

**BSP Programme Board**  
**Action notes from the Thursday 13 February 2007 meeting**

**Present:** David Cragg (LSC, Chair for first half of the meeting); Jon Bright (BCC, Chair for the second half of the meeting); Anil Patani (WMP); Sophia Christie (PCT); Philippa Holland (GOWM); Jerry Blackett (Chamber of Commerce); Les Lawrence (BCC); Kevin Hubery (for item 8); Steve Jordan (WMP); Brian Carr (BVSC); Jagwant Johal (for item 9); Dr Naomi Rees (BSP Partnership Manager, notes); Richard Kenny (BSP Performance Manager); Louise Collett (for Elaine Elkington, BCC); Joy Warmington (BRAP) and Jayne Bench (for Peter Woodall, BCC).

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

Apologies were received from Stephen Hughes and Jason Lowther. The notes were agreed as accurate. A few additional points were made to update the group since the last meeting, the two issues leading to actions are described below.

- Philippa Holland said that DCLG/GOWM was currently involved in establishing the national outcome/indicator set as outlined in the White Paper. She said this would be available in June/July and would be influenced by the CSR, Departmental Strategic Objectives and PSAs. Once the technical piece of work was complete, particularly around determining what data was available, they would be in touch with LSPs. The PB volunteered to assist in the process, utilising its LAA experience, ahead of the guidance.
- Richard Kenny told the group that the first meeting of the WMRA capacity programme had been cancelled and he would send out a reminder note for the meeting scheduled for 23<sup>rd</sup> February. Anil Patani offered to help Richard develop a protocol, template and ToR for the BSPs' involvement.

**Action:** Philippa to consider how best to utilise the PB expertise in developing the national outcome/indicator set. Anil Patani and Richard Kenny to report back to the PB on the BSPs' involvement in the WMRA's capacity programme.

**Item 4: Budgets and underspend in 2006/7**

Jayne Bench explained that there was a 'real' underspend in 2006/7 of £946K but over £2 million worth of bids seeking funding. In addition to this there was the need to 'rephrase' over the financial years, due to late starting FTAPs and ward underspends. The technical device that was suggested involved buying more of the decent homes programme in 2006/7 and returning the funds in 2007/8.

Philippa asked for reassurances that the device suggested isn't the 4<sup>th</sup> option by another name. The group also asked for reassurances that the funds are returned in 2007/8. Others felt this adjustment was simply a delaying tactic and there was an urgent need for financial management to improve in 2007/8. After some discussion the group agreed that all the bids put forward should be funded (see table 1). The £1.2 million transferred from the FTAPs would be reallocated to the FTAPs in 2007-08 with the funding taken from the £5.43 not yet allocated in 07-08.

A number of other points were made;

- The group expressed disappointment, given the planning process and the oversight role of Constituency Strategic Partnership (CSP), that the ward spend was so low again (the actual month 9 spend was £7.85 million against

an allocation of £17.3 million). This amount of NRF allocation was felt to be a political decision rather than a rationale, evidence-based judgement. The group also questioned the link to ward action plans and added-value contribution to outcome delivery. The ward activity needs to support the LAA otherwise half the opportunity of NRF would be lost.

- The nature of work at ward level is such that the governance and decision-making process is different. Whilst much progress has been made with the introduction of ward action plans linked to NRF/LAA outcomes, it is therefore critical, in 2007/8, that councillors are more engaged in the planning process, and understand (if they don't know already) that the system – particularly after March 2008 - will be very different.
- Jagwant Johal mentioned that a presentation by a cabinet member to the constituency chair meeting had been useful to discuss the linkage between the CSPs and the LAA.
- Jon Bright said the devolution and localisation review, due in April, should help clarify the role of CSPs in the delivery of each LAA outcome. An independent evaluation of the impact of projects at ward level should be done to inform that process. It is likely that the McKinsey & Co report will criticize the way the various components of NRF spend (particularly the ward based programme) collectively deliver the agreed outcomes, so such a review would be a good pre-emptive technique.
- A rationale decision-making process – which is clear about what happens where – must be shown to influence spend patterns in 2007/8.

**Action:** Jayne Bench to implement Option 2 for 2006/7 spend and clarify the 'rephasing' device with Philippa. Jon Bright to prepare the scope for the *independent review of the ward planning process and its contribution to closing the gap* for the next meeting.

### **Item 5: Community Engagement Funding**

Jon Bright went through the paper (attached for convenience) and asked the group for views on the options for funding the community engagement service. Brian Carr declared a conflict of interest, as the employing body for BCEN and a potential competing organisation for the resultant community engagement service.

After some discussion the group agreed with recommendation 1 & 4 (to suspend the work agreed last year and stand down the Community Engagement Board), recommendation 3 (that the PB manages this work because of the importance to the BSP and relevance to all 4 LAA blocks) and recommendation 5 (£750K be allocated from NRF 2007/8 to sustain BANF and BCEN through the transition phase). The group recognised that £750K may only be enough to keep the organisations going. There was a limited opportunity to economise as each organisation, although both funded by NRF, were 'owned/governed/managed' differently.

The group had the longest discussion on recommendation 2 around establishing a fresh review in phase 2. The points the group made included;

- There were two main issues; firstly to maintain/sustain the legacy that has been created by BANF and BCEN and secondly to respond to new challenges and develop a commissioning model for the community engagement service that would be useful for all the partners. The group agreed that phase 2 should be a preparatory stage and not another review of processes.

- The focus on outcome delivery, the cross-cutting nature of community cohesion/empowerment and the importance of community engagement to all the BSP partner agencies means that there is an exciting opportunity to commission a set of services within a partnership context.
- It is likely that the community engagement service (which remains critically important) will be delivered by a variety of organisations and a consistent message needs to be relayed to all potential future providers.

There is no certainty of NRF funding beyond March 2008 and therefore 2007/8 needs to be used to develop and design a robust shared partnership commissioning approach. The PB agreed to establish a commissioning group (Anil Patani, Joy Warmington, Sophia Christie, Philippa Holland, Paul Tilsley, Jerry Blackett and possibly Elaine Elkington) to move this forward.

The group agreed that BCEN/BANF should have clear delivery outcomes for the transition year 2007/8 for which they are receiving £0.75 million. A letter from Paul Tilsley would go to BANF and BCEN setting out the position, to avoid any confusion.

**Action:** Jayne Bench to ensure the sum of £750K is set against the NRF 2007/8. Paul Tilsley to send a letter to BCEN and BANF.

#### **Item 6: NRF Allocations for 2007/8**

Jon Bright explained that there were approximately £14 million worth of bids for the remaining around £3.45 million NRF 2007/8 (£5.43 million – over-allocation in 2006/7 of approx £1.2 - £750K for community engagement). He asked the group to declare their preferences. The group felt there was insufficient information in the paper to make an informed decision and were also unclear whether the FTAP bids represented ‘new’ work or the existing agreed activities. They felt strongly that the FTAP work already agreed should take preference, and beyond that a robust criteria should be applied. Several members of the group expressed the view that NRF allocation should be strategically commissioned and not be a ‘pick and mix’.

**Action:** Jon Bright to consider the PB comments and produce an option paper for the next meeting. Jon Bright to prepare a proposal paper to ‘Simplify and strengthen the NRF Programme Management for 2007/8’.

#### **Item 7: PMA Report – Health Inequalities**

Sophia Christie said the purpose of the PMA report on health inequalities was to inform delivery at a ward level and provide each ward with a set of ‘best buys’ when tackling health inequalities. The full report was 700 pages long but it would be possible to request specially designed presentations. Spatial priority setting within a partnership construct was welcomed. Both Louise Collett and Les Lawrence offered to look at the report from a housing conditions and CYP point of view respectively.

The report will be launched by Cllr Sue Anderson on 6<sup>th</sup> March am.

**Action :** Any comments or requests for presentations to go to Sophia Christie.

#### **Item 8: Sustainable Community Strategy – Birmingham 2026**

Kevin Hubery described the process by which the sustainable community strategy (SCS) would be developed. The SCS would address the CPA criticisms that the community strategy was not more obviously long-term and Birmingham specific.

The SCS would be based on the 4 LAA blocks and the group agreed with the suggested PB sponsors/leads for each block.

A few comments were made;

- While the process was welcomed, Philippa questioned whether enough emphasis was placed on community dialogue before the consultation period Nov 2007-Jan 2008. Kevin accepted the point and referred to the talking tent *City Shapers* event to be held in March 2007 which would allow a wider discussion, as one way to ensure this happens. Anil Patani asked that the SCS process considers what exists already, particularly around the consultation processes of each partner. The link to the developing community engagement service should be actively explored.
- Richard Kenny asked whether some 'futures work' and/or the growth agenda would be commissioned. Kevin replied that the national sustainable communities agenda, particularly around planning/housing/economic development would influence the development of the Birmingham SCS.
- Sophia Christie suggested that while the BSP discussion around each community strategy would help review and update, and the Prospectus was critical to articulate the future issues, she also wanted a much higher level of debate/challenge within the SCS.
- Jerry Blackett referred to work that the Chamber of Commerce did on *Forces for Change* and offered to make this available to Kevin.

**Action:** Kevin Hubery to take on board the comments made by the PB in further developing the SCS.

#### **Item 9: Neighbourhood Element – Progress report**

Jagwant Johal updated the group on the Neighbourhood Element initiative. He asked the PB to endorse the same approach for carry forward which, for consistency, the group agreed. He asked for the PB to agree to a re-profiling of phase 1 in order to take into account the late start as well as length of time to get neighbourhood managers in post. While the group sympathised, as this was a very similar situation with the FTAPs, they noted that phase 1 came to an end in March 2008 and that this was not negotiable. The group acknowledged that due to factors outside control the outcome report of phase 1, due in March 2008, will fall short as it won't reflect the completion of phase 1. However the group also noted that phase 2 would be in a better position.

**Action:** Jagwant Johal to liaise with Jayne Bench with regards to managing underspend across financial years.

#### **Item 10: Verbal report: Devolution and Localisation – developing constituency area agreements**

Jon Bright said this was still in progress and he would report back in due course.

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

#### **Next meeting**

Wednesday 13 March 2007, 3 – 4.30pm at BCC Council House, Committee Room 6

Table 1: Funding recommended by PB at 13<sup>th</sup> February 2007 meeting

<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Rationale</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<p><b>Street Cleaning</b></p> <p>This is largely a capital purchase of equipment to reduce levels of litter and detritus and close the gap in the city.</p>	<p>This is an off-track indicator</p>	<p>£1.73 million</p>	<p>There is an expected potential increase in smoking related litter.</p> <p>It will assist in securing £2.7 million Performance Reward Grant associated with the LPSA target.</p>
<p><b>Key stage 3</b></p> <p>Additional work to target schools where key stage 3 – particularly science – and key stage 4 are below target.</p>	<p>Progress on key stage 3 science was deemed unsatisfactory by GOWM.</p>	<p>£0.060 million</p>	
<p><b>Community Safety</b></p> <p>To fund additional work on a media campaign, operation Trojan, schools patrol, environmental crime unit, Public Place Wounding Publicity campaign.</p>	<p>This should create a strong performance position going into the final year of the PSA1 (reducing crime by 20% by 07/08).</p>	<p>£0.256 million</p>	<p>This is in addition to the innovation projects supporting public place wounding, agreed by the BSP in Jan 2007.</p>
<p><b>Neighbourhood Forums</b></p> <p>Transition funding for Neighbourhood Forums.</p>	<p>Pending the development of new community engagement arrangements.</p>	<p>£0.116 million</p>	
<p><b>Community engagement service</b></p> <p>2007/8 funding for BANF and BCEN</p>	<p>To sustain/maintain the BANF/BCEN legacy while the commissioning approach is developed.</p>	<p>£0.75 million</p>	<p>Discussed under item 5 (paper on request)</p>