

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 | <p>Clear line of sight/transparency and accountability for the council in the context of :-</p> <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 |