cancelled?	Interim management arrangements will release operational management capacity which will be re-invested in this project. No other projects will be delayed or cancelled as a result of this project.	
3.11	Are training requirements and resources identified?	None at this stage but a skills audit of all permanent staff involved in this shared service arrangement will be carried out to inform the setting of roles and responsibilities.	

Project scaling

CATEGORY	DESCRIPTION		YOUR SCORE
COST	GREATER THAN £10M	SCORE 8	1
	LESS THAN £10M BUT GREATER THAN £4M	SCORE 6	
	LESS THAN £4M BUT GREATER THAN £1M	SCORE 3	
	LESS THAN £1M	SCORE 1	
COMPLEXITY	EXTREMELY COMPLEX	SCORE 4	3
	HIGHLY COMPLEX	SCORE 3	
	COMPLEX	SCORE 2	
	NOT COMPLEX	SCORE 1	
URGENCY	VERY URGENT	SCORE 4	3
	URGENT	SCORE 3	
	REQUIRED SOON	SCORE 2	
	NOT URGENT AT ALL	SCORE 1	
STRATEGIC SENSITIVITY	EXTREMELY SENSITIVE	SCORE 4	3
	HIGHLY SENSITIVE	SCORE 3	
	SENSITIVE	SCORE 2	
	NOT SENSITIVE AT ALL	SCORE 1	
RISK FROM FAILURE	MAJOR	SCORE 4	2
	LIKELY	SCORE 3	
	UNLIKELY	SCORE 2	
	VERY UNLIKELY	SCORE 1	
TOTAL SCORE			12

START

Project Initiation	Communication Plans	Formal Project Schedule	Change Control	Gateway Reviews	Risk Management	Project Activity Logs	Project Status Report	Project Close Out Report
-----------------------	------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------	--------------------	--------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------------

END

Minimum Mandatory tools

8 OR LESS

GREATER THAN 8 BUT LESS THAN 13

13 OR MORE

Minimal Monitoring: Initiation, Project Status Reports & Close Out Report Only

Intermediate Monitoring: Initiation, Project Schedule, Risk Register, Project Status Reports & Close Out Report

Full Monitoring: All Tools