

**REPORT TO THE MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE
11 OCTOBER 2022****PORTFOLIO: HOUSING, ASSETS & LEISURE****REPORT FROM THE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE****SUBJECT: HEALTH CHECK REVIEW OF THE ASSET DELIVERY
PROGRAMME****1 PURPOSE OF REPORT**

- 1.1 The Committee is invited to scrutinise the health check review of the Asset Delivery Programme (ADP) and the recommendations contained therein and to make recommendations to the Executive.

2 INTRODUCTION

- 2.1 As reported to the Executive in July 2022 the Council commissioned Local Partnerships to complete a health check review of the ADP ahead of the decision to commence the construction phase of the programme, referred to as the 'stop/go' decision in previous reports.

3 HEALTH CHECK REVIEWS

- 3.1 Health check reviews are an essential element of strong governance; the process provides an independent assessment of the health of a project ahead of key decision points.
- 3.2 Health check reviews are peer reviews carried out at a key point in the life of a project. They are carried out by trained and experienced practitioners. Reviews consist of a series of interviews with stakeholders preceded by key document review and followed by a short, focused report with findings and recommendations delivered to the Senior Responsible Officer.
- 3.3 They offer informed, constructive challenge and recognise good practice as well as setting out areas for improvement and recommendations for success.
- 3.4 The Council previously commissioned a health check review of the ADP by Local Partnerships in February 2019, ahead of drafting the Final Business Case. Local Partnerships is owned by HM Treasury and the Local Government Association and offers professional support to public bodies in the review of strategic projects.
- 3.5 This first review concluded with an Amber/Green delivery confidence meaning: 'successful delivery appears probable; however, constant attention will be needed to ensure risks do not materialise into major issues threatening delivery assurance'. The review also made recommendations that the Council addressed to support the successful delivery of the programme.

- 3.6 As the ADP has now progressed and achieved the milestones as set out in the report to the Executive in July 2022, it was recommended that a further health check review be commissioned on the ADP with any recommendations being considered ahead of the 'stop/go' decision being brought to Council.
- 3.7 The review has now been completed and is appended to this report at Appendix 1.
- 3.8 The health check review team working in partnership with the Council invited the following to contribute to the report: the Chief Executive Officer, senior officers of the Council, the Leader of the Council, Portfolio Holder for Housing, Assets & Leisure, Group Leaders, Partnership Panel Members, GB Partnerships, external advisers and stakeholders.

4 PRE-SCRUTINY BY OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

- 4.1 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered the Health Check Review of the Asset Delivery Programme at its meeting on 4 October 2022.
- 4.2 At the meeting a number of questions were raised and the following points were noted:-
- As the Asset Delivery Programme progressed there would be a need to factor in the Council's carbon neutrality objectives.
 - Reporting to Council by the end of the year with an outline business case (OBC) for a stop/go decision presented a challenging timescale; however, it was necessary to work at pace on the programme. Factors such as the current increasing rate of inflation, the strategic partnership with BBC and Covid-related factors further strengthened the strategic case.
 - The OBC would include indicative costings; the main focus would be that of reviewing strategic factors of the case for change. The financial business case would be light touch, confirming specific changes in figures.
 - No specific date had been set previously for the stop/go decision.
 - The case for change would review costs and risks of not going ahead with the programme in the light of the current economic climate and central government cuts on public spending. Efficiencies would need to be reviewed, including the costs of continuing to operate the current Council buildings, increased building costs and building materials, and surplus assets. The aim of the Asset Delivery Programme was to deliver efficiencies and that was still currently the case.
 - The Council now had an opportunity to pause and reflect on the programme and to build on work that has previously been undertaken, developing an amended version.

- Evaluating all potential options, regardless of whether or not they were part of the original outline business case, could compromise the timescale of reporting to Full Council on the OBC by the end of the year as this would involve looking back at a volume of historic work.

4.3 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee requested that, going forward with the ADP, consideration of the impact of our carbon footprint be given when buying in services and procuring goods. It also requested that a risk register/issues log be presented to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and finally asked that the Executive ensured that the programme continued to be vision-led and that all options would be evaluated, regardless of whether or not they were part of the original outline business case.

5 RISK IMPLICATIONS

5.1 It is good practice to review projects at key milestones to test that the strategic objectives remain valid, take account of new or emerging factors since they were originally conceived and are deliverable. Failure to complete such reviews or give due consideration to any resulting recommendations risks a project failing to deliver its stated objectives.

6 CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

6.1 None.

7 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

7.1 None.

8 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

8.1 The cost of the review was £20,000 and the budget for this work was agreed by the Executive on 13 July 2022, as part of the ADP update report.

9 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

9.1 None arising out of this report.

10 PARISH IMPLICATIONS

10.1 None.

11 EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

11.1 As no decision is being recommended, no Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) has been completed.

12 RECOMMENDATION

12.1 It is proposed that the Executive **RESOLVES**

- (1) That, going forward with the ADP, consideration of the impact of our carbon footprint be given when buying in services and procuring goods.
- (2) That a risk register/issues log be presented to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
- (3) That the Executive ensures that the programme continues to be vision-led and that all options will be evaluated, regardless of whether they were part of the original outline business case.



Matt Harwood-White

Assistant Director, Assets & Commercial

Background Papers:-

None.

For further information please contact Matt Harwood-White on:-

Phone: 01702 318164

Email: matt.harwoodwhite@rochford.gov.uk

If you would like this report in large print, Braille or another language please contact 01702 318111.



JOINTLY OWNED BY



Health Check Review 2 Investment decision

Rochford District Council
Asset Delivery Programme

Version number: FINAL v 1.0

Date of issue to PO: 21/09/2022

Project Owner: Matt Harwood White

Health Check Review dates: 01/09/2022 to 02/09/2022

Health Check Review Team Members:

Michael Murphy

Hazel Nickless

This report is an evidence-based snapshot of the project's status at the time of the review. It reflects the views of the independent review team, based on information evaluated over a three to four day period, and is delivered to the Project Owner immediately at the conclusion of the review.

Gateway reviews has been derived from OGC's Successful Delivery Toolkit which is a Crown Copyright Value Added product developed, owned and published by the Office of Government Commerce. It is subject to Crown copyright protection and is reproduced under licence with the kind permission of the Controller of HMSO and the Office of Government Commerce.

Summary of report recommendations

The review team makes the following recommendations which are prioritized using the definitions below.

Ref	Recommendation	Critical /Essential / Recommended
1.	The Council needs to collectively recognise the value of stakeholder engagement and should engage specialist external support to invest in refreshing stakeholder relationships across the project and build participation and mutual trust.	CRITICAL
2.	Re-cast the original OBC considering the changing future operating environment.	CRITICAL
3.	Consider the function and purpose of the Partnership Panel and ensure that participants are aware of their respective roles.	ESSENTIAL (3 Months)
4.	Take all reasonable steps to secure “embedded institutional knowledge” relating to key elements of the ADP before it is lost when key personnel leave and appoint to key project roles as soon as possible ensuring time for a meaningful handover.	ESSENTIAL (3 Months)
5.	Re-programme the ADP to allow time to re-base the OBC based on the current, changed requirements of the Council, develop stakeholder participation, and consider the potential for alternative (or amended) solutions.	CRITICAL

Critical (Do Now) – To increase the likelihood of a successful outcome it is of the greatest importance that the programme/project should take action immediately

Essential (Do By) – To increase the likelihood of a successful outcome the programme/project should take action in the near future

Recommended – The programme/project should benefit from the uptake of this recommendation.

Background

The aims of the programme:

Rochford District Council (the Council) wants to make better use of its public assets and, in so doing, bring the added benefit of providing new homes, drive economic growth and regeneration and assist in the delivery of more efficient and improved public services. Its 2018-28 Asset Strategy sets out the principles and objectives on which the Council intends to base future investment in the Council's assets.

The Asset Strategy focuses on the Council's strategic built assets and land holdings and aligns with the Council's other key strategies and its Business Plan. The vision is set out in the Asset Strategy:

'An optimised asset base that is fit for purpose, delivering capital receipts to help fund future investment and revenue income streams where appropriate, enabling quality service delivery for residents and visitors through a sustained programme of transformation'

The driving force for the programme:

The Asset Delivery Programme (ADP) considers the future service delivery needs of the Council and determines how the Council's key strategic assets should be developed. The Programme will validate the scale and nature of opportunities available. The buildings and sites included in the original ADP are:

- the Council's South Street Offices, Rochford:
- The Civic Suite, Rayleigh:
- Freight House, Rochford:
- numbers 19 and 57 South Street, Rochford: and,
- The Mill Arts and Events Centre, Rayleigh (now removed from the ADP – see below).

The procurement/delivery status:

- On 5 September 2019, the Council's Investment Board approved an Output Specification for the ADP's OBC.
- A full business case (FBC) was presented to full Council on 19 May 2020 has subsequently been reviewed by officers and advisers in light of the COVID 19 pandemic.
- On 8 September 2020 the Council awarded a contract to GBPartnerships (GBP) to act as its development partner and in doing so, created the Voyage Partnership.
- The Council's Partnership Panel published a cross party Position Paper on 25 March 2022 formally recommending no residential or commercial development on The Mill Arts & Events Centre site.
- On 13 July 2022, the Council's Executive resolved to terminate CSC2 of the ADP resulting in the Mill Arts & Events Centre site being removed from the ADP. In addition, the Council decided to vary CSC1 and the Overarching Development Agreement ("ODA") to remove any obligations in relation to the Mill Arts & Events Centre site.
- The Council has decided to re-open the Mill Arts and Events Centre and seek expressions of interest from constituted organisations with charitable purposes; local service providers, voluntary or community groups, sports organisations, charities or other partners who would be interested in entering into a partnership with the Council to occupy or manage the centre.

- Planning permission was granted for 3-15 South Street, Rochford, the Civic Suite, Rayleigh and Freight House, Rochford in March 2022.
- No.19 South Street was granted planning permission on 9 July 2018 with amendments being approved in June 2022 which were designed to make the site more environmentally sustainable.
- Obtaining planning permission for 57 South Street, Rochford has been challenging

Current position regarding Local Partnerships Gateway Reviews:

A Local Partnerships Health Check Review 1 was carried out in February 2019. At that time the Review Team found a project progressing well with strong support from members and officers. The Health Check Review 1 made several recommendations to support the ADP moving forward all of which appear to have been addressed. A summary of recommendations, progress and status from the previous Local Partnerships Health Check Review can be found in Appendix C.

Purposes and conduct of the Review

Purposes of the Review

Appendix A gives the full purposes statement for a Local Partnerships Gateway Review 3 for reference. These criteria have been used as a template to create this Health Check Review 2.

The primary purpose of this Local Partnerships Health Check Review 2 is to confirm that the business case and benefits plan are robust – that is, in principle it meets business need, is affordable, achievable with appropriate options explored and likely to achieve value for money. This review considers the Council's asset management proposals as set out in the Asset Strategy 2018-2028 dated July 2018 including particularly the 'Asset Delivery Programme' (ADP) the draft Outline Business Case which was considered by the Council's Investment Board in January 2019.

The focus of the review will be on outcomes rather than process and will examine the viability of the proposed ADP solution for Rochester in the context of the Council's wider corporate goals.

The review will also focus on the 'investment decision' by considering a number of questions.

- Is the project still required?
- Is it aligned with the council's wider strategic objectives?
- Will it deliver the expected benefits?
- Does the recommended way forward meet the Council's current business needs and future potential service delivery models?
- Is there current and continuing support for the project from key stakeholders?

Conduct of the Review

This Local Partnerships Health Check Review 2 was carried out on 1-2 September via virtual meetings with individuals and groups of key stakeholders. The Review Team members are listed on page 2. The people interviewed are listed in Appendix B.

The Review team would like to thank Matt Harwood-White, Kay Tinson, Councillors, external advisers, stakeholders and colleagues at Rochford DC for their support and openness, which contributed to the Review Team's understanding of the Programme and the outcome of this Review.

Findings and recommendations

1: Business case and stakeholders

The development of the OBC for the ADP had been progressed in exemplary fashion: the Strategic Outline Case (SOC) was issued in August 2018, the OBC was approved by the Council's Investment Board in January 2019. The FBC was approved by the Council in May 2020.

Initially, all progressed well including the appointment of GBP as the Council's development partner. The Council also took very positive steps to obtain specialist skills and professional expertise from external consultants. In particular, the Review Team heard that the engagement of a 'critical friend' from the East of England Local Government Association had been very positively received.

Engagement of wider stakeholder groups – including residents - has taken place, but the Review Team established that this was neither timely nor comprehensive, and many interviewees argued that it had not been well carried out.

Frequently Asked Questions have been published on the Council's website and the partnership also held webinars and virtual 1:1 meetings and placed advertorials in local press, created a dedicated website, and completed telephone appointments. Despite this, the Review Team found wide acceptance that because a great deal of engagement took place during the height of COVID-19, too much emphasis was given to online methods with too little in-person messaging. As a result, the quality of stakeholder engagement was severely compromised, and some stakeholders felt excluded from the consultation process.

Objections increased especially against the Council's proposals for the Mill Arts and Events Centre, and widespread support for elements of the original ADP has diminished to the point where the Council has now removed the Mill Arts and Events Centre from the ADP.

The Review Team found that there is now a great deal of mistrust around the Council's future intentions regarding Mill Hall especially. Many stakeholders indicated that they accept that commercially sensitive information cannot be shared but highlighted that they rely on Freedom of Information legislation to obtain information that they feel should have been made available by the Council.

It is good practice for the Council to consider the full range of people, business and voluntary bodies affected by the policy, and whether representative groups exist. The Council should consider targeting specific groups if appropriate. As well as ensuring that stakeholders are aware of the consultation and can access it, consideration should be given to the needs and preferences of particular groups, such as older people, younger people or people with disabilities that may not be able to respond to certain stakeholder engagement methods.

The Review Team found that a stakeholder engagement plan was in place. However, the stakeholder engagement plan did not identify separate stakeholder groups and their specific concerns, their preferred channels of communication or how key messages can be tailored – including messages that the Council has listened to and acted upon stakeholder concerns. The Review Team also heard that certain groups had 'missed' communications and were not aware of all key messages.

The Review Team heard that affected stakeholders want the Council to listen to their legitimate concerns. The communications plan should be refreshed to reflect this. The Council would do well to consider how it can demonstrate leadership in a difficult political environment to repair relationships with stakeholders. The aim should be to build a co-operative and trusting relationship based on inclusion and participation in line with the Council's wider corporate aims.

RECOMMENDATION 1

The Council needs to collectively recognise the value of stakeholder engagement and should engage specialist external support to invest in refreshing stakeholder relationships across the project and build participation and mutual trust.

The commercial impact of the decision to remove Mill Hall from the scope of the ADP has caused a degree of tension between the Council and its delivery partner GBP. The Council's executive has now approved a rebasing of the contract and both sides appear to be on track to establishing a solid working relationship moving forward.

The anticipated capital receipts from developing residential solutions on the Mill Hall site were expected to be substantial but will now no longer be available to the Council to fund a new facility. As a result, the Council will be exposed to revenue costs it was hoping to avoid. Now that Mill Hall has been removed from the scope of the ADP, the assumptions in the original Outline Business Case are no longer valid. As a result, the Council approved an addendum to the OBC (dated October 2021) where it reviewed the impact of removing Mill Hall from the ADP and the resulting reduction of benefits.

The addendum to the OBC asserted that in undertaking the revised Option B it is expected that following occupation of the new Freight House facility the Council will improve its revenue position significantly compared with the Do Minimum option. The Council recognises that the position is not as favourable as envisaged under the original OBC or FBC proposals, due to the impact of the Mill Site not being developed. There is clearly a need for a robust financial case taking all short- and long-term costs into account.

The Review Team found evidence that many interviewees were unclear about whether the remaining programme made sense any longer. Furthermore, future solutions for Mill Hall are yet un-costed and it is not clear what future revenue burden the Council will be required to carry although the Review Team understands that a process is in place to consider the future operating model with a report expected to be presented to the Executive in the Autumn.

Interviews revealed that there were concerns about the next steps in the programme and as indicated above, some Elected Members expressed concerns about not understanding their future role on the Partnership Panel. Many interviewees agreed there was a need to pause and make an honest assessment of exactly where the programme stands and for the Council to give more clarity over the future of the ADP and Mill Hall.

As set out more fully in Section 5 below, in the future, the Council will find itself in an operating environment different to that envisaged during the original OBC and which formed the basis of the 5 cases set out in the OBC. Specifically:

- Since COVID, many employees now work from home and demands for office space are expected to continue to be lower in the future. Previous assumptions of office occupancy need to be revised to take this into account.
- The Council's CONNECT transformation initiative is facilitating a move to more a digital operating environment, with consequential reduced space demands.
- The proposed partnership with Brentwood BC is expected to result in economies of scale and greater resilience.
- Construction materials price indices are high and volatile due to international trade tensions and actual construction costs could be expected to be much higher than assumed in the original OBC.
- The Council needs to be mindful of the need for continuity and expertise to deliver the programme.

The future partnership with Brentwood BC, increased agile working, higher inflation costs and other expected financial pressures mean that it is appropriate to re-cast the original OBC considering the changing future operating environment.

RECOMMENDATION 2

Re-cast the original OBC considering the changing future operating environment.

In developing its original OBC, the Council has ensured that the following elements of the 5 case model were fully incorporated:

- financial costing model,
- Capex and Opex requirements,
- impact of the project on balance sheet, and
- overall affordability and funding.

However, the OBC addendum only considered these elements at a high level but will need to be done in more detail for a final business case. The Review Team heard concerns from interviewees about uncertainties relating to funding, increased costs already accrued and the need for surveys to identify and quantify backlog and future maintenance costs of the various properties. The Review Team has been advised by the Council that it has agreed to commission a survey of Mill Hall.

Considering inflation and building costs generally, there are significant risks regarding future redevelopment costs. Added to this there is no certainty yet about the future operating model for Mill Hall.

In recasting the OBC, the Council needs to ensure it continues to follow the above elements of the 5 case model, supported by a forensic financial analysis.

Elected Members from across the political spectrum have been engaged using a 'Partnership Panel' which is an example of good practice. Panel members have made a significant contribution to shaping the programme including developing the Freight House design and making recommendations to the Board regarding engagement and sustainability.

The Panel's terms of reference were recently reviewed; however, the Review Team was advised by several members that they felt that their role in the Partnerships Panel was unclear, and the Council would do well to refresh the role.

RECOMMENDATION 3

Consider the function and purpose of the Partnership Panel and ensure that participants are aware of their respective roles.

2: Assessment of the proposed solution

The Overarching Developer Agreement (ODA) sets out the relationship between the Council and GBP, including their respective rights and responsibilities. The ODA follows the form and structure of commercially similar development agreements and deals specifically with how other contractual documents fit into the deal structure. It was intended that the sites which will transfer to the Developer would do so in two tranches under two legal contracts – the CSC1 and the CSC2.

Development of each of the remaining sites within the ADP is controlled by (subject to acceptable review of the OBC – see above) the Output Specification (OS). The Review Team found that a robust OS was in place in line with best practice and, on the face of it, could lead to specific solutions that satisfy the Council's overall aims and objectives.

However, the transfer for the CSC2 will not now take place due to the removal of Mill Hall from the scope of the ADP. As above, the future partnership with Brentwood BC, increased agile working, higher inflation costs and other expected financial pressures mean that it is appropriate to re-cast the original OBC considering the changing future operating environment.

The original OBC (and its addendum) is clearly based on assumptions that will no longer be valid in the future changing operating environment and the Council has acknowledged this. The project and the OBC need to be reviewed to establish expected benefits from the remaining programme. Uncertainties about the expected programme benefits and the future level of revenue demands for Mill Hall make it difficult to give a full assessment of the proposed solution.

3: Review of current phase

In practical terms, planning permission was granted for 3-15 South Street, Rochford, the Civic Suite, Rayleigh and Freight House, Rochford in March 2022. No.19 South Street was already granted planning permission on 9 July 2018 with amendments being approved in June 2022 to make the site more environmentally sustainable. Obtaining planning permission for 57 South Street, Rochford has been challenging and the Review Team heard that GBP have made a planning appeal on the grounds of 'non-determination' for this property. The Review Team were also advised that the project has suffered from difficult relationships with some of its statutory planning consultees. Excellent external expertise has been brought to the table especially in heritage terms with the Review Team finding that Purcells was particularly well-regarded.

The ADP is by some way one of the largest capital and revenue projects ever undertaken by RDC. The Review Team understands that the Council's "Connect" programme is intended to be a digitally led transformation change programme demanding new ways of working many of which will be enabled by the ADP. The Council has now developed the Connect programme and has begun to embed new ways its new approach across the board. The Connect programme and the proposed partnership working with Brentwood BC are key drivers for ADP delivery.

Doing nothing is not an option, and many interviewees and stakeholders recognised this. The Council remains in a position where it has too much space whilst occupying an aging portfolio of assets with leisure and community assets that remain financially unviable. Changes because of the Covid-19 pandemic have worsened the current position and strengthened the case for change. The Council aspires to operate in a more agile manner. However, this is not possible in the current facilities without some form of intervention.

4: Risk management

The Review Team found evidence that key programme risks are being managed using a robust risk management framework in line with previous recommendations and good practice. The Review Team feel it would be helpful if the Risk Register was reviewed more frequently by the project team, and that they are considered 'live' documents.

There is also an implied link with the Council's strategic risk register, however the ADP is not explicitly mentioned in the latter document, and the Council would do well to strengthen the articulation of risk dependencies on programme delivery. As an example, Strategic Risk 8 talks about understanding the Council's asset base, but not the criticality of delivering the ADP.

It should be noted that the Council is managing a new Strategic Risk (16) because of the forthcoming partnership between Rochford District Council and Brentford Borough Council. The Review Team found that several interviewees were due to leave the Council and that new posts had not yet been filled. The Review Team was impressed with the continued professionalism, knowledge and commitment demonstrated by many interviewees on the project team who are due to leave the Council in the very near future.

A key risk here is that critical "institutional knowledge" could well be lost during the reorganisation. There is also expected to be a 'gap' in resources available until new post-holders can be appointed and programme roles filled.

RECOMMENDATION 4

Take all reasonable steps to secure "embedded institutional knowledge" relating to key elements of the ADP before it is lost when key personnel leave and appoint to key project roles as soon as possible ensuring time for a meaningful handover.

5: Readiness for next phase – Readiness for Service

The Review Team found evidence that the ADP is still very much required. As stated above, there are changing strategic drivers in the form of a new partnership with Brentwood BC, demands for agility and transformational working to reduced costs. Consequently, doing nothing is not an option and many interviewees and stakeholders recognised that some form of ADP is essential and there are legitimate questions about what form the delivery solutions should take in the future.

The principles of the Asset Review still align with the Council's wider strategic objectives and its transformation programmes. However, the Review Team found that the expected benefits set out in the ADP are unclear until the new programme is developed. In trying to answer whether the recommended way forward meets the current needs of the business and its future potential service delivery models, the Council acknowledges that the world has changed greatly since the original OBC was developed. The Council is also aware that it does not enjoy universal support from its stakeholders for its ADP proposals.

For these reasons, the Review Team - and many interviewees - feel that there is a need and an opportunity for the Council to re-programme its delivery of the ADP and take stock of its Asset Review. This would allow to Council time to complete the other recommendations in this review and to explore alternative (or amended) delivery solutions that reflect upon and consider previously unforeseeable changes that now impact on the ADP.

A redefined ADP is essential and taking the time at this stage to consider all the implications allows a fuller understanding of financial risks, and lets the Council take into account stakeholder input while considering the wider social benefits (and possibly exploit untapped Social Capital) to give more confidence in future programme delivery and benefits realisation.

RECOMMENDATION 5

Re-programme the ADP to allow time to re-base the OBC based on the current, changed requirements of the Council, develop stakeholder participation, and consider the potential for alternative (or amended) solutions.

The next Review is expected in 12 Months

APPENDIX A

Purpose of the Gateway Review 3: Investment decision - These criteria have been used as a template to create this Health Check Review 2 and are included here for reference only.

- Confirm the business case and benefits plan now that the bid information has been confirmed.
- Check that all the necessary statutory and procedural requirements were followed throughout the procurement process.
- Confirm that the recommended contract decision, if properly executed within a standard lawful agreement, is likely to deliver the specified outputs/outcomes on time, within budget and will provide value for money.
- Ensure that management controls are in place to manage the project through to completion, including contract management aspects.
- Ensure there is continuing support for the project.
- Confirm that the approved procurement strategy has been followed.
- Confirm that the development and implementation plans of both the client and the supplier or partner are sound and achievable.
- Check that the business has prepared for the development (where there are new processes), implementation, transition and operation of new services/facilities.
- Confirm that there are plans for risk management, issue management and change management (technical and business) and that these plans are shared with suppliers.
- Confirm that the technical implications, such as 'buildability' for construction projects; and for IT-enabled projects information assurance, the impact of e-government frameworks (such as e-business and external infrastructure) have been addressed.

APPENDIX B

Interviewees

NAME	ROLE
Cllr Simon Wootton	Leader of the Council, Conservative
Jonathan Stephenson	Chief Executive
Cllr Mike Webb	Portfolio Holder for Housing, Assets & Leisure
Alastair Gourlay	Development Partner GBPartnerships
Matt Harwood-White	(SRO) Assistant Director Assets and Commercial
Andrew Rowson	East of England Local Government Association
Richard Brooks	Anthony Collins Solicitors
Duncan Blackie	East of England Local Government Association
Kirk Hardy	GLEEDS
Dave Piper	National Trust
Kevin Hall	Rayleigh Brass
Mike Davies	Chair, Rayleigh Town Museum
Jill Waight	Rayleigh Town Council
Angela Law	Assistant Director Legal & Democratic (Monitoring Officer)
Naomi Lucas	Assistant Director Resources, S151
Dawn Tribe	Assistant Director Transformation & Customer
Cllr Adrian Eves	Rochford District Residents (Partnership Panel appointee)
Cllr Jim Cripps	Liberal Democrat (Partnership Panel appointee)
Cllr Michael Hoy	Rochford District Residents (Partnership Panel appointee)
Cllr Mike Steptoe	Conservative (Partnership Panel Chair)
Cllr Mike Wilkinson	Independent (Partnership Panel appointee)
Cllr James Newport	Liberal Democrat Leader

APPENDIX C

Progress with Recommendations arising from Health Check 1

Ref	Recommendation	Critical /Essential / Recommended	Position as of July 2022
1	Establish a corporate change programme with accompanying governance arrangements.	Essential (within 3 months)	'Connect' programme now fully established. Governance established Link to ADP established
2	Recruit an executive level external appointee to bring expertise and challenge.	Essential (within 3 months)	EELGA Advisor appointed (March 2019). Critical friend role for Members. Attends Panel meetings Provide challenge to Officer group and bring expertise from previous similar programmes.
3	Put in place risk management arrangements at corporate and ADP levels.	Essential (within 3 months)	Risk register created. Risk owners identified. Risks RAG rated with mitigation Reported to Members as part of programme updates OBC Forms part of Programme meetings
4	To make time in the programme for a formal decision point as to the Council's preferred partnership approach.	Essential (within 6 months)	Member Work party briefed on partnership approaches during Feb/March 2019. Advice sought and presented to Members as part of Work Group Formal decision taken: Development Contract. by IB 24/4/19.
5	To review capacity of the ADP SRO.	Essential (within 3 months)	Formed part of ongoing 1:1 process with SRO and SD. Needs to be reviewed again in light of new Partnership arrangement with Brentwood BC.