

Appendix 1 – Governance Model Options

Table One – Advantages and disadvantages of aligning models

Advantages of retaining two models	Disadvantages of retaining two models
Little service disruption	Not in line with the BCP Council alignment strategy and could affect long term credibility of the council if two service models remain
Reduce staff anxiety (although may assume alignment will still come but at a later date)	Value for money - Not realise opportunity to remove duplication and secure financial efficiencies which could be reinvested back into services for tenants e.g. senior and middle management, duplicate contracts, duplicate systems – we will need to make significant spending choices within the 30 year business plan
Both models deliver good services to residents and there are no vocal tenant concerns with the current differences	Separate systems, contracts, cultures and ways of working are likely to continue to some degree even if key policies and strategies are aligned over time
Could still work to align policies and practices within the two models	Duplication of effort and resource overseeing two governance structures
	The opportunity of fresh thinking and innovative service redesign in the context of the national White Paper would not be fully realised with two separate structures and systems
	The transformation agenda for the council would be difficult to apply with two separate structures and systems
	Separate resident engagement structures would not be helpful in the context of greater regulation on this area and an increased focus on the tenants voice
	Not equitable and many residents would expect consistency as part of the wider journey of integrating services into one BCP council offer

Table Two – Advantages and disadvantages of a combined company model (2c) or an in-house model (2d)

Advantages for option 2 c	Advantages for option 2 d
Expert scrutiny of an independent board	Direct tenants voice to the landlord – the ‘tenants voice’ is closer to the landlord (White Paper)
Ability to trade and sell services to others	Clear line of sight/transparency and accountability for the council in the context of :- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increasing regulation and accountability required by the landlord, as set out in the White Paper. (The council is the accountable body) • an increasing focus on safety, as evidenced by the White Paper (‘To be safe in your home’)
The council is familiar with wholly owned companies as the ALMO model would sit alongside other wholly owned companies overseen by housing	Connect, re-integrate and join-up with other council services to achieve better outcomes (e.g. community safety team, housing delivery, communications, legal, procurement housing options)
Potential for more rapid decision-making within delegated authorities provided by the council	Enable better delivery of the council’s transformation journey to modernise and improve services to all completely in line with the council’s vision and culture
	Advisory panel (operating well elsewhere) would provide independent expert input and tenant representation and ensure good governance and oversight
	Greater control for the council of its assets to meet strategic short, medium and long term strategic priorities
	No additional company overhead costs incurred and no need to resource the internal ‘clienting’ of a stand-alone company and independent board
	Value for money - scope for securing further savings with functions gaining economies of scale from operating within the wider council organisation