

**BSP Programme Board**  
**Action notes from the Wednesday 14 March 2007 meeting**

**Present:** David Cragg (LSC, Chair); Jon Bright (BCC, Vice-chair); ACC Anil Patani (WMP); Sophia Christie (PCT); Andrea Whitworth (for Philippa Holland GOWM); Les Lawrence (BCC); CSupt Paul Scarrott (WMP); Dr Naomi Rees (BSP Partnership Manager, notes); Richard Kenny (BSP Performance Manager); Elaine Elkington, (BCC); Joy Warmington (BRAP); Mashuq Ally (BCC); Jayne Bench (BCC) and Peter Woodall (BCC).

**Item 1, 2 and 3: Apologies, minutes and matters arising**

Apologies were received from Jerry Blackett, Brian Carr, Stephen Hughes, Paul Tilsley and Jason Lowther. The notes were agreed as accurate and outstanding matters were on the agenda.

CSupt Paul Scarrott was welcomed as a new member (he replaces Steve Jordan). One of Paul's roles will be to contribute to the community engagement service commissioning group. Jon Bright explained that the BSP needed to articulate what it is looking for fairly quickly. The group will scope what currently exists next to what is required so a route for development can be established.

**Item 4: Financial update**

Peter Woodall described the financial position since the last meeting. The ward spend had increased and he was confident that the target spend would be achieved. LPSA slippage was of less concern as it was a three year programme. Peter confirmed that the 'housing back-stop device' described at the last meeting would be 'used' essentially to move NRF and NE underspend in 2006/7 to be used in 2007/8. Sophia Christie expressed concern that any funding allocations needed to be subject, firstly, to the commitments laid out in the FTAPs. The chair confirmed that any underspent FTAP funds in 2006/7 would be secured and guaranteed for the FTAP in 2007/8, using the 'housing device'. The allocation of 2007/8 was a separate issue and would be discussed under the next agenda item.

**Item 5: Neighbourhood Renewal Fund**

There were three parts to this agenda item, the first two lead by Richard Kenny and the last by Jon Bright.

**i) Managing the final year of NRF 2007/8**

**ii) Options for 2007/8**

The chair summarised the position so far. BSP had formally confirmed as a minimum for 07/08 a budget equal to the 06-07 allocation for each of the Floor Target Action Plans. The remaining unallocated NRF for 07-08 should be the subject to a further review (now taking place). As the equivalent of the allocation not spent on the 06-07 FTAPs had already been committed to the 07-08 FTAP budget this left £3.2m unallocated.

Sophia Christie raised a serious concern about the health FTAP, as signed off with GOWM, as it was based on £3.7 million in 2006/7 and £6 million in 2007/8. The commissioning processes were underway and with only half of the funding expected the Programme Board would need to consider whether infant mortality is funded or life expectancy. Her understanding had been that the FTAP funding, as confirmed by

the contractual process with GOWM, took priority and any further allocation should be after the FTAP commitments. Sophia also said it had been difficult to follow the financial information placed before the PB as it was often piece-meal. Andrea Whitworth confirmed that while GOWM agreed the FTAPs it was because the plan was judged to be the best to deliver, the financial information was only taken as an indication and up to the partner/partnership to organise funding.

Returning to the paper about managing the final NRF year the group agreed a number of points;

- Para 6 should start 'in recognition this is the final year, the BSP through the accountable body....Para 12 should also include partners commissioners within the group that need to be aware of funding changes that could impact on a local area or ethnic group.
- To 'balance' the suggested power (paragraph 10) vested in the BSP chair (Paul Tilsley) and BCC accountable officer (Jon Bright), in this final NRF year, the group agreed that a third non-council person be included. The suggestion that this be the PB chair (David Cragg) was agreed.
- The decision-making role of the PB is consistent with the paper; such matters will come before the PB for validation and ratification.
- The process of reviewing service plans and projects to determine how to mainstream (funding or practice) should be happening already and some partnerships were actively remodelling around LAA commitments.
- The transformational value of the NRF programme is important as it may help show where to stop doing things as well as how to improve service and development.

Richard Kenny took the group through the proposed rationale process for allocating the £3.2 million NRF. The proposal was to fund work that gave the best return on investment and addressed underperforming areas. The reputation risk to the partnership with regards to the LAA was high if performance did not improve. He suggested that the LPSA reward grant (likely to be between £15-20 million) should be reinvested. He had constructed his proposal by considering the seriousness of the issue and what would give a viable reward.

The group asked whether the Council had a position on the suggestion to reinvest the LPSA as there had not been a universal correlation between amount of work carried out by a non-council partner and proportion of reward grant then received/shared. Peter Woodall said the City's intent had not been articulated so far.

The chair stated that GOWM had now acknowledged that the worklessness mandatory target was challenging and unachievable across all the West Midlands local authorities. The city/region joint investment plan would bring an additional £7 million to commit to the worklessness agenda. The Neighbourhood Action plans would help determine how to utilise this fund within Birmingham. In addition to this the NEET program would gain an extra £3 million. This meant that £1 million under the worklessness and the £160K under the NEET proposal could be allocated to other areas.

Sophia Christie said she couldn't support any of the allocation proposals on principle. The HCOP had signed off work to start in April and there was a £3 million short-fall in the health FTAP. Elaine highlighted there was a £2 million short-fall between the housing FTAP and the amount of NRF allocated. Anil Patani made the point that it is also important to sustain performance and the additional £250K committed by the PB

at the last meeting had been critical to focussing on robbery and public place wounding, two areas of increasing concern.

In recapping the discussion the chair stated that the FTAPs were unique as they signalled a contractual commitment over 2 years and had been conditional on the 10% NRF withdrawal being returned. As a principle they had 1<sup>st</sup> priority. He asked that Jon Bright explore the 'art of the possible' outside the meeting, to develop the best financial package for the FTAPs, given the constraints. Jon was asked to consider the infrastructure (including exit strategies for ward support officers), innovation and the contributions the wards might make to deliver the FTAPs. Jon Bright also offered to think on how the supporting information can be better expressed.

**Action:** Jon Bright to conduct a series of bilateral meetings to determine a financial package that takes into account the health and housing FTAP requirements.

### **iii) Targeting the local element of NRF 2007/8**

Jon Bright had been requested at the last meeting to report back on the scope for an independent review of the ward-based NRF projects. The paper gave a historical perspective and this led to two main conclusions; firstly that the individual ward projects were probably sound (the concern was about collective strategic impact) and secondly while the priority statements showed some signs of influencing investment/expenditure and outcomes, this had happened fairly late in the day. Jon Bright suggested that both theme and ward aspects of the NRF program be evaluated.

Sophia Christie suggested that as the partners share the same auditors it may be useful to buy some of their time to get a collective evaluation. Joy Warmington felt it was important that the evaluation was independent.

**Action:** Jon Bright to further develop the evaluation process and notify the PB in due course.

### **Item 6: LAA Roadshow on 20 March 2007**

This was for information only. Richard Kenny and Paul Hanna were planning on attending. Anil Patani offered to send a further person and Sophia Christie said the invitation had been sent to HCOP colleagues.

### **Item 7: CPA Feedback – partnership working**

Jon Bright referred to the recent CPA and highlighted a number of areas that the CPA felt further improvement was required, particularly around partnership working. The Council's improvement plan would cover;

- 1) Developing a clearer, more quantified and more challenging long term vision for the city which is fully shared by partners
- 2) Developing a clearer focus on outcomes and more comprehensive and effective supporting strategies
- 3) Further developing and strengthening our approach to equalities and diversity, including community engagement, cohesion and the Council's direct responsibilities
- 4) Understanding and responding to the views of some partners who have a negative view of their partnership with the Council

- 5) Ensuring a robust assessment of current relative performance and what is required to achieve our goal of excellence in all our services.

Les Lawrence noted that the JAR had concluded that partnership working was good.

#### **Item 8: LAA/LSP Regional support programme**

Richard Kenny asked the PB for a view about the level of interest and participation. There were a number of useful discussions/learning set to get involved in and scope for bringing forward improvement projects. However a great deal of time investment was required to 'pick up' the maximum value of £40K.

Andrea Whitworth clarified that this work programme was not lead by GOWM and noted that others had reflected similar thoughts as Richard on its value-for-time. However she said there was an opportunity to shape the programme with the LGA. The chair reflected that the program was too generic and a more specific program might be more useful to the partnership. The group agreed that a decision could be made after the 21<sup>st</sup> March event.

**Action:** Richard Kenny to attend the 21<sup>st</sup> March workshop and then make a judgement on the extent of the partnerships role.

#### **Item 9: Equality and diversity – What next?**

This was held over to the next meeting. Joy Warmington also referred to employer/employee guidance notes that Brap had produced and the group agreed to consider these, alongside the equality and diversity paper, at the next meeting.

**Action:** Mashuq Ally to present at the April meeting.

#### **Item 10: Budget requests, i) LAA survey, ii) Alcohol strategy**

This was held over to the next meeting and should be seen alongside the budgeting work described earlier.

**Action:** Dr Naomi Rees to schedule in this topic at the next appropriate meeting.

#### **Next meeting**

Thursday 12<sup>th</sup> April, 8:30-10am at BCC Council House, Committee Room 1