

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT
TASKFORCE**

**REPORT OF THE SHARED
SERVICES SUB-GROUP**

30 JUNE 2006

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Our Approach

1. As a sub-group of the Local Government Taskforce, our approach to the brief before us was to:
 - i. consider and agree our Terms of Reference;
 - ii. define what we mean by shared services in their widest form;
 - iii. consider suggested principles that might underlie the choice, governance and delivery of shared services within local government;
 - iv. consider existing services within local government that are delivered on a shared or group basis and suggest possible options for the future delivery of those services ensuring best value services for the citizen;
 - v. consider a number of key services transferring to local government as a result of Review of Public Administration decisions and, in relation to those services, whether they might be delivered on a regional or shared basis, in whole or in part so as to ensure best value services for the citizen;
 - vi. ensure that shared service arrangements reflect appropriate governance and funding arrangements;
 - vii. consider how a shared service agenda for the future might be developed, in relation to the period between now and new Councils coming into existence in 2009, and in the period beyond 2009, bearing in mind the right of the new Councils to determine how best to deliver services.

2. This report marks the end of the initial phase of work of developing a shared services agenda for the future. It identifies the primary and subordinate legislative changes required to give effect to shared or regional services and also sets out a wide range of issues to be

considered in developing and delivering a shared services strategy in the run-up to the creation of new Councils in 2009 and beyond.

3. In submitting this report to the Local Government Taskforce Working Group and Political Panel for consideration we are conscious that much work remains to develop and implement a shared services strategy. We are also conscious of the developing knowledge and understanding of shared service issues within the sub-group, and suggest that the Taskforce may wish to consider drawing on that knowledge base in taking forward the development and implementation of a shared service strategy.

Our Recommendations

4. Our recommendations fall into two categories. The first category is those recommendations that will require legislative change or provision to give enabling effect to the recommendation. The second is those recommendations which can be taken forward as part of the development of a shared service strategy for the future.

Recommendations that Require Legislative Change

Building Control

There should be no need for a Building Control Group system when the new Councils are created in 2009 and that change to Building Control subordinate legislation is required to abolish the group system and empower the new Councils.

Environmental Health

There should be no need for a Group Environmental Health system when the new Councils are created in 2009. This will require subordinate legislative change.

Waste Management

Given the parallel work of the Waste Infrastructure Taskforce, we do not feel that it would be appropriate for this sub-group to recommend a way forward. However, given the accelerated timetable for the primary legislation necessary to give effect to the Review of Public Administration, and the need to develop policy over the summer to enable instructions to be put to Legislative Counsel in September, we do recommend that the Department should develop, on a without prejudice basis, legislative proposals to give effect to the fourth of the options set out at paragraph 25, ie the creation of a new statutory waste disposal authority within local government, and that it should work closely with local government in doing so. The outcome of the number of operational units is not presumed.

Fire and Rescue Service

There should be no disruption to the capacity of the Fire and Rescue Service to deliver what is universally accepted as an excellent regional service and that it should continue as a unitary body serving the whole of Northern Ireland and delivered on a mandatory regional basis across the new Councils.

Each of the new Councils should be represented on the Fire and Rescue Service Board. Elected members should hold the majority on the Board. However, in addition to representation from the new Councils, a number of independent members should also be appointed to the Board to bring other specific expertise to the management of the Fire and Rescue Service. This recommendation will require legislative change.

As a regional service delivered within local government, the funding mechanism for the Fire and Rescue Service will require careful consideration and explicit political agreement to ensure that it does not create an additional burden on the ratepayer on transfer to local government, and to ensure that the burden of funding is spread equitably across the new Councils. This recommendation may require specific legislative provision.

Shared Service Enabling Powers

We recommend that a wide approach should be taken to this to allow options to be kept open. The range of powers available to Councils in both Scotland and England should be granted to enable a more creative, empowered environment for Northern Ireland Councils to work within to deliver effective and customer-focused services¹, and legislation needs to continue to allow the sharing of information. It will, of course, be for individual Councils to determine whether and when to use those powers.

¹ TUS registered objection to the extension of powers to enter into PPP/PFI contracts.

Recommendations that can be taken forward as part of the Development of a Shared Service Strategy for the Future

Building Control

A case for sharing professional building control staff across individual Councils is not proven, although further consideration should be given as to how the delivery of building control services might be co-ordinated across the new Councils from 2009, perhaps by way of a regional building control committee. This is unlikely, however, to require specific new primary legislation.

Environmental Health

The case needs to be examined for sharing a small group of professional environmental health staff across individual Councils, although further consideration is required as to how this should be given effect. No option is seen as requiring any specific primary legislation.

Corporate Support Services

In the longer term, each new Council will warrant its own legal and other corporate services capacity but some aspects of many services could attract economies of scale and more effective service delivery through co-operation and the exploitation of common infrastructure services.

There is a case, for example, for sharing legal and other corporate support services across groups of Councils during the shadow period and, possibly, after the creation of new Councils, although further consideration as to how this might be given effect is required in developing a shared services agenda for the future. No new legislation is likely to be required to give effect to these recommendations.

Planning Service

Planning functions should be provided on a Council basis. However, there is a case for certain small specialist functions to be provided on a shared basis within local government, for reasons of work volume, scarce expertise, and accountability. These include the property certificate service and a small number of specialist professional teams, such as landscape advice and the processing of specialist waste and mineral applications (although it should be noted that the decision in respect of these specialist applications will remain with the individual Council). We recognise that this may produce some diseconomies, in that similar but separate specialist resources and expertise will also be required within the central government planning function.

Consideration needs to be given to the planning back-office IT systems. Ideally these should be provided as a single seamless system across local government and central government, but the case

for continuing with a single IT system, under local government management, should be considered.

The precise mechanisms for sharing, including the governance and funding arrangements for sharing planning services, should be considered carefully in planning for implementation. New legislation is unlikely to be required to enable such sharing.

Roads

The administration and delivery of roads, other than motorways and trunk roads, should be carried out by individual Councils for their own area. However, the provision of specialist advice and functions, either within local government or on a shared basis with central government, should be actively explored for the following functions: specialist Engineering Consultancy Services; Traffic Information and Control Centre - provision for motorway and urban traffic control services; Parking Enforcement Unit - responsible for enforcing parking regulations; and Blue Badge Unit - responsible for issuing blue (disabled parking) badges.

The precise mechanisms for sharing, including the governance and funding arrangements, should be considered carefully in planning for implementation. New legislation is unlikely to be required to enable such sharing.

TERMS OF REFERENCE, MEMBERSHIP AND APPROACH OF THE SUB-GROUP

5. Our Terms of Reference were discussed and agreed at the first meeting of the sub-group. They are reproduced at Annex A.
6. The membership of the sub-group was drawn from the five main political parties, the Northern Ireland Local Government Association, a range of local government officers and civil servants from relevant functions and organisations, and representatives of a number of social partner groups. A list of the members of the sub-group is attached at Annex B.
7. We met in plenary session four times, including one away-day. In addition, the chair, secretariat, IDeA peers and elected members met twice. All of the papers produced for and considered by the sub-group have been placed with the minutes of sub-group meetings on the DOE website.
8. Our approach to the brief before us was to:
 - i. consider and agree our Terms of Reference;
 - ii. define what we mean by shared services in their widest form;
 - iii. consider suggested principles that might underlie the choice, governance and delivery of shared services within local government;
 - iv. consider existing services within local government that are delivered on a shared or group basis and suggest possible options for the future delivery of those services ensuring best value services for the citizen;
 - v. consider a number of key services transferring to local government as a result of Review of Public Administration decisions and, in relation to those services, whether they might

be delivered on a regional or shared basis, in whole or in part so as to ensure best value services for the citizen;

- vi. ensure that shared service arrangements reflect appropriate governance and funding arrangements;
 - vii. consider how a shared service agenda for the future might be developed, in relation to the period between now and new Councils coming into existence in 2009, and in the period beyond 2009, bearing in mind the right of the new Councils to determine how best to deliver services.
9. This report marks the end of the initial phase of work of developing a shared services agenda for the future. It identifies the primary and subordinate legislative changes required to give effect to shared or regional services and sets out a wide range of issues to be considered in developing and delivering a shared services strategy in the run-up to the creation of new Councils in 2009 and beyond.
10. In submitting this report to the Local Government Taskforce Working Group and Political Panel for consideration we are conscious that much work remains to develop and implement a shared services strategy. We are also conscious of the developing knowledge and understanding of shared service issues within the sub-group, and suggest that the Taskforce may wish to consider drawing on that knowledge base in taking forward the development and implementation of a shared service strategy.

SUGGESTED PRINCIPLES THAT MIGHT UNDERPIN THE CHOICE, GOVERNANCE AND DELIVERY OF SHARED SERVICES

11. Shared services are not new, either within local government, the wider public sector or the private sector. Indeed, within local government in Northern Ireland there are already examples of services being delivered on a group or shared basis, such as waste management, environmental health, some legal and other corporate support services,

the Local Government Staff Commission, the Local Government Training Group and building control.

12. Recently, governments in other jurisdictions have encouraged the development of shared services within the public sector because they offer a way of delivering more efficient and customer focused support services and, in some cases, front line “customer facing” services.
13. The most common areas for developing a shared service approach elsewhere within the public sector include HR and payroll, finance, ICT, legal services, facilities and estates management and areas of specialist expertise. Shared services can be delivered directly by participating organisations or by a commercial company, depending on the shared service model selected. Developing a shared service approach offers not only the potential for financial savings, which can be redeployed by local government to front line services or used to limit rate increases, but also the non-financial benefits, including quality of service improvements. Indeed, evidence from other jurisdictions suggests that if organisations focus solely on costs savings, they are likely to miss the chance to improve service outputs.
14. Recently, local authorities in England, Scotland and Wales have become familiar with the idea of forming partnerships to deliver joined-up services to customers. Similarly, many public sector organisations have a relatively long history of working together for mutual benefit in some areas. Shared services takes this one step further by looking to consolidate corporate, administrative or transactional services, such as:
 - HR and payroll
 - finance
 - ICT
 - legal services
 - facilities management
 - benefits administration

15. All the evidence we have seen from the development of shared service models in other jurisdictions suggests that there is much hard work involved in managing the change, but that if the right principles are adopted at the outset in relation to the choice, governance and delivery of shared services, and important consequential decisions weighed carefully, then a move towards shared services may be worth the effort. There have been examples of unsuccessful shared services, and it will be important to learn the lessons from those examples. More work through the autumn is needed on this. The evidence also suggests that a significant financial investment is required at the outset and that it may then be two to three years before any financial savings are realised. More work through the autumn is required to examine funding options.
- 16 We considered the principles that might underpin the choice, governance and delivery of shared services within and beyond local government in Northern Ireland. We did not however have sufficient time to address these principles in any real depth and we put forward the principles below as examples of the type of principles that might be considered in Northern Ireland. We recognise that further substantial work on these is required, and we address this issue in the final section of this report.

PRINCIPLES THAT MIGHT UNDERLIE THE CHOICE, DELIVERY AND GOVERNANCE OF SHARED SERVICES IN NORTHERN IRELAND

These principles have been drafted in the spirit of the European Charter of Local Self Government and in the context of the Review of Public Administration and local government modernisation agenda which have the overarching principle of local government empowerment at their core.

1. Decisions to share must be for each local authority to make.
2. In any move to establish a shared service arrangement, S75 equality obligations and Government's New Targeting Social Need policy must be central to the process.

3. There should be no existing pre-determined or preferred operating models for shared or regional services and a range of delivery models should be considered. The aim should be to achieve value for money and an improved service for the citizen.
4. Each service identified should be looked at on its own merits to determine the type and structure of any shared service arrangement.
5. Pilot arrangements should be considered where appropriate, and an exit facility built into the process allowing a local authority to detach itself from the shared service arrangement.
6. As shared or regional services should play a role in improving the efficiency and effectiveness of public services, benefits must be illustrated in terms of costs and quality of services provided.
7. The opportunities for efficiency savings and service improvements to be gained through the adoption of shared or regional services initiatives should be clearly identified and realised, thus freeing resources for other front line services.
8. Services should be user focused and organised around users and citizen needs and aspirations. They will need to be considered in the context of community planning.
9. Proposed shared services initiatives should be selected on the basis of a business case outlining accurate costs and benefits and identifying the level of efficiency savings and other benefits that the project will deliver to local authorities.
10. Local authorities should ensure that full consultation with key stakeholders takes place.
11. Local authorities will be required to negotiate/consult with TUS and as necessary the Local Government Staff Commission on all staffing issues related to proposals for shared service delivery. In doing so, local authorities will need to ensure that they comply fully with all statutory employment protection regulations.
12. Opportunities to build on existing investments, and capacity technology and skills should be considered as part of the business case options appraisal process where these are suitable for expansion to a wider range of users.
13. In any move to a shared services centre, location decisions should be determined openly with no unnecessary concentration in any one area, with Section 75 equality obligations in mind and in line with the Regional Development Strategy.
14. Effective governance arrangements must be in place providing local authorities which participate in a shared service arrangement with a clearly defined role in the specification and development of the services provided.

15. Open and transparent communications with staff must be in place throughout the development and implementation of any shared services initiative.

CURRENT SHARED OR GROUP SERVICES WITHIN LOCAL GOVERNMENT

17. There are a number of services within local government which are already delivered on a shared or group basis within local government. These include building control, environmental health, legal services and waste management, the Local Government Staff Commission and the Local Government Training Group. We considered how these services are delivered at the moment and possible models for future service delivery, including whether elements of the service delivery model might be delivered on a shared basis and, if so, how.

Building Control

18. We considered whether:
- i. a variation of the Group system would still be required when new Councils are created in 2009;
 - ii. there will be a need for a regional building control committee.
19. Our conclusions were that:
- i. **there should be no need for a Building Control Group system when the new Councils are created in 2009 and that change to Building Control governing legislation is required to abolish the group system and empower the new Councils;**
 - ii. **a case for sharing professional building control staff across individual Councils is not proven, although further consideration should be given as to how the delivery of building control services might be co-ordinated across the new Councils from 2009, perhaps by way of a regional**

building control committee. This is unlikely, however, to require specific new primary legislation.

Environmental Health

20. We considered whether:

- i. a variation of the Group system would still be required when new Councils are created in 2009;
- ii. there will be a need for a regional group of professional staff, either within local or central government, to provide specialist support, communication and cohesion across the environmental health function.

21. Our conclusions were that:

- i. there should be no need for a Group Environmental Health system when the new Councils are created in 2009. This will require subordinate legislative change;**
- ii. the case needs to be examined for sharing a small group of professional environmental health staff across individual Councils, although further consideration is required as to how this should be given effect. No option is seen as requiring any specific primary legislation.**

Corporate Support Services

22. We considered whether:
- i. individual Councils should establish their own corporate support services departments;
 - ii. there was a case for corporate support services to be shared across Councils.
23. Our conclusions were that:
- i. in the longer term, each new Council will warrant its own legal and other corporate services capacity but some aspects of many services could attract economies of scale and more effective service delivery through co-operation and the exploitation of common infrastructure services.**
 - ii. there is a case, for example, for sharing legal and other corporate support services across groups of Councils during the shadow period and, possibly, after the creation of new Councils, although further consideration as to how this might be given effect is required in developing a shared services agenda for the future. No new legislation is likely to be required to give effect to these recommendations.**

Waste Management

24. On waste management we were conscious that we were not starting with a clean sheet, and that considerable thought was already being given to how the waste management functions of Councils might be delivered in future, both in terms of developing Northern Ireland Waste

Management Strategy² and in terms of the continuing work of the Waste Infrastructure Taskforce, which is due to report to the Minister in August 2006.

25. At present, Councils have responsibility for collection and disposal of waste. However, the 26 Councils have formed 3 Waste Management Groups, which are responsible for the preparation of Waste Management Plans and, to varying degrees, for procuring waste infrastructure. These groups, each of which is already delivering a shared service, have been formed within existing legislative provisions.

26. We note what the new Waste Management Strategy, *Towards Resource Management*, says in relation to the development of a single waste disposal authority for Northern Ireland:

“The Department will move to establish a single regional waste disposal authority, drawing on the work of the Waste Infrastructure Taskforce, within the context of, and in parallel with, the implementation of the Review of Public Administration. The Department envisages that a new regional authority will be put in place at the same time as new arrangements for local government, ie 2009.”

27. We also note that the Waste Infrastructure Taskforce is considering how a single waste disposal authority might be constituted as an entity within local government, consistent with the spirit of the Review of Public Administration, and that it is consulting on proposals within local government at present with a view to reporting to the Minister in August 2006.

28. We do not wish to pre-empt the report of the Waste Infrastructure Taskforce, but we have considered a number of options for giving

² *Towards Resource Management: The Northern Ireland Waste Management Strategy 2006 – 2020: March 2006*

effect to the creation of a single waste disposal authority within Northern Ireland, including:

- Joint Committee
- Joint Committee, incorporated (as arc21)
- Special Purpose Vehicle (eg company)
- Statutory Body within Local Government (cf Fire and Rescue) with clear separation of roles and responsibilities between single waste disposal authority and individual Councils.

29. We note that the first two options can be delivered within existing legislation and that the Department is in the process of bringing forward legislative proposals to enable the third option. However, new legislative provision would be required to enable the last of the options, if that option is recommended by the Waste Infrastructure Taskforce and accepted by the Minister.

30. **Given the parallel work of the Waste Infrastructure Taskforce, we do not feel that it would be appropriate for this sub-group to recommend a way forward. However, given the accelerated timetable for the primary legislation necessary to give effect to the Review of Public Administration, and the need to develop policy over the summer to enable instructions to be put to Legislative Counsel in September, we do recommend that the Department should develop, on a without prejudice basis, legislative proposals to give effect to the fourth of the options set out at paragraph 28, ie the creation of a new statutory waste disposal authority within local government, and that it should work closely with local government in doing so. The outcome of the number of operational units is not presumed.**

KEY SERVICES TRANSFERRING TO LOCAL GOVERNMENT AS A RESULT OF THE REVIEW OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION DECISIONS

31. Following the Secretary of State's announcements in November 2005 and March 2006, Councils will have responsibility for a wider range of functions. We considered the key transferring functions such as the Fire and Rescue Service, Planning and Roads Service – how these functions are currently delivered, potential models for future service delivery, including whether elements of the service delivery model might be delivered on a shared basis and, if so, how.

Fire & Rescue Service

32. We considered whether:

- i. the Fire and Rescue Service's delivery arm should continue to be a single body serving the whole of Northern Ireland as a regional service within local government, what the consequences of such an arrangement might be for governance and funding arrangements; and
- ii. responsibility for the provision of Fire and Rescue services should be devolved to the individual new Councils and whether this should be within a shared service body controlled by the new Councils.

33. Our conclusions were that:

- i. **there should be no disruption to the capacity of the Fire and Rescue Service to deliver what is accepted as an excellent regional service and that it should continue as a unitary body serving the whole of Northern Ireland and delivered on a mandatory regional basis across the new Councils.**

- ii. **each of the new Councils should be represented on the Fire and Rescue Service Board. Elected members should hold the majority on the Board. However, in addition to representation from the new Councils, a number of independent members should also be appointed to the Board to bring other specific expertise to the management of the Fire and Rescue Service. This recommendation will require legislative change.**

- iii. **as a regional service delivered within local government, the funding mechanism for the Fire and Rescue Service will require careful consideration and explicit political agreement to ensure that it does not create an additional burden on the ratepayer on transfer to local government, and to ensure that the burden of funding is spread equitably across the new Councils. This recommendation may require specific legislative provision.**

Planning Service

- 34. We considered whether:
 - i. All Council planning functions should be delivered through a single shared service, rather than each Council managing its own planning resources.
 - ii. The majority of planning resources should be devolved to individual Councils to manage.
 - iii. Whether there was a case for specific specialist planning functions to be delivered on a shared basis across all Councils or, in some cases, with central government.

- 35. Our conclusions were that:

- i. planning functions should be provided on a Council basis. However, there is a case for certain small specialist functions to be provided on a shared basis within local government, for reasons of work volume, scarce expertise, and accountability. These include the property certificate service and a small number of specialist professional teams, such as landscape advice and the processing of specialist waste and mineral applications (although it should be noted that the decision in respect of these specialist applications will remain with the individual Council). We recognise that this may produce some diseconomies, in that similar but separate specialist resources and expertise will also be required within the central government planning function.**
- ii. consideration needs to be given to the planning back-office IT systems. Ideally these should be provided as a single seamless system across local government and central government, but the case for continuing with a single IT system, under local government management, should be considered.**
- iii. the precise mechanisms for sharing, including the governance and funding arrangements for sharing planning services, should be considered carefully in planning for implementation. New legislation is unlikely to be required to enable such sharing.**

Roads

36 We considered whether:

- i. each new Council should be responsible for the future administration and delivery of all roads services (other than motorways and trunk roads) in its area.**

- ii. specific specialist functions could be delivered through a shared services arrangement with the remainder of services relating to roads other than motorways and trunk roads being delivered by individual Councils.

37. Our conclusions were that:

- i. **the administration and delivery of roads, other than motorways and trunk roads, should be carried out by individual Councils for their own area. However, the provision of specialist advice and functions should be actively explored for the following functions:**

- **Specialist Engineering Consultancy Services;**
- **Traffic Information and Control Centre - provision for motorway and urban traffic control services;**
- **Parking Enforcement Unit - responsible for enforcing parking regulations; and**
- **Blue Badge Unit - responsible for issuing blue (disabled parking) badges.**

- ii. **the precise mechanisms for sharing, including the governance and funding arrangements, should be considered carefully in planning for implementation. New legislation is unlikely to be required to enable such sharing.**

A SHARED SERVICE STRATEGY FOR THE FUTURE

Enabling Powers Available to Councils in Northern Ireland

38. We compared the range of powers available to Councils at present in Northern Ireland to enter into shared or joint service arrangements,

noting that the powers available to Councils in Scotland and England were wider.

39. **We recommend that a wide approach should be taken to this to allow options to be kept open. The range of powers available to Councils in both Scotland and England should be granted to enable a more creative, empowered environment for Northern Ireland Councils to work within to deliver effective and customer-focused services³, and legislation needs to continue to allow the sharing of information. It will, of course, be for individual Councils to determine whether and when to use those powers.**

DEVELOPING A STRATEGY TO 2009 AND BEYOND

40. This draft programme sets out a framework for exploring how to develop and deliver a shared services strategy to 2009 and beyond. It does not presume a particular governance model for this work, but suggests the range of issues that might be considered in developing a shared services strategy and then puts forward an illustrative timeline for delivering the strategy.

Forward Programme of Work

41. We suggest that the sub-group, in its present form or with some changes, reflecting the availability and expertise of individuals, and consistent with the implementation arrangements that emerge from discussions over the summer within the Taskforce Political Panel and Working Group, should be reconvened as a Working Group in Autumn 2006 to carry out a preliminary programme of further work. Within this, smaller groups may need to be set briefs to investigate

³ TUS registered objection to the extension of powers to enter into PPP/PFI contracts.

specialist areas, co-opt where appropriate, and report back to the sub-group, having particular regard to:

- guiding principles
- 21st century fit for purpose services
- technology available
- finances
- democratic controls and involvement
- choice –v- value for money

Illustrative Timeline Subject to Further Discussion

July 2006	Report considered by Political Panel.
Aug/Sept 2006	Possible workshop by the 9 work streams to update others.
Sept 2006	Shared Services Working Group established
Oct 2006	Work programme and timeline agreed. Consider the range of issues flagged up in the preceding sections of this report, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Guiding principles• Governance and funding considerations• Experience in other sectors and jurisdictions/case studies• The case for central government pump priming of shared services initiatives• The potential for delivering of HR, ICT, facilities management and other corporate support functions on a shared basis
Nov 2006	Start programme of wider member empowerment. Obtain funding for small scale pathfinder projects and seek

	funding for interim work to March 2009.
Jan 2007	Start 2 pathfinder projects. Develop draft implementation plans for all shared services work programme areas.
Feb 2007	Briefings in each of the new Council areas.
March 2007	Consult existing Councils on emerging more detailed shared services proposals.
June 2007	Conclusion of consultation.
July 2007	Management structures are drawn up, Councils are invited to nominate as appropriate.
Sept 2007	Draw up the criteria required in individual Councils if making a business case to opt out.
Oct 2007	Start tendering process for any contracts, if needed.
Nov 2007	Continuing investigation of best practice for public sector shared services.
Feb 2008	Secondment of officers sought to interim posts.
July 2008	Quality standards for new services are specified together with performance management criteria.
Sept 2008	Substantive senior officer posts are advertised.
Oct 2008	Local Government elections.
Nov 2008	New Councils in shadow form adopt/renew commitment to shared services and nominate to governance bodies.
Dec 2008	Substantive officer appointments are made.
Jan 2009	Further appointments are made/secondments.
April 2009	New services go live plus continuing phased change.
May 2009	Continuous evaluation.

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT TASKFORCE
SHARED SERVICES SUB-GROUP**

TERMS OF REFERENCE

On 22 November 2005 the Secretary of State announced major changes to local government in Northern Ireland as part of the Review of Public Administration.

In consultation with the sector the Department has agreed to establish a Local Government Taskforce, to develop proposals for modern and effective local government. The Taskforce will engage politicians strategically through a **Political Panel** chaired by the Minister which along with a high level **Working Group** chaired by the DOE Permanent Secretary will provide oversight, cohesion and direction to the RPA process. A number of work streams will be taken forward through 9 sub-groups and many of the issues developed here will feed into the new legislation being developed for local government.

The Shared Services Sub-Group of the Local Government Taskforce is charged with bringing forward proposals for the delivery of a range of shared and regional services across local government, by:

- identifying the principles that might underlie the choice, governance and delivery of shared and regional services;
- identifying the range of services that might be delivered on a shared or regional basis;
- identify those services which might be delivered on a mandatory regional basis across all new Councils, as well as those services which can be delivered on a voluntary opt in/opt out basis;
- developing proposals for the governance arrangements in relation to shared or regional services delivery;

- developing legislative proposals to underpin/enable the delivery of shared or regional services;
- identifying good practice in shared and regional services delivery;
- identifying the potential for co-operation with other elements of the public sector in relation to the delivery of shared services;
- exploiting synergies between the work of the Shared Services Sub-Group and other Sub-Groups of the Local Government Taskforce;
- identifying, where appropriate, the respective roles and responsibilities of shared or regional services and individual Councils;
- developing a funding model for the delivery of shared or regional services;
- developing proposals for the implementation of shared or regional services model across local government;
- advising the Local Government Taskforce on issues in respect of shared services.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE SHARED SERVICES SUB-GROUP

NAME	ORGANISATION
Ian Maye, Sub-Group Chair	Local Government Reform Unit, DOE
Cllr Jim Wells, MLA	DUP
Cllr Seamus Shields	SDLP
Cllr Marion Smith	UUP
Cllr Lynn Fleming	Sinn Féin
Cllr Tom Ekin	Alliance
Moira McVeigh	NI Local Government Association
Roger Wilson	Armagh City & District Council
Canice O'Rourke	Down District Council
Morris Crum	Larne Borough Council
Sharon Logue	Newtownabbey Borough Council
Ciaran Quigley	Belfast City Council
Rose Crozier	Belfast City Council
Ellen Cavanagh	Derry City Council
Joan McCaffrey	Omagh District Council
Richard Cummins	IDeA Associate Consultant
Paul Bettison	IDeA National Peer
John Quinn	arc21
Tom McCabe	SOCPO
Graham Byrne	SWaMP
Eamon Molloy	NWRWVG

NAME	ORGANISATION
Bob Stronge	NICVA
Bumper Graham	ICTU
Philip Irwin	SIB
Colin Reid	IOD
Lorna Parsons	LGSC
Alistair Morgan	Group Chief Environmental Health Officer
Robert White	Chief Officers Building Control Group
Fergus Devitt	Department of Finance and Personnel
Ray Wright	Department of Finance and Personnel
Colin Cluney	Department of Finance and Personnel
Jim Wilkinson	Department of the Environment
Colin McMinn	DHSSPS
Jim Stewart	Local Government Division, DOE
Janet Cooper, Secretariat	Local Government Reform Unit, DOE
Greg Magee, Secretariat	Local Government Reform Unit, DOE