



**North Somerset Partnership
Executive Meeting
23 September 2009, 2pm-4pm**

Present:

Kay Wozniak (KW) Chair	Chief Superintendent Avon and Somerset Constabulary
Dr Paul Phillips (PP)	Principal, Weston College
Bob Snow (BS)	Chief Executive, Voluntary Action North Somerset
Andy Hicklin (AH)	Wessex Area Planning & Communications Manager, Environment Agency

Charles Walker (CW) Chairman, North Somerset Initiative

Apologies:

Clive Bodley (CB)	Chief Executive, NSHousing
Graham Turner (GT)	Chief Executive Officer, North Somerset Council
Chris Born (CBorn)	Chief Executive, NHS North Somerset

In attendance:

Dr Max Kammerling (MK)	Director of Public Health, NHS North Somerset (on behalf of Chris Born)
James Foster (JF)	Strategic Policy Development Manager, North Somerset Council
Stella Milsom (SM)	Locality Manager, GOSW
Emma Short (ES)	Policy & Research Development Officer, North Somerset Council
Lorraine Bush (LB)	Policy & Partnership Development Officer, North Somerset Council
Valerie Kelly (VK)	Policy & Partnership Officer, North Somerset Council

Item		Action by	Deadline
1.	Welcome & apologies KW noted the apologies and welcomed Sara Brown, Manager for the South Ward Neighbourhood Management Programme to the meeting.		
2.	Minutes/Matters arising from meeting held 12 August 2009 The previous minutes were agreed with one amendment – MK to be shown as in attendance. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governance Handbook – Executive members were given a copy of the finalised governance handbook and asked to sign the partnership agreement at the back and hand to VK. Handbooks will be sent out to remaining Board members. • ‘Working better together’ – A draft forward meeting plan had been circulated. This is an evolving document and members were asked to advise the P&P team of any additional agenda items in due course. • CAA – JF gave a verbal update. Further evidence in a number of areas had been requested by 25/9 by the Audit Commission: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Affordable Housing ○ Strategic Planning of Housing ○ Street Scene satisfaction of residents ○ Provision of Gypsy and Traveller sites A further update meeting will take place on 30 September. Currently North Somerset has no red flags and is in discussion on possible areas for green flags. Bristol, BANES & South Glos	<p>ALL VK</p> <p>ALL</p>	

	<p>are in a similar position. Final outcomes will be available on 27 November and findings made public on 10 December.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3rd Sector Commissioning Code of Practice VK gave a short update. Consultation on the Code began on 1 September, runs for 12 weeks and closes on 23 November. An initial meeting to discuss the Code with grant-funded organisations was held on 3 September. Further meetings will be held around the area. Phil Humphries will speak to the Voluntary Sector Forum about the Code at their next meeting, 30 November. • Executive members were reminded to forward details of any suitable distributions points for the SCS Summary. 	ALL	
3.	<p>Neighbourhood Management (NM) Succession Plan KW reminded members that, following SB's presentation at the last NSP Board meeting, the Board had asked the Executive to consider how the NSP could best support NM succession planning.</p> <p>PP declared his interest as Chair of the NM Board.</p> <p>SB circulated and spoke to a briefing paper (attached) outlining the key principles behind NM, the approach adopted in South Ward and key questions being asked of the NSP.</p> <p>Key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NM is a process that brings together the local community and local service providers at a neighbourhood level to tackle local problems and improve local services. • NM Board has recently had a facilitated session looking at local issues and future of the programme. It is clear that residents are committed to participation and are keen to maintain the dialogue established with agencies. • There is a level of expectation about continuation of the process. • NM funding has enabled a £2.1m capital programme that will end in 2010. • Investment has been in low maintenance projects that organisations have already agreed to take on at the end of the programme • The most significant effect of the programme has been bringing together local people, local agencies and local service delivery. Residents use their local knowledge and expertise to identify what is important locally. Joint Tasking between agencies and residents has enabled joint problem solving. Residents monitor delivery of contracts locally e.g. ensuring potholes dealt with, rubbish collection satisfactory. • It is recognised that working alongside residents has enabled better service delivery but it is difficult to provide cost saving evidence. • Revenue projects – NM team is in negotiation with agencies as to how projects which residents particularly value e.g. community wardens, domestic violence project 		

could be continued. A youth project has secured funding to continue to 2011.

- The NM team act as an honest broker between residents and agencies but this will cease when the NM team finish in September 2010. Role also includes managing the programme, training and support for the Board and residents to enable full involvement.

SB asked the Executive to consider whether they wanted the model to continue and how the roles could be fulfilled. She also asked for a clear steer on what the NM team could do to support these considerations. Considerable discussion followed and the key points raised are shown below:

- Local ward councillors receive regular briefings, one is on the Board. Interaction is valued and the level of engagement considered the highest they have known.
- Would councillors be the natural successors to the honest broker role?
- The NM role is more than being an honest broker, would councillors would have the capacity to undertake the additional tasks?
- It is difficult to attribute improvements in South Ward directly to NM. There is a lot of other activity in South Ward e.g. Children's Centre, Healthy Living Centre, NSHousing work. NM has had a particular focus on the local environment and coordinating neighbourhood services. People generally appear to be more satisfied with the area e.g. with the cleanliness of the local area and less people consider crime to be increasing.
- NM is about tackling the impact of deprivation and improving quality of life for residents. It brings people together and enables them to better respond to their environment.
- Nationally it has been shown that initiatives that work best are usually those where agencies work with people rather than 'doing to'. It can often take up to ten years to be able to measure tangible differences.
- At a minimum what has already been achieved should be continued, there is always more that can be done.
- Building trust takes time and longer-term work would enable more complex issues to be tackled. Agencies need to commit to continuing to work in this way.
- All agencies are looking to connect better with communities. We need to build on what is already having an impact - it is about new ways of working, culture shift and developing trust between agencies, rather than spending more money.
- South and Central Ward have particular issues and the model may not work across all communities. One size does not fit all. What about rural communities?
- Engagement is more difficult in some areas.
- Joint planning has had an impact and this should continue. The model shouldn't just be for South Ward; it should be a blueprint

	<p>for working across other areas. Draw out what activity existing agencies can absorb and come back to Executive with what remains. It is also important to retain the expertise that has been gained by the team through development of the South Ward programme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not just about looking at benefits to the community, what are the benefits to organisations and the area? What savings might be available as a result of more effective, efficient planning of service delivery that could be used to roll the model out across area? • SM to provide examples of what Swindon & Wiltshire have done, models, evaluation and so on. • It is about education of communities, helping them to understand the needs of their community, how best to tackle issues and the role of NM as an honest broker. • From a council perspective there is evidence that the most dissatisfied, most difficult communities to engage are not necessarily the most deprived. NM working could be one tool used to tackle this. <p>The Executive agreed: To support the neighbourhood management model of transformation of services and community engagement, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintaining the established model of joint working/planning of services with local people and between agencies in South Ward • Identifying where possible the costs/benefits of the programme to people, organisations and place • Developing an understanding of the lessons learnt • Executive to identify a ‘champion’ to support the succession planning and notify SB within 10 days. • Terms of reference to be developed between the ‘champion’, Chair of the Executive and SB. • VK to circulate NM Board presentation to Bob and Stella 	<p>SM</p> <p>SB</p> <p>ALL</p> <p>KW/SB</p> <p>VK</p>	
<p>4.</p>	<p>Performance Reward Grant (PRG) & LAA Update As requested at the May 2009 Executive meeting ES brought a paper outlining a draft PRG bidding process and application form to the Executive for consideration.</p> <p>PRG of approximately £3.8m is expected and will be available in two instalments in the two financial years following the end of the 2007-10 LAA. Each will be 50% capital and 50% revenue. The first instalment payable by March 2011, the second during May 2011. Due to the closeness of the two payments it is suggested that only one bidding round takes place. Bids will have to satisfy the criteria outlined in the document including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrating it contributes to delivery of one of the priority areas identified • Demonstrating how activity will support delivery of the Shared Priorities and aims of the Sustainable Community Strategy 		

- Demonstrating sustainability of project or outcomes
- Development of an exit strategy
- Delivery of project within 3 years
- Bids may be for full or part costs of the project
- Interim and final reports will be required
- Payments will be phased through the project

This funding is not to be used as a substitute for reduced budgets; it is a one off payment for additional work.

The suggested process is:

Jan 2010	Executive identify priority work areas
April 2010	Delivery Partnerships (DPs) given bidding criteria and submit bids by August 2010
Sep/Oct 2010	Executive consider bids and forward recommendations to Board
Jan 2011	Board agree bids
Jun 2011	Funding released

Discussion followed and a number of points and questions were raised:

- A guidance document will accompany the application forms.
- Will DPs be expected to identify detailed proposals? E.g. identify contractors
- Will the exit strategy need to be part of the initial bid?

The application form is fairly straightforward. There is always the opportunity to request further information.

- The Partnership must be clear how it will evaluate whether the money has made any difference. How will the Partnership know success factors have been achieved?

The application form asks what are the key success factors and how the outcomes of the project will be measured. Bids will be submitted through DPs who will take a robust view on evaluation criteria before forwarding to the Executive. Success factors and measures will be agreed by the Executive and the applicants before any bid is agreed.

- What capacity is there to support evaluation of projects? The Executive previously agreed a guided bidding process. Considering headline projects would limit the number of projects and therefore limit evaluation capacity needed.
- Should there be a limit on the level of bids? Does the Executive wish to allocate a certain level of funding to each DP area? This is an opportunity to deliver a limited number of projects of substantial value. Projects should be evaluated on merit and funding considered on a project-by-project basis.
- What will the Partnership do if a project seems to be falling too far behind its planned outcomes or spending? The guidance document states that funding will be phased over the life of the project so it will be possible to delay or stop payments if circumstances dictate.
- The draft document states that the Executive will identify key

	<p>priorities for bids. What role do DPs have in this? KW - DPs should be engaged early in the process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will the process involve the community, what about Neighbourhood Management? There is an opportunity to impact and engage communities through both the main bidding process and through the community chest. • Applicants need to be able to demonstrate their ability to deliver what is promised, to have a good track record. • The process could enhance connectivity across DPs by identifying a joint project or the Executive combining bids where submitted separately, if appropriate. • The Partnership needs to manage expectations and outcomes. The process could be considered to be rewarding failure; which is disempowering to those who have achieved their targets. • It is an opportunity to look at the SCS and do what is not currently being done <p>Decision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That delivery partnerships be involved in setting priority work areas for bids • The extent of community involvement and engagement to be explicit in application • ES to amend PRG guidance and application form to take account of changes discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Inclusion of a request for exit strategy information in any bid ○ No maximum bid to be specified <p>Community Chest</p> <p>It has been suggested that a set sum of PRG (£250k), from the second payment, is set aside for a community chest. This would be more widely available and provide grants of up to £5,000 to community groups. The Community Chest would be available from January 2011 and funds paid out during the summer 2011.</p> <p>Decision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive agreed that bids up to 100% could be made and that funds allocated would be considered on a project-by-project basis. • ES to further develop the scheme and return to Executive in due course. <p>LAA</p> <p>ES updated the Executive on the latest results for two of the LAA stretch indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provisional GCSE results are above target and if confirmed will result in £679k PRG • The inactive benefit indicator has made progress and is currently on target to receive 100% of PRG, £379k. 	<p>ES</p> <p>ES</p>	
--	--	---------------------	--

5.	<p>Recession Action Plan</p> <p>1. Improving coordination and promoting support, advice and information services – Clive Bodley was unable to attend the meeting but had provided LB with a short update. He had hosted a meeting with colleagues to explore opportunities to better signpost services for individuals, communities and businesses. The group had agreed to bring together the work they are doing, to share information and look at how to improve provision of that information. They will be meeting again in December.</p> <p>JF had also been looking at the longer-term opportunities to promote services and information. NSC currently looking at how this can be done and it will be a focus of 2010 planning.</p> <p>2. Green Recovery – Chris Born’s paper will be considered by the Transport, Economy & Environment delivery partnership on 24 September. Further update to come to next Executive.</p> <p>3. NS VCS Emergency Recession Fund – BS advised the Executive that the Fund is now up and running and that there had been a number of enquiries and three applications. More applications are expected as the deadline (30 Sept) approaches.</p>	AH	
6.	<p>Stakeholder Event Update</p> <p>VK had circulated notes from the 24 September meeting between KW, Phil Hall (NSC), LB & VK. From the outcomes of that meeting LB & VK had developed what they felt was a workable format for the Event. There would be short presentations, possibly interactive using voting buttons, at the beginning followed by round robin workshops. There would be three workshops looking at issues under the shared priorities but within the delivery partnership framework.</p> <p>VK advised the Executive that the meeting of public sector finance directors to help identify key issues for consideration had not yet taken place.</p> <p>Executive members emphasised the need for the Event to be positive and looking at future opportunities.</p>		
7.	<p>Delivery Partnership Feedback</p> <p>KW offered Executive members, particularly those with close links to the delivery partnerships, the opportunity to feedback on how the new structures are working, and identify any barriers or new opportunities for their work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEE group would be looking at the Green Recovery paper to identify what they could deliver and how • HWB group has appreciated the broader remit and has been quite positive about the changes. • Important that there is good communication between delivery partnerships, Executive and Board. • Performance reporting will be useful. DP chairs on the Exec can be questioned on results and challenged to bring further information to future meetings. <p>LB briefly outlined the performance reporting process that had</p>		

	been developed with the performance officers and delivery partnership representatives. The first half yearly report will be brought to the Executive and circulated to delivery partnerships in December. The report will provide information on progress against the aims contained within the SCS. This information, alongside the LAA stretched target reporting, will provide a picture of progress and challenges overall.		
8.	AOB VK advised the Executive that the December meeting would be held on 22 December.		

Date of next meeting: 29 October, 2pm – 4pm – CSU Room, Town Hall

Draft