

APPENDIX 4

ALTERNATIVE METHODS OF DELIVERY FOR LICENSING UNDER LICENSING ACT 2003

TOPIC	PULL OUT OF DELIVERY ALTOGETHER	TEST IN THE EXTERNAL MARKET, WITH OR WITHOUT AN IN-HOUSE BID	PARTNERSHIP, BOTH FORMAL (CONSORTIUM OR TRUST) AND INFORMAL 'JOINT WORKING'	CORE PROVISION IN-HOUSE WITH TOP-UP PROVIDED EXTERNALLY	RESTRUCTURE TO MATCH THE BEST (IE BENCHMARKING TO IDENTIFY THE BEST AND THEN RESTRUCTURE TO ACHIEVE THAT BEST
Licensing Policy	No	Could use consultant to draft policy. Will be local variations which may be significant. Would need considerable input from Officers. Time restraints	Already underway to draft a framework policy for all Essex	Local variation / adaptation of Essex framework policy will be needed	Too early in process to consider
Training (for Officers/Members)	No	Yes – possible	Yes – possible. Investigate joint Officer or Member training	Yes – but would involve considerable Officer time. Developing area of work – national expertise would be valuable	Possible – need to assess what is successful elsewhere
Resources including IT. Accommodation staffing	Only by outsourcing complete service delivery	IT – yes, software data management transfer etc. Management of personal licence. High costs likely. Accommodation – high	Not practical	IT software – not possible to develop in-house economically. Staffing – yes. Accommodation – yes	Best practice not yet identified

TOPIC	PULL OUT OF DELIVERY ALTOGETHER	TEST IN THE EXTERNAL MARKET, WITH OR WITHOUT AN IN-HOUSE BID	PARTNERSHIP, BOTH FORMAL (CONSORTIUM OR TRUST) AND INFORMAL 'JOINT WORKING'	CORE PROVISION IN-HOUSE WITH TOP-UP PROVIDED EXTERNALLY	RESTRUCTURE TO MATCH THE BEST (IE BENCHMARKING TO IDENTIFY THE BEST AND THEN RESTRUCTURE TO ACHIEVE THAT BEST)
		cost. Staffing – could use contract staff – depends on availability of skilled personnel. Transfer of local knowledge difficult			
Procedures	No	Not applicable	Yes – some procedure development already underway	Yes	Best practice not yet identified
Members	No, but level of delegation from Members can be varied	Not applicable	Not lawful	Has to be elected Members of the Authority	Best practice may indicate a full Committee meeting on every occasion. But, may be in conflict with efficiency of operation
Offences	No	External specialist legal services could be employed. Contract enforcement and inspection staff could be used	Yes – with Police, Fire Authority and other local authorities	Yes	Best practice not yet identified
Whole Service provision	No – Members have to be involved	Cannot outsource the Member involvement. All other aspects might theoretically be outsourced. Would require a complex	Possible. Could have a lead authority or form a consortium arrangement. Short timescale for implementation. Costs	Yes. But no known market providers at present for most aspects of the service. Unlikely to be spare capacity within other	Best practice not yet identified

TOPIC	PULL OUT OF DELIVERY ALTOGETHER	TEST IN THE EXTERNAL MARKET, WITH OR WITHOUT AN IN-HOUSE BID	PARTNERSHIP, BOTH FORMAL (CONSORTIUM OR TRUST) AND INFORMAL 'JOINT WORKING'	CORE PROVISION IN-HOUSE WITH TOP-UP PROVIDED EXTERNALLY	RESTRUCTURE TO MATCH THE BEST (IE BENCHMARKING TO IDENTIFY THE BEST AND THEN RESTRUCTURE TO ACHIEVE THAT BEST
		<p>combination of knowledge and skills. No known market providers at present. Costs likely to substantially exceed licence fee income. Extent of duties and responsibilities not yet fully established. Short timescale for implementation likely to make this option very difficult</p>	<p>unknown. Local control / accountability likely to be a key issue. Previous partnership arrangements for service provision have been stopped</p>	<p>local authorities to assist for some time. Need to consider in-house transfers/ secondments particularly in early phases of new regime</p>	