

NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

CORPORATE AND PARTNERSHIPS OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

15 NOVEMBER 2010

ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE MONITORING OF PARTNERSHIPS

1.0 **Purpose of Report**

- 1.1 To report the conclusions of your Group Spokespersons on how the Committee might approach a review of partnerships.

2.0 **Background**

- 2.1 At your last meeting you added a review of partnerships to the work programme. The approach you were minded to take included inviting Corporate Directors to list and report on partnerships they are involved in or associated with. This remit might also extend further to include arrangements and possible approaches to future collaborations between authorities and agencies in the county
- 2.2 In 2009 the Audit Committee asked the Executive “to consider how Members might be included in monitoring the effectiveness of partnerships and any issues arising from partnership governance, together with the view of the Audit Committee that the Audit Committee’s role is to consider whether it is satisfied that the issue is being addressed”.
- 2.3 Following discussion at Management Board and Executive meetings, the Executive on 2 February 2010 received a report on the outcome of a review of arrangements for the monitoring of partnerships, including with a 15 page appendix in tabular format listing key partnerships and governance arrangements.(Appendix 1)
- 2.4 Because of the wide range of partnerships, and their differing roles, a “one size fits all” approach is not practical or appropriate. Arrangements for partnership governance are set out in the County Council's constitution and financial procedure rules, recently updated by full County Council on 19 May 2010 and 21 July 2010.
- 2.5 Whilst there is an inclusion of finance and performance monitoring data from partnership working in a range of more general updates, including those submitted to the Executive as part of the Quarterly Performance Monitoring reports, there are few examples of formalised reporting of these matters, in the specific context of the partnership, back to the County Council at either Executive, Executive Member or Scrutiny Committee level. Often the data from partnerships is not readily separated from the more general level of reporting, and in many cases to do so would result in duplication.

3.0 **Proposal for an Annual Report**

- 3.1 The Executive agreed that an annual report on partnership monitoring arrangements should be developed for presentation to the Executive and the Audit Committee. It is anticipated that this annual report will be made to the Executive in

May or June of each year starting in 2011, with the report then going to Audit Committee to provide assurance that the issue is being addressed.

3.2 Since then, following the change of government and the forthcoming cuts in public expenditure, a consensus has emerged that a fundamental review of partnerships in North Yorkshire is required.

3.3 A proposal to undertake a review was agreed at a meeting of Local Government North Yorkshire and York (ie the nine local authority leaders) on 8 October 2010. The paper from that meeting is attached as Appendix 2.

4.0 **Conclusions and Recommendations of Group Spokespersons**

4.1 To avoid duplication, given that work is about to start on a fundamental review of partnerships and the process recently agreed for an annual report on partnership monitoring arrangements, your Group Spokesperson agreed with the proposal and **Recommends** that the Committee (in the second half of 2011) instead first reviews the annual report on partnership monitoring arrangements and any subsequent decisions taken by the Executive, prior to considering what additional work, if any, may be required.

HUGH WILLIAMSON
Head of Scrutiny and Corporate Performance

County Hall
NORTHALLERTON

5 November 2010
Background Documents: None

NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

EXECUTIVE

2 FEBRUARY 2010

PARTNERSHIP GOVERNANCE – REVIEW OF ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE MONITORING OF PARTNERSHIPS

Joint Report of the Chief Executive and the Corporate Director – Finance and Central Services

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To report back to the Executive on the outcome of the review of arrangements for the monitoring of partnerships.
- 1.2 To seek views on whether these are adequate, or whether enhanced arrangements should be put in place.

2.0 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 At its meeting held on 25th August 2009, the Executive were informed that the Audit Committee had considered a report on Partnership Governance at its April meeting, and had resolved:

‘That the Executive be asked to consider how Members might be included in monitoring the effectiveness of partnerships and any issues arising from partnership governance, together with the view of the Audit Committee that the Audit Committee’s role is to consider whether it is satisfied that the issue is being addressed.’

- 2.2 The Executive were informed that Management Board had given initial consideration to the matter, but had requested further work by the Chief Executive’s Policy Unit to identify the current monitoring and scrutiny arrangements for partnerships. In view of this, the Executive agreed:

- (i) To note the work being undertaken by the Management Board to prepare a schedule which will show the current monitoring and scrutiny arrangements for the High Risk Partnerships.
- (ii) To consider the matter further once that schedule is submitted to the Executive.’

- 2.3 Since that meeting, the Management Board has considered a preliminary draft of the schedule, and in the light of issues arising from that discussion asked for further work to be completed. The outcome of this was discussed again in January 2010 and is now presented to the Executive for further consideration.

3.0 **SCOPE OF THE CURRENT EXERCISE**

3.1 One of the issues that arises whenever partnership matters are discussed, is the need to define what we mean by the term and then determine the level of significance of partnerships to be considered in the matter under review.

3.2 For the purpose of the current exercise, the scope of the review has covered the definition shown below, and has looked at partnerships and other strategic arrangements involving outside bodies to which Members of the County Council are nominated. The schedule of arrangements for those in scope, is attached as **Appendix 1**.

3.3 The scope, therefore, covers partnerships which are characterised by one or more of the following conditions:

- are strategic – in the sense that they will have a significant impact on the direction of services provided, at the level of County Council, Directorate or Sustainable Community Strategy themes and priorities
- involve Members on the governing board
- involve a financial input from the County Council of £50k pa or more
- involve the County Council as accountable body for external grant funding to the partnership
- have a risk assessment arising from the partnership governance work of High or Medium.

3.4 It should be noted that there are a number of other partnerships that have been identified, and that are included on the partnership risk register that do not meet the above criteria. These have not been included in **Appendix 1**.

3.5 The County Council nominates Members to a range of outside organisations, some of which cross relate to the current exercise, and are, therefore, included on the schedule at **Appendix 1**. It should be noted, however, that the large majority of these outside bodies, as listed in the Constitution, are not partnerships, and any need for regular feedback by the nominated Member would need to be considered as a separate issue.

4.0 **CURRENT ARRANGEMENTS IN PLACE TO MONITOR PARTNERSHIPS**

4.1 The schedule at **Appendix 1** indicates a range of approaches taken at the present time.

4.2 Reporting arrangements might be seen to cover:

- Key issues, including service issues as well as any specific issues relating to the management of the partnerships.

- More routine reporting on financial or other performance, highlighting any key issues or variances to budgets or performance plans.

4.3 The exercise indicates a variety of arrangements are in place, although a number of these might be described as ad hoc. Such reporting tends to relate to the “key issues” mentioned in paragraph 4.2 above rather than to performance monitoring information.

4.4 In relation to finance and performance monitoring, whilst there is an inclusion of data from partnership working in a range of more general updates, including those submitted to the Executive as part of the Quarterly Performance Monitoring reports, there are few examples of formalised reporting of these matters, in the specific context of the partnership, back to the County Council at either Executive, Executive Member or Scrutiny Committee level. Often the data from partnerships is not readily separated from the more general level of reporting, and in many cases to do so would result in duplication.

5.0 **ADEQUACY OF THESE ARRANGEMENTS?**

5.1 The wide range of partnerships, and their differing roles, suggests a “one size fits all” approach will not be either practical or appropriate.

5.2 Whilst key issues are raised, as necessary, through a range of specific and more general reporting as part of normal processes, the analysis does identify some questions on the need for a more focussed approach:

- (i) arrangements do not necessarily provide a clear record to Members of the specific achievements, or challenges, arising from particular partnership working
- (ii) this may make it more difficult to assess whether the partnership is being successful in delivering it’s objectives
- (iii) there is a further difficulty in the use of the term “partnership” to cover such a wide range of different approaches. Some, for example the Children’s Trust, are a coming together of partners with separate budgets to jointly plan and align their own organisations activity. Others, for example Supporting People, are a delivery mechanism for joint budgets and joint decisions, where the County Council is the Accountable Body.

5.3 So any arrangement will need to be appropriate and commensurate to the role of the partnership, and what it seeks to achieve. It is necessary to ensure that the arrangements reflect appropriately the significance of the issues arising in the partnership within the overall framework of the monitoring arrangements involving Members. There is a need to avoid the risk of providing an unnecessarily detailed analysis for relatively small partnership working areas.

5.4 As part of the ongoing work on partnership governance, matters of reporting will be considered as part of the review of arrangements and their alignment with the best practice guidance appropriate to the nature of the partnership. Actions plans will

highlight the need for changes to current arrangements. For example, an exercise is underway at the present time to review financial and performance reporting arrangements for the Children's Trust and its Sub-Groups, in the light of the latest guidance from the DCSF, and building on the already established monitoring arrangements. The governance work is being progressed within Directorates, in respect of the partnerships in which they have involvement, using the risk ranking undertaken as part of the approach adopted to prioritising this work

- 5.5 This is likely to leave a position where some of the partnerships included in Appendix 1 are not the subject of separate reports, as a matter of course, to the Executive, another County Council Committee, or an Executive Portfolio holder. The proposal, therefore, is that an Annual Statement, on a compendium basis along the lines of that included in Appendix 1, and with the addition of a "key issues" column covering significant matters arising in the last 12 months, should be presented to the Executive and also referred to the Audit Committee for consideration. This would also highlight changes in the list of such partnerships, including additions and deletions during the year. This would provide an opportunity for the Executive, in the first instance, to consider whether more (or less) information should be submitted in separate monitoring reports, and to which appropriate Member, or member body.
- 5.6 For this initial report, the view of the Executive is sought on whether there are particular partnerships included on the list where the current arrangements are not considered to be appropriate, to allow any matters highlighted to be addressed in the current and forthcoming reviews of these reporting arrangements.

6.0 **RECOMMENDATIONS**

6.1 Members are asked to:

- (i) Note the content of the schedule of partnership monitoring arrangements;
- (ii) Consider whether there are any specific arrangements that need to be reviewed;
- (iii) Agree to receive an annual report on partnership monitoring arrangements;
- (iv) Agree that this report, and the proposed annual report, should be referred to the Audit Committee

JOHN MARSDEN
Chief Executive

JOHN MOORE
Corporate Director – Finance & Central Services

Authors of Report

Geoff Wall, Assistant Director – Projects
Neil Irving, Head of Policy and Partnerships

Background Papers: None

Finance and Central Services
County Hall
Northallerton

18th January 2009

Partnership	Lead Directorate	Membership and governance arrangements of partnership	Which NYCC elected member body does the partnership report to and how often	NYCC budget contribution and financial reporting arrangements of partnership	Risk rating from Partnership Risk Matrix	NYCC elected member(s) directly involved in partnership	Role they play in partnership	Who in NYCC appoints them to partnership	NYCC risk manager
NYSP									
NYSP Partnership	CEG	The NYSP Partnership is undergoing change, the previous arrangements ended and partners are considering how best to secure the appropriate involvement of elected members and non-executives from other key bodies.	Issues arising from the partnership are fed into County Council processes in the usual way, although there is no formal reporting direct from the partnership to an elected member body. Following discussions with the Districts, a paper on Scrutiny arrangements for the work of the NYSP is currently being circulated to NYCC Scrutiny Committees.		M				Neil Irving
NYSP Executive	CEG	Chief executives of local authorities and key local public sector partners. Written terms of reference	Issues arising from the partnership are fed into County Council processes in the usual way, although there is no formal reporting direct from the partnership to an elected member body. See comment above re Scrutiny arrangements.	Although no direct budget, the NYP Executive have overseen Pump Priming Grant (£1.3m over 3 years to 2009/10) and have input regarding the utilisation of Performance Reward Grant. It also oversees the funding for the implementation of a cross partner Local Information System (£150k). £150k bid from RIEP.	M	none			Neil Irving
York and North Yorkshire Safer Communities Forum	CEG	Senior reps (mostly officers) of key local community safety partners inc chairs of district CDRPs. Written governance document	Issues arising from the partnership are fed into County Council processes in the usual way, although there is no formal reporting direct from the partnership to an elected member body. Following agreement with the District Councils, the NYCC Safer and Sustainable Communities OSC considers the work of this forum.	No budget. Forum makes recommendations to NYCC on allocation of Area Based Grant and Home Office capital grant for community safety work, mostly to CDRPs (approx £800k pa)	M	Clr Heather Garnett	Member	Executive (as portfolio holder)	Neil Irving
NYSP Adults Strategic Partnership	ACS	Senior reps (officers) of key local partners. Written governance document	Issues arising from the partnership are fed into County Council processes in the usual way, although there is no formal reporting direct from the partnership to an elected member body.	No budget	L	none			Derek Law

Partnership	Lead Directorate	Membership and governance arrangements of partnership	Which NYCC elected member body does the partnership report to and how often	NYCC budget contribution and financial reporting arrangements of partnership	Risk rating from Partnership Risk Matrix	NYCC elected member(s) directly involved in partnership	Role they play in partnership	Who in NYCC appoints them to partnership	NYCC risk manager
North Yorkshire Children's Trust (formerly the North Yorkshire Children and Young People's Strategic Partnership): Statutory entity in its own right and subject to external inspection	CYPS	Senior reps (mostly officers) of key local partners. Written governance document	The Trust reports to the Executive and Full County Council via the Chair of the Trust (Cynthia Welbourn). Full County Council sign off for the Children and Young People's Plan is required by law. Progress reports on the Trust's work (Children and Young People's Plan) to CYP Overview and Scrutiny Committee bi-annually	The Trust has a leadership and coordinating role for all children and young people spending. The majority of funds are spent by individual partners and currently total circa £644M per annum. The Lead Member & Lead Officer responsibility for the Trust rests statutorily with the Council but with all partners having a statutory duty to co-operate. Some resources are administered through individual partnerships (detailed elsewhere in this summary) who report to the Trust. The financial reporting arrangements for the Trust are currently subject to review/ enhancement	Not on Risk Register	Lead Member (Children's Services) Cllr Caroline Patmore, Observer Cllr Jim Clark (Executive Member, Schools), Observer Cllr Tim Swales (Young People's Champion)	Member / Observers	Executive (as portfolio holder)	Cynthia Welbourn
NYSP Healthier Communities TP	ACS	Senior reps (officers) of key local partners. Written governance document	Issues arising from the partnership are fed into County Council processes in the usual way, although there is no formal reporting direct from the partnership to an elected member body.	No budget	Not on Risk Register	none			Derek Law
NYSP Rural / Stronger TP	CEG	Senior reps (officers) of key local partners. Written governance document	Issues arising from the partnership are fed into County Council processes in the usual way, although there is no formal reporting direct from the partnership to an elected member body.	No budget	Not on Risk Register	none			Gary Fielding
YNY Partnership Executive	BES	Chief executives of local authorities and key local public sector partners. Written terms of reference	Issues arising from the partnership are fed into County Council processes in the usual way, although there is no formal reporting direct from the partnership to an elected member body. There is a regular report to LGNYY Economy and Skills Board.	£94k	Not on Risk Register	none			Richard Flinton

Partnership	Lead Directorate	Membership and governance arrangements of partnership	Which NYCC elected member body does the partnership report to and how often	NYCC budget contribution and financial reporting arrangements of partnership	Risk rating from Partnership Risk Matrix	NYCC elected member(s) directly involved in partnership	Role they play in partnership	Who in NYCC appoints them to partnership	NYCC risk manager
LSPs									
Craven Local Strategic Partnership	CEG	Senior reps (members and officers) of key local partners. Written governance document	Craven Area Committee normally every meeting	NYCC contributes £10k to LSP running costs. Craven District Council is accountable body. LSP makes recommendations to NYCC Area Committee on use of Community Fund	L	Cllr Patrick Mulligan	Member	Craven Area Committee	Neil Irving
Hambleton Strategic Partnership	CEG	Senior reps (members and officers) of key local partners. Written governance document	County Committee for Hambleton - normally every meeting	NYCC contributes £10k to LSP running costs. Hambleton District Council is accountable body. LSP makes recommendations to NYCC Area Committee on use of Community Fund	L	Cllr David Blades	Member	County Committee for Hambleton	Neil Irving
Harrogate District Strategic Partnership	CEG	Senior reps (members and officers) of key local partners. Written governance document	Harrogate Area Committee - normally every meeting	NYCC contributes £10k to LSP running costs. Harrogate Borough Council is accountable body. LSP makes recommendations to NYCC Area Committee on use of Community Fund	L	Cllr Bernard Bateman	Member	Harrogate Area Committee	Neil Irving
Richmondshire Local Strategic Partnership	CEG	Senior reps (members and officers) of key local partners. Written governance document	Richmondshire Area Committee - normally every meeting	NYCC contributes £10k to LSP running costs. Richmondshire District Council is accountable body. LSP makes recommendations to NYCC Area Committee on use of Community Fund	L	Cllr Carl Les	Member	Richmondshire Area Committee	Neil Irving
Ryedale Strategic Partnership	CEG	Senior reps (members and officers) of key local partners. Written governance document	Ryedale Area Committee - normally every meeting	NYCC contributes £10k to LSP running costs. Ryedale District Council is accountable body. LSP makes recommendations to NYCC Area Committee on use of Community Fund	L	Cllr Clare Wood	Member (Cllr Wood is also Chair, elected by the Partnership)	Ryedale Area Committee	Neil Irving
North Yorkshire Coast Community Partnership	CEG	Senior reps (members and officers) of key local partners. Written governance document	Yorkshire Coast and Moors County Area Committee - normally every meeting	NYCC contributes £10k to LSP running costs. Scarborough Borough Council is accountable body. LSP makes recommendations to NYCC Area Committee on use of Community Fund	M	Cllr Janet Jefferson	Member	Yorkshire Coast and Moors County Area Committee	Neil Irving
Selby Local Strategic Partnership	CEG	Senior reps (members and officers) of key local partners. Written governance document	Selby Area Committee - normally every meeting	NYCC contributes £10k to LSP running costs. Selby District Council is accountable body. Makes recommendations to NYCC Area Committee on use of Community Fund	L	Cllr Chris Metcalfe	Member	Selby Area Committee	Neil Irving

Partnership	Lead Directorate	Membership and governance arrangements of partnership	Which NYCC elected member body does the partnership report to and how often	NYCC budget contribution and financial reporting arrangements of partnership	Risk rating from Partnership Risk Matrix	NYCC elected member(s) directly involved in partnership	Role they play in partnership	Who in NYCC appoints them to partnership	NYCC risk manager
CDRPs									
Safer Craven Community Partnership	CEG	Senior reps (members and officers) of key local community safety partners. Written governance document	Craven Area Committee normally every meeting. Following agreement with the Districts, Scrutiny of CDRP matters is being carried out through District Scrutiny arrangements.	NYCC contributes £63k for CDRP work. Craven District Council is accountable body	L	Cllr Shelagh Marshall	Member (Cllr Marshall is also Chair, elected by the Partnership)	Craven Area Committee	Neil Irving
Hambleton Community Safety Partnership	CEG	Senior reps (members and officers) of key local community safety partners. Written governance document	County Committee for Hambleton - normally every meeting. See above re Scrutiny.	NYCC contributes £89k for CDRP work. Hambleton District Council is accountable body	L	Cllr Tim Swales	Member	County Committee for Hambleton	Neil Irving
Harrogate and District Safety Communities Partnership	CEG	Senior reps (members and officers) of key local community safety partners. Written governance document	Harrogate Area Committee - normally every meeting. See above re Scrutiny.	NYCC contributes £154k for CDRP work. Harrogate Borough Council is accountable body	L	Cllr Cliff Trotter	Member	Harrogate Area Committee	Neil Irving
Richmondshire Community Safety Partnership	CEG	Senior reps (members and officers) of key local community safety partners. Written governance document	Richmondshire Area Committee - normally every meeting. See above re Scrutiny.	NYCC contributes £59k for CDRP work. Richmondshire District Council is accountable body	L	Cllr Michael Heseltine	Member	Richmondshire Area Committee	Neil Irving
Safer Ryedale Partnership	CEG	Senior reps (members and officers) of key local community safety partners. Written governance document	Ryedale Area Committee - normally every meeting. See above re Scrutiny.	NYCC contributes £59k for CDRP work. Ryedale District Council is accountable body	L	Cllr Val Arnold	Member	Ryedale Area Committee	Neil Irving
North Yorkshire Moors and Coast Safer Communities Partnership	CEG	Senior reps (members and officers) of key local community safety partners. Written governance document	Yorkshire Coast and Moors County Area Committee - normally every meeting. See above re Scrutiny.	NYCC contributes £145k for CDRP work. Scarborough Borough Council is accountable body	L	Cllr David Jeffels	Member	Yorkshire Coast and Moors County Area Committee	Neil Irving
Selby District Community Safety Partnership	CEG	Senior reps (members and officers) of key local community safety partners. Written governance document	Selby Area Committee - normally every meeting. See above re Scrutiny.	NYCC contributes £112k for CDRP work. Selby District Council is accountable body	L	Cllr Karl Arthur	Member	Selby Area Committee	Neil Irving

Partnership	Lead Directorate	Membership and governance arrangements of partnership	Which NYCC elected member body does the partnership report to and how often	NYCC budget contribution and financial reporting arrangements of partnership	Risk rating from Partnership Risk Matrix	NYCC elected member(s) directly involved in partnership	Role they play in partnership	Who in NYCC appoints them to partnership	NYCC risk manager
ACS									
Overarching NYCC and PCT Service Delivery Partnership	ACS	Corporate Director ACS and Chief Executive NHSNY&Y with Support from lead commissioning officers. Joint Commissioning Statement and Performance Framework agreement in place	No direct NYCC Member involvement though ACS Portfolio holder receives regular briefings	No direct budget allocation. The partnership is about co-commissioning in partnership. Pooling not required at this stage. Work is ongoing in developing integrated service delivery approaches. Draft governance documentation is being discussed and agreed for mental health, telehealthcare, continuing care, safeguarding and reablement and intermediate care. Once formalised these will be part of a suite of agreements which will then to be covered by an overarching governance agreement. At present there is only a joint vision statement.	H	Cllr Chris Metcalfe Portfolio holder for ACS holds overview but is not directly involved in a Board capacity	Portfolio holder offers overview		Seamus Breen
Hambleton and Richmondshire Learning Disabilities Partnership Board	ACS	Elected People with LD, with lay co-chair, care representatives, PCT, ACS and Northallerton College and 3rd Sector rep.	Annual Update to ACS Portfolio Holder	Learning Disability Development Fund (now part of Area Based Grants) £89.3k	L	No Member involvement			Stuart Lomas
Selby Learning Disabilities Partnership Board	ACS	Elected People with LD, with lay co-chair, care representatives, Advocacy PCT, ACS, Adult Educ and 3rd Sector rep.	Annual Update to ACS Portfolio Holder	Learning Disability Development Fund (now part of Area Based Grants) £53.2k	M	No Member involvement			Stuart Lomas
Craven and Harrogate Learning Disabilities Partnership Board	ACS	Elected People with LD, with lay co-chair, care representatives, PCT, ACS and 3rd Sector rep. and Harrogate Borough Councillor Robert Heseltine	Annual Update to ACS Portfolio Holder	Learning Disability Development Fund (now part of Area Based Grants) £139.3k	M	No Member involvement			Stuart Lomas
Scarborough, Whitby and Ryedale Learning Disabilities Partnership Board	ACS	Elected People with LD, with lay co-chair, care representatives, PCT, ACS and Yorkshire Coast college and 3rd Sector rep.	Annual Update to ACS Portfolio Holder	Learning Disability Development Fund (now part of Area Based Grants) £100.6k	M	No Member involvement			Stuart Lomas

Partnership	Lead Directorate	Membership and governance arrangements of partnership	Which NYCC elected member body does the partnership report to and how often	NYCC budget contribution and financial reporting arrangements of partnership	Risk rating from Partnership Risk Matrix	NYCC elected member(s) directly involved in partnership	Role they play in partnership	Who in NYCC appoints them to partnership	NYCC risk manager
Supporting People Partnership	ACS	District Councils, PCT Probations CYPS, ACS, Providers, Third Sector reps	Reports to ACS Exec as agenda requires.	Joint Commissioning Partnership Board has overall responsibility for the allocation via Area Based Grant of £14m. The Assistant Director - Resources is the accountable officer and there is full reporting via ACS Executive Portfolio Holder.	M	Cllr John Fort, Cllr Shelagh Marshall, Cllr Caroline Patmore	Members of the SP Elected Members Committee	Executive	Avril Hunter
Drugs and Alcohol Action Team (DAAT)	ACS	PCT, ACS, Probation, Police, NTA	Reporting is via ACSMB to ACS Executive Member as required. Also Governed by a DAAT Board under the NYSP and national NTA Guidelines	The NY DAAT covers drug and alcohol commissioning with £4m for drug treatment. Includes a pooled treatment budget of £2.7m and a £25K area based grant allocation.	H	No Member involvement			Seamus Breen
Physical and Sensory Impairment Partnership Board	ACS	People with Physical and Sensory Impairment elected from local user groups, PCT, ACS and 3rd Sector rep	Formally reports to the Adult Strategic Partnership under the NYSP governance arrangement, and informal reporting to ACS Executive Member	NYCC contributes £45k towards the project officer and network support. Other partners of the ASP have not contributed. Will be a call against the reward grant.	M	No Member involvement			Stephen Harrison
Older Peoples Partnership Board	ACS	ACS, PCT, Elected representation from locality older people networks under an elected chair. Reports to the Adult Strategic Partnership under the NYSP thematic Partnership arrangements.	None directly but comes under the NYSP Governances arrangements	NYCC contributes £35k towards the project officer and network support. Other partners of the ASP have not contributed. Will be a call against the reward grant.	L	Cllr Sheila Marshall as Council's Older Peoples Champion	Play a role at both national, regional and Council level as the elected representative and formal role of Older People's Champion	Elected by OP membership to OP Board. Appointed by Leader of Council as OP Champion.	Seamus Breen
Extra Care Delivery Partners	ACS	Each new Extracare development entails a new partnership involving a District Council, an RSL, possibly the HCA and/ or the Dept of Health as funding provider, and a service provider. The proposal is to develop a wider more stable partnership and in Feb 2010 a procurement exercise will formally kick off this process.	The Executive portfolio holder for ACS keeps an active overview of each project and has received an Exec Report on the proposed direction of travel	Dependent on scheme. Capital contributions managed through capital plan. Revenue costs dealt with as part of normal operational budget reporting, and highlighted in MTFS	H	No Member involvement			Juliette Daniel
Safeguarding Adults Board	ACS	Accountable to ACS Exec as required, the NYSP	6 monthly to Care and Independence OSC	Nil other than officer time	M	Cllr Chris Metcalfe	Member	Executive (as portfolio holder)	Anne Marie Lubanski

Partnership	Lead Directorate	Membership and governance arrangements of partnership	Which NYCC elected member body does the partnership report to and how often	NYCC budget contribution and financial reporting arrangements of partnership	Risk rating from Partnership Risk Matrix	NYCC elected member(s) directly involved in partnership	Role they play in partnership	Who in NYCC appoints them to partnership	NYCC risk manager
Care Alliance for Workforce development	ACS	ACS, Independent Care Group (ICG), reps from the 3rd Sector, City of York and Higher Education Institutions	Reporting is via ACSMB to ACS Exec as required.	No direct budget but allocations of staff resources valued at approx £120k	M	No Member involvement			Jackie Ridley
Market Development Board	ACS	Independent Care Group (ICG), Third Sector via NYVF, PCT, NYCC ACS	On matters relating to fees and funding of contributions to ICG, reporting is to Exec Portfolio holder for ACS. The ACS Executive is involved on matters effecting social care policy or implementation	No funding direct to the Board but £30k is payable to ICG to help facilitate the Board and activities.	M	No Member involvement			Seamus Breen
BES									
York-NY Cultural Partnership and 2012	BES	The Corporate Director sits on the Y-NY Partnership Executive	Issues arising from the partnership are fed into County Council processes in the usual way, although there is no formal reporting direct from the partnership to an elected member body.	Average £52k per annum: NYCC is the accountable body.	M	No Member involvement			Gillian Wall
Dales and Harrogate Area Tourism Partnership	BES	Public/private sector partnership - membership constitution in place	Issues arising from the partnership are fed into County Council processes in the usual way, although there is no formal reporting direct from the partnership to an elected member body.	None directly (EDU provides £80K pa to Welcome to Yorkshire, which then funds D&HTP)	H	Cllr Carl Les	Member	Executive	Rita Lawson
Moors and Coast Area Tourism Partnership	BES	Public/private sector partnership - membership constitution in place	Issues arising from the partnership are fed into County Council processes in the usual way, although there is no formal reporting direct from the partnership to an elected member body.	None directly (EDU provides £80K pa to Welcome to Yorkshire, which then funds M&CArea TP)	M	Cllr Carl Les	Member	Executive	Rita Lawson
Local Access Forum	BES	LAF purpose set out in statute with agreed terms of reference	Issues arising from the partnership are fed into County Council processes in the usual way, although there is no formal reporting direct from the partnership to an elected member body.	Cost of meetings and admin	L	Cllr John For, Cllr Robert Heseltine, Cllr Michael Knaggs	Members	Executive	Aidan Rayner

Partnership	Lead Directorate	Membership and governance arrangements of partnership	Which NYCC elected member body does the partnership report to and how often	NYCC budget contribution and financial reporting arrangements of partnership	Risk rating from Partnership Risk Matrix	NYCC elected member(s) directly involved in partnership	Role they play in partnership	Who in NYCC appoints them to partnership	NYCC risk manager
York - North Yorkshire Inward Investment Board	BES	It should be noted that this arrangement this will be transferring in-house from June 2010	Issues arising from the partnership are fed into County Council processes in the usual way, although there is no formal reporting direct from the partnership to an elected member body.	£40K. Budget reports are considered by the Board	L	Cllr John Watson	NYCC rep on Board - a company limited by guarantee. NYCC provides financial support and has a seat on the Board.	Executive (as portfolio holder)	Andrew Harper
YNY Waste Management Partnership	BES	Exec Member chairs the member group consisting of NYCC, Districts and CYC. There is a statement of agreed principles	Issues arising from the partnership are fed into County Council processes in the usual way, although there is no formal reporting direct from the partnership to an elected member body.	£40k. Budget reports are considered by the Partnership Board.	M	Cllr Clare Wood	Member (also chair, elected by partnership)	Executive (as portfolio holder)	Ian Fielding
95 Alive Road Safety Partnership	BES	NYCC, North Yorkshire Police, Fire & Rescue, City of York, Highways Agency, CDRPs, NY & Y Public Health, GOYH, Ambulance Service, National Parks. Steering Group oversight of Working Group. Formal draft constitutional framework written and to be considered at next Steering Group meeting.	Annual report to each area committee, and Transport & Telecommunications Overview and Scrutiny Committee	NYCC is accountable body for Road Safety Grant element of the Area Based Grant; approximately £2m per annum (80:20 revenue/capital). Internal NYCC reporting systems and through 95 Alive Steering Group.	M	None.	N/A but members play 'critical friend' role through annual report to Transport and Telecommunications Overview and Scrutiny Committee.		Allan McVeigh
Forest of Bowland AONB JAC	BES	Memorandum of understanding - JAC inc one NYCC elected member. There is also an Officers Steering Group	Issues arising from the partnership are fed into County Council processes in the usual way, although there is no formal reporting direct from the partnership to an elected member body.	£6.3k	M	Cllr Richard Welch	Member	Craven Area Committee	Graham Megson
Nidderdale AONB JAC	BES	Memorandum of understanding - JAC incl three NYCC elected Members. Also Officers Steering Group. Harrogate BC lead	Issues arising from the partnership are fed into County Council processes in the usual way, although there is no formal reporting direct from the partnership to an elected member body.	£20K	M	Cllrs Heather Garnet, John Fort & Bill Holt	Member	Executive	Graham Megson

Partnership	Lead Directorate	Membership and governance arrangements of partnership	Which NYCC elected member body does the partnership report to and how often	NYCC budget contribution and financial reporting arrangements of partnership	Risk rating from Partnership Risk Matrix	NYCC elected member(s) directly involved in partnership	Role they play in partnership	Who in NYCC appoints them to partnership	NYCC risk manager
Howardian Hills AONB JAC	BES	Memorandum of understanding - JAC incl two NYCC elected Members. Also Officers Steering Group. NYCC lead	Issues arising from the partnership are fed into County Council processes in the usual way, although there is no formal reporting direct from the partnership to an elected member body.	£36K	M	Cllrs Clare Wood & Caroline Patmore	Member	Executive	Graham Megson
North Yorkshire Concessionary Fares Partnership	BES	Officers from each of the District Council's & York NYCC in advisory role. Note that the nature of this partnership will change from April 2011 when Concessionary fares become a county responsibility.	Issues arising from the partnership are fed into County Council processes in the usual way, although there is no formal reporting direct from the partnership to an elected member body.	None	M	None			John Laking
Welcome to Yorkshire	BES	Public/private partnership	Issues arising from the partnership are fed into County Council processes in the usual way, although there is no formal reporting direct from the partnership to an elected member body.	£80k	M	None			Rita Lawson
North Yorkshire Strategic Housing Board	BES/ ACS	NYCC, NY Distrcts, York, National Parks. Governance arrangements being worked up.	This Housing Board is now part of the overall sub regional arrangements. Issues arising are fed into County Council processes in the usual way, although there is no formal reporting direct from the Housing Board to an elected member body.	£7.5k	M	Cllr Peter Sowray	Member	Executive	Andrew Harper (BES) Avril Hunter (ACS)
North Yorkshire - Cleveland Coastal Forum	BES	2 NYCC members, officers & national agencies	Issues arising from the partnership are fed into County Council processes in the usual way, although there is no formal reporting direct from the partnership to an elected member body.	£9k - reports to steering group	M	Cllrs Kenyon, Swiers and Plant	Member	Yorkshire Coast and Moors Area Committee	Graham Megson

Partnership	Lead Directorate	Membership and governance arrangements of partnership	Which NYCC elected member body does the partnership report to and how often	NYCC budget contribution and financial reporting arrangements of partnership	Risk rating from Partnership Risk Matrix	NYCC elected member(s) directly involved in partnership	Role they play in partnership	Who in NYCC appoints them to partnership	NYCC risk manager
CYPS									
Local Children's Safeguarding Board: Statutory Body in its own right which reports to, but also reports on, the multi-agency working relating to Safeguarding carried out by Children's Trust and individual agencies.	CYPS	Lead Member Children's Services, Senior Managers from CYPS and Partners	Reports to Executive Members, Overview and Scrutiny Committee	Multi-agency funding arrangements. NYCC contribute £131k. NYCC is the accountable body.	Not on Risk Register	Lead Member (Children's Services) Cllr Caroline Patmore	Member	Executive (as portfolio holder)	Cynthia Welbourn
CAMHS Strategy Group	CYPS	Senior Officers from CYPS and Health	Reports to Children's Trust (See above for details of Children's Trust reporting to elected members). NYCC work reported via DCS to Exec Members and to CYP OSC	NYCC CAMHS Funding totals £595K in 2009-10. Governance arrangements under review but currently "reports" into City of York Children's Trust North Yorkshire children's Trust and the NY&Y PCT Board	Not on Risk Register	No member involvement in current arrangements			Paul Nixon
Youth Justice Service (Management Board)	CYPS	CEX, Lead Member Children's Services, Senior Managers from CYPS and Partners	Reports periodically to Executive Members	Multi-agency funding arrangements. NYCC contribute £1.2M. NYCC is the accountable body.	Not on Risk Register	Lead Member (Children's Services) Cllr Caroline Patmore	Member	Executive	John Marsden/ Lesley Ingleson
LDD Strategy Group	CYPS	This is a sub-group of the Children's Trust and as such is subject to the Children's Trust Governance Arrangements. Senior Managers from CYPS and Partners	Reports to Children's Trust (See above for details of Children's Trust reporting to elected members). NYCC work reported via DCS to Exec Members and to CYP OSC	NYCC contribution to Aiming High for Disabled Children comprises: revenue £1,728K and capital £778K. NYCC is accountable body. Other LDD and SEN investment is part of operational budget monitoring and reporting arrangements	Not on Risk Register	No member involvement in current arrangements			Andrew Terry
14-19 Strategic Advisory Group	CYPS	This is a sub-group of the Children's Trust and as such is subject to the Children's Trust Governance Arrangements. Senior Managers from CYPS and Partners	Reports to Children's Trust (See above for details of Children's Trust reporting to elected members). NYCC work reported via DCS to Exec Members and to CYP OSC	14-19 Strategy Group is part of the consultative/ advisory arrangements introduced to enable the authority to achieve effectively its' responsibilities for community 14-19 provision from April 2010. The responsibility for the use of all the funds for 14-19 remains with the authority. This includes school budgets re: 14-16 resources and post-16 funds allocated to schools and colleges by individual funding formula. However, the Group has a more influential role in the allocation of non-delegated 14-16 resources for the support of the development of diploma, other vocational provision, education business services and supporting initiatives which currently total circa £1.6M per annum.	Not on Risk Register	No member involvement in current arrangements			Chris McGee

Partnership	Lead Directorate	Membership and governance arrangements of partnership	Which NYCC elected member body does the partnership report to and how often	NYCC budget contribution and financial reporting arrangements of partnership	Risk rating from Partnership Risk Matrix	NYCC elected member(s) directly involved in partnership	Role they play in partnership	Who in NYCC appoints them to partnership	NYCC risk manager
Early Years Partnership	CYPS	This is a sub-group of the Children's Trust and as such is subject to the Children's Trust Governance Arrangements. Officers, Schools, Private sector, Members	Reports to Children's Trust (See above for details of Children's Trust reporting to elected members). NYCC work reported via DCS to Exec Members and to CYP OSC. Exec Member provides link from Partnership.	NYCC revenue contribution totals circa £28M including £10M for increased flexibility and funding for 3 & 4 year old providers. NYCC capital contributions in the period 2008-11 total £19M. The responsibility for the use of all the funds remains with the authority and is monitored through operational budget monitoring and reporting arrangements. Changes in service delivery and spending levels are reported to CYPSC Executive Members.	Not on Risk Register	Cllr M Andrew, Cllr K Barnes, Cllr J Clark (Executive), Cllr C Patmore (Exec Member), Cllr M Smith	Members	Executive	Julia Lowery
Multi-agency Looked After Children Partnership	CYPS	This is a sub-group of the Children's Trust and as such is subject to the Children's Trust Governance Arrangements. Mainly Senior Managers from CYPS and Partners. Executive Member	Reports to Children's Trust (See above for details of Children's Trust reporting to elected members). NYCC work reported via DCS to Exec Members and to CYP OSC. Additional report to the Corporate Parenting Standing Group	NYCC Child Placement budgets in 09-10 total £15.5M and will certainly increase in 10-11. These form part of operational budget monitoring and reporting arrangements to CYPLT and CYPS Executive Members.	Not on Risk Register	Cllr C Patmore (Exec member), Cllr T Swales (Children's Champion) Cllr H Garnett	Members	Executive	Paul Nixon
Workforce Development	CYPS	This is a sub-group of the Children's Trust and as such is subject to the Children's Trust Governance Arrangements. Senior Managers from CYPS and Partners	Reports to Children's Trust (See above for details of Children's Trust reporting to elected members). NYCC work reported via DCS to Exec Members and to CYP OSC.	No budget	Not on Risk Register	No member involvement in current arrangements			Penny Yeadon
Voice, Influence and Participation Group	CYPS	This is a sub-group of the Children's Trust and as such is subject to the Children's Trust Governance Arrangements. Senior Managers from CYPS and Partners	Reports to Children's Trust (See above for details of Children's Trust reporting to elected members). NYCC work reported via DCS to Exec Members and to CYP OSC	NYCC pays for 6 young people's development worker posts to support this work.	Not on Risk Register	Cllr T Swales (Children's Champion)	Members	Executive	Ian Marr
Play Partnership	CYPS	This is a sub-group of the Children's Trust and as such is subject to the Children's Trust Governance Arrangements. Senior Managers from CYPS and Partners	Reports to Children's Trust (See above for details of Children's Trust reporting to elected members). NYCC work reported via DCS to Exec Members and to CYP OSC	Government Grant 'Playbuilder' administered by County Council. Modest revenue resources (£27K) to support implementation of capital infrastructure of £1.1M over the project period 2009-11	Not on Risk Register	No member involvement in current arrangements			Ian Marr

Partnership	Lead Directorate	Membership and governance arrangements of partnership	Which NYCC elected member body does the partnership report to and how often	NYCC budget contribution and financial reporting arrangements of partnership	Risk rating from Partnership Risk Matrix	NYCC elected member(s) directly involved in partnership	Role they play in partnership	Who in NYCC appoints them to partnership	NYCC risk manager
Others									
Local Resilience Forum	FCS	Multi-agency partnership chaired by NYCC Chief Executive, to carry out statutory duties as defined by the Civil Contingencies Act (CCA) plus additional legislation.	No routine report to NYCC elected member body, although any issues requiring decisions or reports will be fed in through normal processes.	Currently has available funding of £20,000 for training and other purposes, provided by Cat 1 partners under the CCA.	Not on Risk Register	No Member involvement			Robin Myshrall
Nynet	FCS	A registered company with a Board of Directors. Chief Executive (NYCC) is Chairman and other NYCC appointees are Cllr Watson and John Moore - Cllr Les is an observer. In addition, two officers of Nynet are Directors plus there is one non-Executive independent Director.	To date, reports have been submitted to various Scrutiny Committees, Audit Committee and the Executive.	NYCC provides cash flow/working capital up to a maximum figure of £7m. NYCC purchases services from Nynet which are charged to budgets in the normal way.	Not on Risk Register	Cllrs Watson and Les	Cllr Watson (Board Director), Cllr Les (Observer)	Executive	John Moore
Yorwaste	BES	Board of Directors, Arms length company, Quarterly shareholder meetings	None directly	Dividend received, subsidiary of NYCC in Accounts	Not on Risk Register	Cllr A Barker	Chair of Board of Directors	County Council	Richard Flinton
Veritau	FCS	Limited company with NYCC and City of York Council as the only shareholders, each owning 50% of the company.	Audit Committee	Cost of service budgeted at £545,400 in 2009/10. CD-FCS is aware of company's financial position through his position as a director of the Veritau Ltd.	Not on Risk Register	Cllr Les and Cllr Harrison-Topham	Company directors	Executive and Audit Committee respectively	John Burrows
YPO	FCS	Joint Committee administered by Wakefield MDC and managed by Members from each of the 13 councils involved.	Corporate Procurement Members' Working Group	No direct budget contribution. If YPO makes a surplus and if YPO's Management Committee agree to a distribution, NYCC gets a share. In typical years, this can amount to £0.5m. Trading statements sent to NYCC's Chief Exec on a monthly basis.	Not on Risk Register	Cllr Les and Cllr Casling	Member	Executive	John Burrows

Partnership	Lead Directorate	Membership and governance arrangements of partnership	Which NYCC elected member body does the partnership report to and how often	NYCC budget contribution and financial reporting arrangements of partnership	Risk rating from Partnership Risk Matrix	NYCC elected member(s) directly involved in partnership	Role they play in partnership	Who in NYCC appoints them to partnership	NYCC risk manager
Sub regional (list excludes officer support groups)									
Local Government North Yorkshire and York (LGNYY)		Leaders of local authorities and national park authorities. Written terms of reference	Issues arising from the partnership are fed into County Council processes in the usual way, although there is no formal reporting direct from the partnership to an elected member body.	No budget.	Not on Risk Register	Cllr John Weighell	Member	Executive	
LGNYY Planning Board		One Cllr from each local authority. Written terms of reference	No routine report to NYCC elected member body but regular report to LGNYY, with any issues arising feeding in to County Council processes in the usual way.	No budget	Not on Risk Register	Cllr Peter Sowray	Member	Executive	
LGNYY Transport Board		One Cllr from each local authority. Written terms of reference	No routine report to NYCC elected member body but regular report to LGNYY, with any issues arising feeding in to County Council processes in the usual way.	No budget	Not on Risk Register	Cllr Clare Wood	Member (chair alternates annually between NYCC and City of York Council)	Executive	
LGNYY Housing Board		One Cllr from local authority and reps of key partners. Written terms of reference	No routine report to NYCC elected member body but regular report to LGNYY, with any issues arising feeding in to County Council processes in the usual way.	No budget	Not on Risk Register	Cllr John Fort	Member	Executive	
LGNYY Economy and Skills Board		One Cllr from each local authority. Written terms of reference	No routine report to NYCC elected member body but regular report to LGNYY, with any issues arising feeding in to County Council processes in the usual way.	No budget	Not on Risk Register	Cllr John Watson	Member (chair alternates annually between NYCC and City of York Council)	Executive	

Partnership	Lead Directorate	Membership and governance arrangements of partnership	Which NYCC elected member body does the partnership report to and how often	NYCC budget contribution and financial reporting arrangements of partnership	Risk rating from Partnership Risk Matrix	NYCC elected member(s) directly involved in partnership	Role they play in partnership	Who in NYCC appoints them to partnership	NYCC risk manager
Leeds City Region (list excludes officer support groups)									
LCR Leaders Board	BES	Member body on which NYCC has a representative	No routine report to NYCC elected member body	An overall contribution of £18k is made by NYCC towards the costs of the Leeds City Region arrangements.	Not on Risk Register	Cllr John Watson	Member	Executive	Richard Flinton
LCR Housing and Spatial Planning Panel	BES	Member body on which NYCC has a representative	No routine report to NYCC elected member body	See above	M	Cllr John Fort	Member	Executive	Malcolm Spittle
LCR Transport Panel	BES	Member body on which NYCC has a representative	No routine report to NYCC elected member body	See above	Not on Risk Register	Cllr John Fort	Member	Executive	David Bowe
LCR Innovation and Enterprise Panel	BES	Member body on which NYCC has a representative	No routine report to NYCC elected member body	See above	Not on Risk Register	Cllr Patrick Mulligan	Member	EDU portfolio holder	Andrew Harper
LCR Skills and Labour Market Panel	BES	Member body on which NYCC has a representative	No routine report to NYCC elected member body	See above	Not on Risk Register	To be determined	Member	Executive	Andrew Harper
Tees Valley City Region (list excludes officer support groups)									
TVCR Leadership Board	BES	No NYCC representation	No routine report to NYCC elected member body		Not on Risk Register	none			Andrew Harper
TVCR Executive Board	BES	No NYCC representation	No routine report to NYCC elected member body		Not on Risk Register	none			Andrew Harper
Regional (list excludes officer support groups)									
Local Government Yorkshire & Humber (LGYH)		Leaders of all local authorities, police authorities and fire and rescue authorities. Written terms of reference	No routine report to NYCC elected member body	£69k subscription across this and all the various Boards	Not on Risk Register	Cllr John Weighell	Member	Executive	
LGYH Leaders Board		Two Cllrs from each sub-region. Written terms of reference	No routine report to NYCC elected member body but regular report to LGNYY		Not on Risk Register	Cllr John Watson (representing LGNYY)	Member representing LGNYY	(appointed by LGNYY)	
Joint Regional Board (Yorkshire Forward / LGYH)		Eight members of the LGYH Leaders' Board and eight members of the Yorkshire Forward Board. Written terms of reference	No routine report to NYCC elected member body but regular report to LGYH Leaders Board		Not on Risk Register	Cllr John Watson (representing LGNYY)	Member representing LGNYY	(appointed by LGNYY)	
LGYH Spatial Planning Board		Two Cllrs from each sub-region plus senior reps from key partners. Written terms of reference	No routine report to NYCC elected member body but regular report to LGNYY		Not on Risk Register	none			
LGYH Regeneration and Housing Board		Two Cllrs from each sub-region plus senior reps from key partners. Written terms of reference	No routine report to NYCC elected member body but regular report to LGNYY		Not on Risk Register	none			

Partnership	Lead Directorate	Membership and governance arrangements of partnership	Which NYCC elected member body does the partnership report to and how often	NYCC budget contribution and financial reporting arrangements of partnership	Risk rating from Partnership Risk Matrix	NYCC elected member(s) directly involved in partnership	Role they play in partnership	Who in NYCC appoints them to partnership	NYCC risk manager
LGYH Work and Skills Board		Two Cllrs from each sub-region plus senior reps from key partners. Written terms of reference	No routine report to NYCC elected member body but regular report to LGNY Y		Not on Risk Register	Cllr Chris Metcalfe (representing LGNY Y)	Member representing LGNY Y	(appointed by LGNY Y)	
LGYH Transport Board		Two Cllrs from each sub-region plus senior reps from key partners. Written terms of reference	No routine report but regular report to LGNY Y		Not on Risk Register	Cllr Clare Wood (representing LGNY Y)	Member representing LGNY Y	(appointed by LGNY Y)	
LGYH Independent Sustainable Development Board		One Cllr from each sub-region plus independent appointees. Written terms of reference	No routine report but regular report to LGNY Y		Not on Risk Register	none			
Yorkshire and Humber Strategic Migration Group	CEG	One Cllr from each sub-region plus senior reps from key partners. Written terms of reference	No routine report but regular report to LGNY Y		Not on Risk Register	Cllr Paul Richardson	Member representing LGNY Y	(appointed by LGNY Y)	Neil Irving
Yorkshire and Humberside European Regional Development Fund Performance Management Board for North, East and West Yorkshire		One Cllr from each sub-region plus senior reps from key partners. Written terms of reference	No routine report but regular report to LGNY Y		Not on Risk Register	none			

FUTURE COLLABORATION

Local Government North Yorkshire and York
8th October 2010

Executive Summary

District and County Leaders considered a paper on "Future Collaborations" in April 2010 which facilitated a discussion and lead to the formation of some conclusions on future collaborations. This work was not intended to cut through existing or forming collaborations - but rather at the strategic level set the 'next agenda'. It continues to tease out some of the complexities and partnership dynamics that will impact on achieving future collaborations and points to what is or could achieve the art of the possible as opposed to chasing something that just simply will not happen.

Over the summer months, Councils have given informal feedback which have now been drawn together to form something of a more structured work programme represented in this paper.

Whilst that consultation was ongoing and with the support of a RIEP bid work on initiating the scope and commitment to a shared service programme across North Yorkshire and York has started. RIEP support has also been gained for a project to look at Asset Management.

The group looking at this now includes the City of York, Police, Fire and Rescue and NHS NY.

LGNY&Y is asked to note the position and support the direction of the work in hand.

Introduction

1. The Joint Leaders Meeting on 16th April 2010 considered a paper which gave further consideration to possible approaches to future collaborations. The purpose of that paper was to facilitate a discussion and form some conclusions on future collaborations that all Leaders could take to their Councils. This work was not intended to cut through existing or forming collaborations - but rather at the strategic level set the 'next agenda'.
2. It was intended that over the summer months informal sounding should be taken in each Council to draw together some conclusions which could then be taken forward. Responses received have been collated in Annex A and a summary based on those responses and the original questions are set out below with some views on a way forward.
3. What is clear is that collaborations will only be formed by 'the willing' where there is common purpose and jointly shared commitment. 'Unwillingness' is not necessarily a negative as Authorities have different drivers for the collaborations being sort. It can equally be a function of timing etc.

4. As agreed at the last Joint Leaders meeting, the series of meetings that developed the discussion paper at 'Assistant Chief Executive level' have continued as 'the Future Collaborations Group' (FOC). This has now widened to include the City of York Council, Police, Fire and Rescue and NHS HY&Y as some of the suggested propositions might have wider appeal.

Principles that underlay future collaboration

5. It is reasonably clear that each Council has its own purpose in seeking collaborative ventures. So that this is properly understood and to avoid false starts borne out of different understanding or imperatives some principles that affect collaboration were drawn together. An extract from the previous report outlining these principles, summarised under the following headings, is reproduced at Annex B.
 - a. *Eight Councils working together on the same thing* - At the 'service level' there is recognition that this will not be practical for all services but some areas present greater opportunities.
 - b. *Starting small - growing larger* - Most agreed that the best collaborations will start relatively small (in partner number terms – not ambition).
 - c. *Lost energy*- If there is a close fit of requirements between potential partners it will usually be better working with an authority that has the capacity to deliver the service another requires as the basis for a partnership or collaborative working. Equally joining an existing partnership will save on the 'set up' of establishing a similar partnership.
 - d. *Competitive partnerships* - There is little mileage in creating new partnerships which operate in the same territory as existing partnerships.
 - e. *Political sovereignty*- All collaborations are expected to work within the current framework. This is not seen as an issue - it just needs stating.
 - f. *Geography* - Geography can be an issue.
 - g. *Governance* - When two or more sovereign bodies share services, governance can be an issue. It needs to be clear when Member or Managerial governance is required - if at all.
 - h. *Redundancy* - Attitudes to redundancy vary.
 - i. *Comfort zones* - Shared service partnerships may feel uncomfortable for some for a variety of reasons.
 - j. *Complexities* - Shared service arrangements both in development and delivery are complex. Complexity brings its own dynamic.
 - k. *Cashable gains* - Shared service arrangements must release cashable savings.
 - l. *Accounting for progress* - Each of the principal partnerships needs a methodology that accounts for savings, costs and costs avoided.

- m. *Sustainability*- Moving to shared service partnerships will require a level of understanding about sustainability within any structural context for Local Government.
 - n. *Processes and Systems* - This will impact on the scale of the challenge for collaboration and the effort required to deliver improvements in cost and performance
6. The question raised was to test if *these principles were recognised and if any need to change to support future work?*
 7. The principles are recognised but need to be applied honestly and openly to have any meaning. A good dose of common sense and pragmatism should prevail – not all the principles will be relevant in the same order to everything. The need to avoid lost energy and competitiveness needs to be avoided to benefit from early movers, avoid abortive work and duplication.
 8. Leaders and Chief Executives need to ensure these principles are reflected in business planning.

Local Authority Governance

9. Within North Yorkshire there are two principal tiers of governance. In parished areas there is a third tier.
10. The question raised was to test if *there was enough, too much or too little democratic representation? Should Member/elector ratios in the principal tiers be reviewed reflecting contemporary governance models, community engagement and access to services? Should North Yorkshire promote a discussion about a single tier of democratic representation for the principal authorities?*
11. There were mixed views on this from the extremes of ‘explorations underway’ to ‘not interested’. If this is to be pursued it will be in those District areas where there is an appetite (e.g. Selby and Hambleton). Others may become interested if issues such as rurality and district councillor effectiveness in larger wards can be overcome (e.g. Richmondshire).
12. Alternative models of representation e.g. a single ‘college’ of councillors is not widely enough supported or not of a sufficient priority to warrant any use of resources to pursue. Scarborough in particular made the point that twin hatted members are appreciating the impact more of the different but complementary roles.

Two tier relationships

13. Relationships continue to improve with purposeful dialogue and partnerships. Leaders have met jointly specifically on two tier issues and District leaders have started to meet with County portfolio leads to discuss issues of mutual interest. North Yorkshire seems to be ahead of the game in comparison to other two tier areas and the pathfinders. The original ‘enhanced two tier’ projects are developing with other partners now involved.

14. The question raised was to test if *the joint leaders meetings need to continue or can business be progressed through LGNY&Y recognising the wider partnership involvement? Are further meetings between District leaders and County Executive Members supported?*

15. The continuation of joint oversight on the key 'two tier projects' is supported. Although the Joint Leaders meetings took place on the same day as LGNY&Y anything that reduces meetings is welcomed. With wider partner involvement in these project areas (and more generally) it is felt that this oversight could be exercised by LGNY&Y. It is therefore recommended that the business of the joint leaders meetings be dealt with in this way. Two things arise:

- Maintaining momentum. All of the two tier projects have partnership arrangements of some form overseeing the work. It is important that Leaders through LGNY&Y maintain strategic oversight and direction of this work, as well as identifying new opportunities. LGNY&Y will therefore receive update reports as required where decisions are required but should as a minimum receive an annual report (say one topic per meeting) that accounts for progress, efficiencies and how the projects are expected to continue with defined outcomes etc. To start with this should apply to the key areas of:

Access to services
Housing
Waste
Transport

Leaders may wish to identify other areas over time that this approach will apply to.

- Communications. It has been usual for a newsletter to be produced after each Joint Leaders meeting aimed principally at Members and partner organisations to update on progress. If the approach outlined is accepted this would cease as such but it is recommended that LGNY&Y now consider a newsletter. As a body it will be gaining in significance within revised 'regional' arrangements and a newsletter type approach of its work may be more consumable to a wider audience rather than just relying on the circulating/publishing of minutes.

16. District Leaders would like to continue discussions with relevant county portfolio holders on a topic by topic basis and as capacity allows.

17. Since this work commenced there have also been announcements on CAA, LAA, LEPs etc all of which have some impact on partnership working. There was an emphasis in the work about greater integration between the NYSP thematic partnership and the LSPs and now a more wider acceptance about the timeliness of some partnership rationalisation proposals which will be progressed.

Opportunities for future collaborations

18. Future collaborations need to rise above past events. There is enough common ground to do this but some new models of working will be required to stick with it. The pace and rationale for collaboration will be different amongst the Councils which may in itself define the opportunities without working to the lowest common denominator. Therefore any overarching commitment that can be made needs to

19. It is more likely that there will be District to District collaboration on front line services. Similarly the County Council would potentially look to other partners in its key service areas where there is service synergy. There are other front line opportunities where there is a shared interest e.g. waste. It is important this scenery is recognised.
20. Back office or support services have a greater potential for wider collaboration. It is recognised that the greater cost savings will be in front line services when looking at the balance of Councils costs. Support services costs must however continue to be challenged. A considerable cost of support service charges is held in corporate estates (workspace). There is seen to be potential in legal, human resources, asset management and printing and reprographics as areas to test out new approaches and models of working which would allow a 'menu' driven choice. Sharing existing BPI work or sharing the load in developing new approaches should be considered. Fees and charges should be compared/reviewed beyond normal Council budgetary processes
21. The question raised was to test if *this approach had resonance and not seen as an aversion to District/County collaboration. Is there a commitment to look further at these areas and develop possible business case/actions for further consideration? We can not do everything at once. There is a view from the group looking at this work that as far as wider collaborations are concerned we should concentrate next on:*
- Asset Management
Income i.e. fees and charges and new areas of potential
BPI*
22. The basic view is that those who need to seek partnership solutions will do so. Partnership groupings or relationships will emerge that have purpose to those who want to be involved. Finding the right hubs with a shared can do attitude is what is required. It is as much about identifying sharing aspirations as it is about timing of opportunities to make them happen and for others to join later.
23. The most established examples of shared service partnerships are on internal audit (District based and County/City of York partnership), building control and the full shared service approach between Hambleton and Richmondshire. Tourism should also be included – although in transition. Scarborough is developing an approach with local partners. Craven, Harrogate, Selby are seeking to work closer together.
24. This in itself does not answer the key question of who is more definitely interested in what on any wider basis and timing issues. Therefore whilst the consultation with individual councils about the April report was ongoing, the FOC group has progressed this. A successful bid was made under the Regional Improvement and Efficiency programme (RIEP) and £220k (£130K revenue; £90K capital) was secured to initiate the programme and as a result a scoping document has been produced and agreed by the group.
25. This paper is therefore seeking support to the “**North Yorkshire & York Shared Service Programme**” **scoping report**. This is attached at Annex C and rehearses the strategic need to explore a shared service programme including:

- a) Public authorities in the area are predominantly providing a whole range of in-house services and support services in line with local choices and priorities. It is recognised that the future financial constraints means that there is ever greater value in reviewing services and particularly those where there is scope to share and enjoy economies of scale and / or rationalisation.
- b) This initiative should help to secure significant (and quantifiable) efficiency savings and a sustainable model to share which provides local options (where possible and desirable) and allows for equity of partners whilst having the appropriate amount of governance.
- c) In some areas it is anticipated that there is scope for a better experience for the customer through joint-working (e.g. waste coordination and where organisations share place and customer).

26. The Scoping document proposes that the programme will

- a) Identify those areas where partners wish to explore shared services
- b) Provide benchmark data to help identify where each organisation has the greatest potential for savings and / or improvements
- c) Develop the means by which shared services can be taken forward on a genuine partnership basis (as opposed to contractual relationships) but without developing undue bureaucracy
- d) Improve collaborative working and coordination within and between the public agencies listed above leading to an ongoing culture of collaboration (i.e. where individual organisations look to work together before contemplating going solo)
- e) Challenge assumptions and “sacred cows” on the delivery of services and thereby move towards genuine transformation across the partners
- f) Develop a set of real practical opportunities for sharing which partners are willing to take up
- g) Ensure sufficient capacity and expertise to seize the opportunities that are available in the short and medium term, recognising that there will inevitably be a need to re-engineer whatever services are to be shared

27. These will ultimately lead to

- Shared services in place (for some partners and for some or all services – to be determined)
- The delivery of tangible financial savings
- Efficiency gains through the rationalisation and improvement of business processes
- Where possible, better services for customers

28. To date the following organisations have expressed their support to the project as follows:

- All the councils in York & North Yorkshire and North Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Service have given their support
- The National Parks have expressed a willingness to look at opportunities as the work progresses.
- North Yorkshire Police are reviewing regional collaboration opportunities but have expressed an interest in participating so opportunities where more local collaboration is appropriate can be seized.

29. The project is being led by Hambleton & Richmondshire District Councils, reporting to the FOC group. There will be further reports as the work progresses.
30. A project team has been established. Consultancy support will be secured, using the RIEP funding, to provide an independent challenge to partners and the project team. They will also facilitate discussions and explorations of shared services opportunities, barriers, concerns and risks with individual partners and develop a challenging but achievable delivery plan. The consultants will present their findings about
- the feasibility of the NY & Y Shared Services Programme
 - make recommendations about implementing the programme including the possible structures/vehicles for sharing services, governance issues and risks
 - the resources individual partners are able to contribute to implementing the Programme
31. It is envisaged that this will be progress over the next six months with a view to, by the end of March 2011, being in a position to commence implementation of a programme.
32. A further successful bid has been made under the Regional Improvement and Efficiency programme (RIEP) to support some joint **Asset Management** work (Annex D). This was an area which has had strong support from across the sub-region and £310k (£180k revenue; £130k capital) was secured to initiate the programme. The following has been produced and agreed by the group as intended outcomes:-
- improve data on property assets within and across the public agencies listed above leading to a resource for better decision-making
 - improve collaborative working and coordination within and between the public agencies listed above leading to better asset management of the public estate
 - improve asset efficiency through taking opportunities to co-locate, dispose of surplus assets, improve utilisation of existing assets through better space planning and multi-use and transfer of assets between agencies as appropriate.
 - ensure sufficient capacity and expertise to maintain an effective asset strategy and sustainable lean asset management processes across agencies in the medium term.
33. In practical terms, this piece of work has commenced with the collation and mapping of all of the public sector assets across York and North Yorkshire. Once this data is available partners will be able to have a holistic view and the right conversations can take place between organisations. It is recognised that this will not happen by itself and leadership will be required to challenge the way in which organisations currently think about assets and service provision. To assist, it is likely that some external challenge will be brought in so that a longer term approach to asset management can be developed whilst recognising any short-term opportunities. There are clear financial benefits in trying to rationalise assets across the sub-region. However, there are also potential benefits in trying to identify more creative ways by which the sector collectively funds development at a time when capital funding is being hit even harder than revenue.

34. Fees and charges is an area where there is less room to manoeuvre. The 'Chief Finance Officers' have shared what exists. Most of the statutory fees are set on an historical base of the time involved etc and any fundamental review is unlikely to achieve any sense of common fee structures or be worth it in terms of yield. If the Government deregulates such as planning fees then this topic will be returned to. Additionally new opportunities for any new income streams will be shared e.g. Hambleton charges for street naming and numbering which will now be considered by the other District Councils who do not.
35. A further opportunity is available following the creation of a Business Redesign project to work across the region in establishing joint approaches to business transformation. This includes the setting up of a network to share knowledge and best practice and a joint training programme on business redesign, lean approach and other business transformation methodologies. Further information has not been provided to date (this project is being run by Hull & the Humber) but York and North Yorkshire partners were mindful that this project needs to be very practically focussed if it is to add value. In anticipation or in advance of this work we will be cataloguing BPI work that exists for wider sharing.

Waste

36. Waste was identified as an area of greater opportunity. The Waste Partnership is progressing key areas of development but there is a view that this will require a refreshed strategic oversight to make progress. There is also an issue about accounting for progress either in terms of service improvement, cashable or other efficiencies or future costs foregone. This applies across the 'enhanced two tier' collaborations.
37. The question raised was to test if *leaders want to explore this further to have this debate? Do Leaders wish to charge each of the enhanced two tier projects to adopt a methodology that tracks or accounts for improvements, efficiencies or costs foregone?*
38. Yes seems to be the consensus answer. Waste should therefore be the subject of the first 'annual report' to LGNY&Y and from this seek agreement/endorsement to a timed forward plan of action.

Economic Development

39. Economic Development activities are a specific area of common interest.
40. The question raised was to test if *it was worth some further work on defining roles and responsibilities to identify any duplication that may exist?*
41. Yes seems to be the consensus answer. Therefore the FOC group has made initial enquiries about the scope for sharing Economic Development Services as identified in the work on future collaborations. This has added impetus around the development of Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) and is supported from that perspective also.
42. As a result of these developments, the FOC group carried out an initial piece of work to identify some baseline data about Economic Development Services across North Yorkshire. The data that was compiled is only indicative and will

- a) There are approximately up to 80 staff working in this service.
 - b) The salaries for these staff potentially total in excess of £2m.
 - c) Hambleton, Richmondshire & Ryedale are interested in exploring a shared service across North Yorkshire, and Craven has indicated its principle support
 - d) Harrogate's preference is to work with the Leeds City Region including Craven DC & Selby DC.
 - e) Selby's role in economic development work is that of facilitator and although they have few resources in this service, are prepared to look at sharing services where appropriate. They are still to determine whether they sign up to the Leeds City Region or the North Yorkshire Sub region or both in terms of LEPs
 - f) Scarborough BC is happy to give consideration to any proposals for joint working in Economic Development (Regeneration) particularly with the development of, and in light of, LEP's.
 - g) NYCC and the York & North Yorkshire Partnership Unit are supportive of shared services, particularly in the context of LEPs.
43. As a result of these initial data exchanges, Hambleton, Richmondshire & Ryedale DCs have agreed to explore a shared service proposition in more detail, with a view to creating a solution which would not prejudice the outcome of any further study which arises from the LEP developments. With this in mind discussions will also take place, as part of the initial explorations, with NYCC and the Partnership Unit.

Total Place

44. Total place has been considered as this is part of the Treasury Operational Efficiency Programme. The national pilots are in varying degrees of progress but there are no firm results from this work as yet. The Total Place approach is seen as having something to offer – but none want to get bogged down in the bureaucracy of the process. There are a number of initiatives already which can be aligned with Total Place thinking with some Councils wanting to initiate and others potentially joining in. The LGA are seeking to influence the coalition Government to take this initiative through with placed based budgeting. An LGA Paper is attached at annex C.
45. The question raised was to test if *the approach could be utilised around waste, asset management and what has emerged from the discussions – independent living. There are also more local initiatives which Councils have or are wanting to progress. The general view is that Total Place thinking should be applied to initiatives we wish to pursue but not become the initiative.*
46. These views were generally supported and will influence the shape of some of the work as it moves forward rather than become the work.

Peter Simpson – Chief Executive, Hambleton and Richmondshire District Councils

Paul Ellis – Craven District Council

Liz Smith - Hambleton and Richmondshire District Councils

Sandra Walbran – Hambleton and Richmondshire District Councils
Rachel Bowles – Harrogate Borough Council
Gary Fielding – North Yorkshire County Council
Alan Layton – Scarborough Borough Council
Jonathan Lund – Selby District Council
Paul Cresswell – Ryedale District Council

September 2010