

---

## **CHESHIRE LAA: original Agreement evaluation and new Agreement update report**

---

### **Introduction**

The Communities of Cheshire Partnership asked to receive an evaluation report on the performance management process for the original Cheshire LAA (2007/10) at their next meeting.

Additionally, the lessons learnt from the comments made by Partners have contributed to a revised LAA delivery planning process for the new LAA, to be outlined to Partners as part of this report.

### **Background**

The suggestions and comments made during the meeting of the Communities of Cheshire Partnership in late May included the following:

- Learn more from the PMF (performance management framework) to better monitor risks on what we do not know (e.g. ambers;
- Use more helpful and illuminating milestones in the absence of data to report overall direction of travel
- We need to understand more about the 'spirit' of the indicator and not just the 'letter' of the technical definition of the indicators!
- What is the change in culture being effected by the prioritisation of the LAA, how are we working differently?
- We need to monitor things that make a difference, not just the statistics
- We need to ensure the performance management of the new LAA is mainstreamed with the performance management work of the new local authorities and partners and they both need to be effectively integrated
- LAA targets need to be part of the whole system and not 'bolted on'
- Benchmarking is important and how we compare with others
- We need to better explain to Partners what we are trying to achieve and how activities and projects contribute to the performance indicators
- Explain the technical definition of the indicators more effectively to delivery partners.

Two performance management review (and equality needs impact assessment training) workshops have been held and additional comments were made by those working closely with the new performance indicators. The thematic partnership co-ordinating officers have also provided comments on their previous experience.

As previously identified, the performance management and reporting process for the Cheshire Local Area Agreement is complex as delivery is achieved across a range of partner organisations with information on progress drawn from a variety of systems and sources. It is, therefore, important to learn lessons from the experiences of the last twelve months to determine how performance of the 'new style' LAA (in effect from 1 July 2008) will be more effectively managed. This includes a need for:

- more robust baselines and targets across all indicators;
- the development of interim milestones against which in-year performance and progress can be measured;
- further streamlining of performance management systems both across the partnership and internally;
- more robust data quality controls (including more systematic capturing of actions); and
- more localised targets according to needs and priorities (including targeting interventions in specific communities);

The role of LAAs in the new national Comprehensive Area Assessment (CAA) inspection regime to be introduced from April 2009, further reinforces the importance of more effective LAA performance monitoring, reporting and management.

### **Review and re-design**

A review of the original LAA performance management framework has been undertaken and following the approval of the new model Cheshire LAA (2008/11) by the Secretary of State (June 31<sup>st</sup>): new delivery planning guidance and a template (**see Appendix A below**) has been distributed to those responsible for the new performance indicators.

The delivery plans include sections covering:

- *Performance Indicator details – separable baselines and targets*
- *Officer contact details-*
- *Key issues – e.g. are the new indicators practical for Year 1?*
- *Delivery Plan information*
- *Measurable milestones/actions*
- *Resources*
- *Risk and Equality Needs Impact Assessments*
- *Data Quality Assurance*
- *Sign off – approval and authorisation*
- *Non Designated Local Indicator definitions – are they SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time-bound)*

To reflect the new interim Agreement and the new 35 indicators (supported by 18 non-designated local indicators): a new process has been devised to support LAA performance reporting. The layout of a delivery plan proforma for each of the new LAA indicators was distributed to the Responsible Officers on the 17<sup>th</sup> July. The completion date for all the new delivery plans was the 15<sup>th</sup> August. (The statutory early years and child attainment measures will be reported directly to DFES).

(The Excelsis software used to record performance for the original LAA has been temporarily suspended from use until the creation of integrated versions of the software is available i.e. combining all 198 national indicators, not just LAA. These new systems are due to be introduced for Cheshire East and Cheshire West and Chester Councils from the 1<sup>st</sup> April 2009.)

A high level risk assessment has been produced on the challenges of implementing the new interim LAA, resulting in some concerning high scores on a number of key partnership issues (**see Appendix B**).

### **Next steps**

Presently, there are a number of outstanding (designated and non-designated) delivery plans which have not been completed and returned for comment and advice to ensure they are robust and will be effective. This requires urgent action.

The GONW (Government Office North West) have forwarded a report template which will be used to evaluate local progress for CLG (Communities and Local Government), as part of the review process anticipated over the winter period (**see Appendix C**). The CLG quality assurance report outlines a number of categories in addition to clear performance indicator reports, which will be particularly challenging for Cheshire: these include:

- *named partners commitment*
- *the development of partner skills and capacity*
- *collaboration between partners (data sharing and mutual support and challenge to drive improvement) and cross working*
- *improved partnership communication*
- *delivering the new 'duty to involve' and enhancing community empowerment*
- *innovation and good practice – involving the private and Third sectors.*

If our local performance management culture is to be improved and the lessons from the management and co-ordination of the original LAA are to be learnt a number of key actions need to be undertaken to improve local performance and accountability. In order to address some of the more demanding issues outlined above, it is necessary to complete the delivery planning templates, so a greater understanding of the thematic partnership activity across the Blocks can support delivery of agreed LAA priorities and maximise their impact. These actions will help to provide a sounder basis for the introduction of CAA to Cheshire and ensure that the training and capacity building work to be delivered through the RIEP (Regional Improvement and Efficiency Programme) project will also be maximised.

Finally, the timescales and forthcoming milestones are included in the table below and indicate that implementing and reporting on progress on the new Agreement will be demanding. Especially, when additional consideration is given to the process of transfer of legal accountability and responsibility for the LAA and it's integration into the delivery and reporting commitments.

<b>Key dates</b>	<b>Key tasks and milestones</b>
1st July 2008	LAA implementation
15th September	LAA Delivery Plan completion
5 <sup>th</sup> September	Communities of Cheshire Partnership meeting
15 <sup>th</sup> September	LAA Delivery Plans evaluated and assessed against SMART criteria and guidance
Mid September	GONW refresh action plan and delivery plans completed
30 <sup>th</sup> September	LAA Delivery Plans signed off by Thematic Partnership Chairs
1 <sup>st</sup> November	new Local Authority Chief Execs. appointed
7th November	Communities of Cheshire Partnership – LAA mid-year outturn report
19th November	Performance and Overview Committee (Cheshire County Council) - Half Year outturn report
November/December	CLG & GONW Review and Refresh discussions
November/December	Cheshire East and Cheshire West and Chester Councils - Year 2 target review and negotiation
2nd December	Cheshire East Council Executive - Half Year outturn report
10th December	Cheshire West and Cheshire Council Executive - Half Year outturn report
9th January 2009	Communities of Cheshire Partnership meeting - Quarter 3 performance exception report
mid January	First annual CLG & GONW LAA Review held and recorded
22nd January	Performance and Overview Committee (Cheshire County Council) - Quarter 3 performance exception report
29th January	Executive (Cheshire County Council) - Quarter 3 performance exception report
30th January	GONW completion of Year 2 negotiation
3rd February	Cheshire East Council Executive - Quarter 3 performance exception report
11th February	Cheshire West and Cheshire Council Executive - Quarter 3 performance exception report
6th March	Communities of Cheshire Partnership meeting - Half Year Delivery Report
27th March	CLG approval of refreshed LAAs
1st April	Cheshire East and Cheshire West and Chester Councils vesting day
1st April	Cheshire East and Cheshire West and Chester LSPs in place
1st April	New LAA period commences
	* Cheshire Governance Board dates to be confirmed.

## **Conclusion**

Significant progress has been made to date in developing the new interim Agreement, complete with separable baselines and targets to be inherited by the new Councils and LSPs. However, the completion of the paper exercise will provide partners with the intelligence to engage in closer and more effective service planning and delivery and maintain an important focus for partners while the new local authorities take shape.

## **RECOMMENDED:**

- 1. The Thematic Partnership Chairs ensure and support the immediate completion of the outstanding LAA delivery plans, by ensuring all named partners undertake their performance management responsibilities.**
- 2. The Communities of Cheshire Partnership consider any future actions it wishes to take in response to the CLG quality assurance requirements.**

## **Contact details:**

Robbie Taylor – Partnership Business Unit

Tel: 01244 972224

[Robbie.taylor@cheshire.gov.uk](mailto:Robbie.taylor@cheshire.gov.uk)



# Cheshire's 2008/09 Interim Local Area Agreement

## LAA INDICATOR DELIVERY PLAN GUIDANCE (including Delivery Plan proforma)

**Includes** – Delivery plan guidance  
Risk assessment guidance  
Equality Needs Impact Assessment guidance

**Date :29 August 2008**

## **Contents**

	Page
1. 0 – Purpose	1
2.0 – Background	1
2.1 - Performance Management and the Local Area Agreement	1
3.0 - Roles and responsibilities	1
3.1 – Responsible Officers	1
3.2 - Partnership co-ordinators	2
3.3 – Thematic Partnership Blocks – led by a Partnership Chair	2
3.4 - Cheshire Information Liaison Group (CILG)	2
4.0 - Delivery Planning: A guide	3
4.1 – Timescales	3
4.2 – Format	3
4.3 - Requirements	3
4.3.1 - Performance Indicator details	
4.3.2 – Officer contact details	3
4.3.3 - Key issues	4
4.3.4 – Delivery Plan information	4
4.3.5 - Measurable milestones/actions	4
4.3.6 - Resources	5
4.3.7 – Risk	5
4.3.8 - Data Quality	6
4.3.9 - Sign off	6
4.3.10 - Non Designated Local Indicator definitions	7

## **Appendices**

	Page
Appendix 1 Delivery Plan Proforma	8
Appendix 2 Risk assessment guidance	14
Appendix 3 Equality Needs Impact Assessment guidance	19
Appendix 4 The Vision and Priorities for Cheshire	26

## **1.0 - Purpose**

The purpose of this booklet is to provide Responsible Officers with guidance for the completion of LAA delivery plans.

### **Important note**

The **LAA Indicator Delivery Plan proforma** (delivery plan) that needs to be completed by Responsible Officers and signed by them, the Partnership Co-ordinator and the Partnership Chair is on **page 8**.

## **2.0 – Background**

### **2.1 - Performance Management and the Local Area Agreement**

Robust performance management continues to be critical to the delivery of outcomes specified in the Local Area Agreement. Broadly defined, it involves the monitoring, analysis, and evaluation of current performance in order to drive forward continuous improvement.

Managing performance is more than just recording and reporting. Its value lies in learning from results and taking action where required. Indeed, it allows partners to address the following critical questions:

- ◆ What are we trying to achieve?
- ◆ What resources are we putting in?
- ◆ What are we delivering on the ground with these resources?
- ◆ Are we hitting our targets?
- ◆ What are we achieving in reality?
- ◆ Do we have the right information at the right time?
- ◆ Are we doing it cost effectively?
- ◆ Is it what we wanted to achieve?
- ◆ How can we do things better?
- ◆ How can we communicate our progress to Government Office North West?

Consequently, **a Performance Management Framework (PMF) has been written (please see separate document)**. It outlines the principles behind performance management, the responsibilities of various individuals, groups and partnerships, the reporting cycle, arrangements to manage underperformance, and the potential system used to support the framework.

## **3.0 - Roles and responsibilities**

### **3.1 - Responsible Officers**

The central message of the PMF document is that each of the LAA Indicators will be assigned at least one named individual or 'Responsible Officer'. The officer will be responsible for coordinating the performance monitoring and management of the delivery of a particular LAA Indicator and the associated risks. This involves:

- ◆ developing a delivery plan on an annual basis (including post LGR)
- ◆ co-ordinating the support from other relevant partners to help achieve delivery
- ◆ collecting the data required to inform performance indicators
- ◆ measuring the progress of performance indicators
- ◆ measuring the progress of milestones/actions
- ◆ presenting a quarterly progress report to their respective Partnership co-ordinator.
- ◆ taking action in areas of under performance

The progress of the LAA indicators will be used to measure the progress of the thematic partnership blocks and the LAA as a whole.

### **3.2 - Partnership co-ordinators**

Partnership co-ordinators have strategic responsibility to maintain an overview of the issues in relation to the whole partnership block. They must regularly engage with responsible officers, other Partnership co-ordinators, and partner agencies to maintain an awareness of the risks, dependencies, progress, finance, and performance issues. They will be responsible for reporting progress to their respective thematic partnership on a quarterly basis and ensuring key milestone performance details are completed to ensure that timely progress reports can be provided to the CCP.

### **3.3 - Thematic Partnerships– Led by a Partnership Chair**

Thematic Partnerships are responsible for signing off delivery plans, monitoring performance and risks of the partnership block on a quarterly basis and addressing any underperformance and seeking to identify any solutions as specified in the PMF. The Partnership Chairs are required to report to the CCP on performance issues. The Thematic Partnership Chair on behalf of the Thematic Partnership is accountable for the achievement of targets around each of the LAA indicators.

### **3.4 - Cheshire Information Liaison Group (CILG)**

The Cheshire Information Liaison Group brings together research and information practitioners from across the partnership. Members of the group provide research advice within their own organisations and collectively can help the LAA to:

- ◆ Co-ordinate data gathering and data processing activities in Cheshire
- ◆ Identify data needs and problems and to propose common solutions where applicable.
- ◆ Comment and advise on statistical issues
- ◆ Co-ordinate use of resources for data gathering, processing, analysis and dissemination.
- ◆ Commission additional research required to support the outcomes

## **4.0 - Delivery Planning: A guide**

A delivery plan specifies the resources and actions required to achieve specified outcomes. Good delivery plans ensure that:

- ◆ resources are prioritised
- ◆ individuals are aware of their responsibilities
- ◆ progress can be measured, evaluated and inform decision making.

### **4.1 - Timescales**

They will be annual in focus, covering the major activities related to a specific LAA indicator within a single year of the LAA. They will also need to be updated, at least, on a quarterly basis to measure progress achieved within a particular year.

### **4.2 - Format**

Delivery plans will contain the following sections:

- ◆ **Performance Indicator details**
- ◆ **Officer contact details**
- ◆ **Key issues**
- ◆ **Delivery Plan information**
- ◆ **Measurable milestones/actions**
- ◆ **Resources**
- ◆ **Risk**
- ◆ **Data Quality**
- ◆ **Sign off**
- ◆ **Non Designated Local Indicator definitions**

### **4.3 - Requirements**

#### **4.3.1 – Performance Indicator Details**

This will be pre-filled with the relevant information to ensure that all parties are clear what has been agreed. It will include:

- ◆ Indicator Number
- ◆ Indicator Name
- ◆ Indicator Baseline (incl. West/East split)
- ◆ Indicator Target (inc. West/East split)

#### **4.3.2 – Officer Contact Details**

The purpose of this section is to allocate who is responsible for what. It must be fully completed with named individuals. Non completion or vacant posts will NOT be acceptable.

### 4.3.3 – Key Issues

Due to the tight nature of this year’s LAA timetable and the background of LGR in Cheshire; it was felt that everyone who is associated with the LAA needs to be aware straight away of the major issues (if any) facing the delivery of each individual LAA indicator.

It may be easier for Responsible Officers to leave this section until the end so that they can consider the full picture before raising any issues.

This section may include

- ◆ LGR issues
- ◆ Reporting issues
- ◆ Staffing issues
- ◆ Resource issues
- ◆ High level Risks etc.

### 4.3.4 – Delivery Plan Information

This section allows the responsible officer to outline their key plan for the delivery of the LAA indicator. The main description must include details of how this will be achieved, measured and reported internally (if necessary), including a West & East focus and identified high IMD scoring neighbourhoods where applicable.

It must also include the following:

- ◆ The relevant community strategy priority that the LAA indicator contributes towards (See **Appendix 4**)
- ◆ A Proposal for the delivery of this LAA Indicator for both East and West Cheshire
- ◆ Details of how the delivery plan will be measured on a local scale if the indicator is a ‘narrowing the gap’ indicator. (For a list of these indicators please see separate document).

### 4.3.5 – Measurable Milestones/Actions

Milestones must specify necessary detailed stages required for delivery of each delivery plan. They are useful tools for prioritising resources, confirming the roles and responsibilities of individuals involved, and monitoring progress.

#### **Important note**

The milestones included in a delivery plan are **essential** in managing performance when the PI’s only report on an annual or even less frequent basis.

The progress achieved to date against milestones will be reported alongside that of the indicator and may be the only measure indicating progress on a quarterly basis.

**Each individual milestone contributing to the achievement of an LAA indicator requires a description** and will need to include:

- ◆ The lead individual (if different)
- ◆ A description of the action
- ◆ The deadline
- ◆ In-year milestones or activities that will be critical for the action to be achieved within the specified timescale. For actions which have a particularly long timescale, this will be essential.

#### Cheshire West and Chester and Cheshire East

From quarter 3 and beyond it is expected that each of the delivery plans will be presented to the shadow authorities and as such must be appropriately constructed for both Cheshire West and Chester and Cheshire East

Milestones/Actions need to be selected carefully to ensure that they are:

- S** – Specific
- M** - Measurable
- A** - Achievable
- R** - Realistic
- T** – Timebound.

For example, a non-**SMART** action could be "Develop School Coordinators project." This tells us nothing of the schools involved, when the action will be completed and consequently it is impossible to say whether it is achievable or realistic. The following is a SMART alternative:

*"All Schools in Cheshire to be part of the School Sports Co-ordinators project by September 2008".*

As a guide, it is recommended that **no more than three milestones/actions** are attached to any one delivery plan.

#### **4.3.6 - Resources**

This section allows the responsible officer to briefly describe the resources involved in delivery. Please include:

- ◆ The available budget for the year of the plan and any 'in kind' contributions
- ◆ The source of finance
- ◆ Any human resources

Further information on how you may wish to spend your resources on specific activities may be included under the action plan section.

#### **4.3.7 – Risk and Equality Needs Impact Assessment**

**Risks** are defined as:

***'The chance of something happening that will have an impact on objectives'.***

Therefore they will be the things that will stop you achieving your delivery plan and would therefore identify future controls to try and reduce the likelihood of it happening or the impact if it does. You may also identify positive risks (opportunities) things that will help you achieve the LAA indicator and you would want to encourage.

It is important that risks are identified and anticipated from the outset in order that future controls can be put in place to manage them.

Risks may be specific to a particular LAA indicator or may be cross-cutting.

For each risk, you will need to include

- ◆ A description of the risk
- ◆ Whether the risk is LAA indicator specific or cross cutting
- ◆ An evaluation of the risk based on its likelihood and potential impact
- ◆ Current controls in place to address the risk

Further guidance on the risk assessment can be found in Appendix 2.

**Equality Needs Impact Assessment** - Partner organisations responsible for the delivery planning and performance management of the 35 designated indicators of the new model LAA, are required to undertake an ENIA on all new policies and for policies that have been subject to significant change. However, named public bodies (for race) and those providing public services (for gender and disability) there is a legal duty to conduct an EINA, rather than just at a point of significant change to an existing policy (or new policy). However, to establish consistent good practice throughout, it is recommended a thorough assessment is undertaken.

When the two new local authorities of Cheshire West and Chester and Cheshire East and the new LSPs (Local Strategic Partnerships) assume responsibility for LAA implementation on vesting day (1<sup>st</sup> April 2009), they will be provided with this instruction as a legacy to ensure the demonstrable profile on equality and diversity is maintained and reported upon regularly.

A high level assessment of the LAA outcomes to guide individual equality needs impact assessments can be found in **Appendix 3**.

#### **4.3.8 – Data Quality**

This section is taken directly from the standard data quality proforma for all 198 National Indicators that will have to be completed by all custodians.

To **avoid duplication** by the Responsible officers the 35 LAA indicators (taken from the 198 NI's) will complete the data quality **on this form only** and the records will be kept together with those returned for the remaining 198.

#### **4.3.9 – Sign Off**

This section requires 3 signatures before it can be approved. These are:

- ◆ Partnership Chair - The person responsible for monitoring and reporting of partnership block performance to the CCP.

- ◆ Partnership Co-ordinator - The person responsible for signing off the performance indicator.
- ◆ Responsible Officer - The person responsible for writing the delivery plan and ensuring the successful delivery of milestones/actions linked and impacting on the performance indicator and successfully delivering the associated targets. They will be responsible for understanding the definition of the indicator and ensuring systems can meet these requirements.

To ensure accountability this section **must** be completed in order to help meet the new legal duty of regard conferred by the Secretary of State in the new model LAAs.

#### **4.3.10 - Non Designated Local Indicators – Definition**

Each non designated local indicator must also complete the above process and in addition must complete a full definition as it may not currently exist. The format for this section follows the template as set out in the National Indicator definitions.

#### **Important Note**

If this section is not completed then the local indicator is not sufficiently defined for inclusion in the LAA and as such **will not be included.**

**2008/09 LAA NATIONAL INDICATOR – DELIVERY PLAN**

**Section 1 – Performance Indicator Details (Non designated local indicators – see Section 10)**

<b>i. Indicator number</b>		
<b>ii. Indicator name</b>		
<b>iii. Indicator baseline</b>	<b>West</b>	<b>East</b>
<b>iv. Indicator target</b>	<b>West</b>	<b>East</b>

**Section 2 – Officer Contact Details**

- i. Partnership Chair** (The person responsible for monitoring and reporting of partnership block performance to CCP)
- ii. Partnership Co-ordinator** (The person responsible for signing off the performance indicator.)
- iii. Responsible Officer** (The person responsible for writing this delivery plan and ensuring the successful delivery of actions linked and impacting on this performance indicator and successfully delivering the associated targets. They will be responsible for understanding the definition of the indicator and ensuring systems can meet these requirements.)
- iv. Technical Officer** (If there is someone other than the Responsible Officer who would be better suited to discuss detailed questions around the calculation of this performance indicator, please list them here.)
- iv. Organisation**
- v. Department/Service**

**Section 3 – Key Issues**

**Are there any issues with this LAA indicator that need to be flagged straight away that may cause objectives to be missed or that need the immediate attention of Partners etc.?**

**Date –**

**Issue description –**

**Recommended action -**

**Section 4 – Delivery Plan information**

**Delivery Plan Description – Including relevant Community Strategy priority**

**Proposal for West Cheshire -**

**Proposal for East Cheshire -**

**Is this a ‘Narrowing the gap’ indicator? If yes, please demonstrate how you will be providing data at a neighbourhood level.**

**Section 5 – Measurable Milestones/Action –** Each Delivery Plan must include in year milestones to ensure that the delivery plans are on target. Milestones for Q3 onwards must indicate if they apply to West or East Cheshire only (not County wide)

MEASURABLE MILESTONE/ACTION DESCRIPTION	Please (X) relevant quarter to be achieved			
	Q1	Q2	Q3 W/E	Q4 W/E

**Section 6 – Resources**

**i. Available budget/description of contribution “in kind”**

**ii. Source of Finance**

iii. Human Resources

**Section 7 – Risk and Equality Needs Impact Assessment**

**RISK ASSESSMENT**

Description of the risk	A	B	L	I	Current Controls	L x I = Score	Future Controls	Individual responsible

**A = Either – Indicator specific (please put X)**      **L = Likelihood (on a scale of 1-4)**  
**B = Or – Cross cutting (please put X)**              **I = Impact (on a scale of 1-4)**

**EQUALITY NEEDS IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

- **Stage 1** – opportunities and risks - opportunities for benefiting a range of communities and the relations between them - risks of inequality or discrimination.
- **Stage 2** – research and consultation stage to ensure evidence based policy making.
- **Stage 3** – action planning and commitment to continuous review.
- **Stage 4** – published outline of the way forward and performance indicators (Stage 4 can be completed through an co-ordinated approach, in addition to an individual action).

## **Section 8 – Data Quality - Performance Indicator Calculation Methodology and Quality Assurance Procedures**

**i. Is this indicator produced as the result of a data return to Central Government? If “Yes” please specify what return this is and at what time of the year this data is available?**

**ii. Can the indicator been produced in line with the definition? (The latest guidance can be found at the following link:**

**<http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/localgovernment/finalnationalindicators>**

Yes/No

**If no, please explain.**

**iii. Management checks on the data – What Management checks will be undertaken to ensure the accuracy of the data?**

**iv. Brief description of the system which will be used to produce the indicator, please include the source of input data.**

**vi. Is the source information used to produce this performance indicator stored on an IT system (Y/N)? If “Yes” please specify which organisation is responsible for the supporting IT system.**

**vii. Please detail the arrangements in place to ensure: the security of the stored information and the backup/recovery of information in the event of a system failure?**

## Section 9 – Sign Off

Could you please ensure the form has been signed by the relevant Partnership Co-ordinator.

I hereby certify that I have examined the entry(ies) within the enclosed return and that to the best of my knowledge and belief:

- The procedures for monitoring and managing performance against targets are robust, are supported by adequate systems of internal control and are sufficiently reliable to support the information submitted
- We can apply the correct definition and criteria for the production of performance the indicator.

**Name of Partnership  
Chair**

**Partnership Chair  
signature**

**Name of Partnership  
Co-ordinator**

**Partnership Co-  
ordinator signature**

**Name of Responsible  
Officer**

**Responsible Officer  
signature**

Please return the completed form to Jon Amos, Cheshire County Council, Room 203, County Hall, Chester, CH1 1SF, or e-mail it to [Jonathan.Amos@Cheshire.gov.uk](mailto:Jonathan.Amos@Cheshire.gov.uk)

The deadline for returning the form is **15<sup>th</sup> August 2008**

**Section 10 – Non Designated Local Indicators Only – This must be completed in full for the indicator to proceed in the LAA**

<b>Rationale</b>			
<b>Definition</b>			
<b>Formula</b>			
<b>Worked Example</b>		<b>Good Performance</b>	
<b>Collection interval</b>		<b>Data Source</b>	
<b>Return Format</b>		<b>Decimal Places</b>	
<b>Reporting Organisation</b>			
<b>Spatial Level</b>			
<b>Further Guidance</b>			

**Risk Assessment Quick Guide**

**Definitions**

A Hazard:	Something that could cause you harm e.g. failure to secure grant to achieve objectives
Risk:	Chance of something happening that impacts on your LAA indicator e.g. you could be run over by moving traffic and fail to get to work safely
Risk Management:	Identifying and assessing the risk to decide on appropriate action e.g. take action to avoid the cars possibly walk to the crossing

Keep referring to these objectives throughout this process to ensure you remain focused on what you are trying to achieve.

**Identification**

Think of the main things that could stop you achieving those objectives in a brainstorming exercise. These are all your **negative risks**.

Then think of any opportunities that could happen to help you achieve your objectives. These are your **positive risks**.

**Evaluation**

Have a look at the risks you have identified in the brainstorming; weed out any duplicates and group similar ones together. Then try to add some clarity by expressing each risk as:

Event - Result - Consequence.

- ◆ Event (lack of ..., failure to ...) e.g. lack of skills in the workforce
- ◆ Result (leads to ...) e.g. posts remain vacant
- ◆ Consequences (impact) e.g. unable to complete statutory requirements of ...

**Score Risks**

To score the risks you need to use the scoring charts below to help you assess:

How likely is it that this risk will happen? (on a scale of 1-4)

How bad will it be if it does happen? (on a scale of 1-4)

## Current Controls

Identify the measures that are already in place to reduce the risks. These could be things the service has introduced or be corporate policies and practices. They must not be things that are planned; they must be already working effectively.

Do a reality check – Do the controls you have identified look significant enough to change the gross score into the net score?

You may decide to remove some existing controls where the worst case scenario does not warrant the resources that have gone into controlling it.

## Further Controls

These are measures that you plan to do in order to manage the risk. They will generally fall into one of four categories:

- ◆ Reduce – introduce measures to reduce the likelihood or impact.
- ◆ Avoid – stop the activity altogether so risk is removed.
- ◆ Accept – do nothing and accept the risk as it is.
- ◆ Transfer – via insurance or contracts.

You may decide one of your actions is to remove some of the existing controls to accept more risk.

Remember, impacts do not often change unless you are implementing a contingency plan.

## Evaluation of Risks (Scoring)

Likelihood - How likely is it the risk will happen?			
4	Very likely	> 75% chance	Regular occurrence
3	Likely	40-75% chance	Likely to happen in next 1-2 years
2	Unlikely	10-40% chance	Only likely to happen every 3 or more years
1	Very unlikely	< 10% chance	Rare/never

Impact - How bad will it be if it does happen?			
4	Major	Major loss service 5 + days	> £500k
3	Serious	Complete loss major service area 3-5 days	£50k-£500k
2	Significant	Major effect important service area 2-3 days	£10k-£50k
1	Minor	Brief disruption of important service area > 1 day	< £10k

## Risk Thought Triggers

	Types of Risk to consider / <i>Types of controls</i>
--	--

<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);"><b>Finance</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is causing uncertainty in the funding streams or the expenditure estimates? <b><i>Determine what you can do to unravel/monitor/know quality of info when making decisions.</i></b></li> <li>• Are there a large number of people involved in the committing of expenditure? <b><i>Clear roles responsibilities and delegated powers, flows of info and reporting</i></b></li> <li>• Are the costs being incurred by different organisations? <b><i>Clear roles responsibilities and delegated powers, flows of info.</i></b></li> <li>• Are there external factors that will significantly influence costs? <b><i>How can you monitor? Any control? Contingency plans exit strategies.</i></b></li> <li>• What will prevent the savings being achieved? <b><i>Change, monitor.</i></b></li> <li>• Will this project commit the Council to future costs/ responsibilities? <b><i>Whole life costing</i></b></li> <li>• Is there a possibility of fraud and irregularity? <b><i>Roles and responsibilities, monitoring, flags to identify problems</i></b></li> </ul>
<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);"><b>Partnerships</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How much reliance is there on a partner delivering elements of the project? <b><i>More reliance, more controls to monitor and look forward.</i></b></li> <li>• What are their constraints/ pressure that will affect their ability to deliver? <b><i>Can you affect this, monitor.</i></b></li> <li>• Do you have any conflicting objectives that could cause problems in the future? <b><i>Joint risk assessment to identify and gain shared ownership.</i></b></li> <li>• How financially secure are they? <b><i>Financial checks, constant monitoring of financial position, exit strategy</i></b></li> </ul>
<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);"><b>Community</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there any demographic changes that will change viability of this project? <b><i>Monitoring of democratic/user changes is in place.</i></b> <b><i>Strategies for changing project is demands falls.</i></b></li> <li>• Are there any impacts that will be unpopular for some members of the community? <b><i>Communication strategy with public.</i></b></li> <li>• Are there any social trends that will affect delivery?</li> <li>• Any conflicts between users/other citizens? <b><i>Communication, staff training to deal with conflicts</i></b></li> </ul>

<b>People</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there any cultural changes required? <b>Communications, training, publicity, recognise timetables</b></li> <li>• Are there any structural changes required? <b>Planning should allow for appointments and training etc.</b></li> <li>• Are the necessary skills available to deliver? <b>Training Programme.</b></li> <li>• Are there any health and safety issues? <b>Risk assessments, review equipment needs and</b></li> <li>• Do staff have the capacity to deliver and if not what will be prioritised? <b>Planning takes account all work and resources available.</b></li> <li>• What processes/ways of working will need to change? <b>Has Business Process re-engineering been done, links to culture, training, user roles, checking to see it happen.</b></li> </ul>
<b>Information</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What data will you require to plan the project/deliver the project/run the project? <b>Data collection, cleansing, reformatting, training</b></li> <li>• Is it available/reliable or does it need additional resources to make it useful? <b>New processes to collect/analyse data</b></li> <li>• Will there be a reliance on existing/new technology to provide information? <b>New IT system/hardware security of system</b></li> <li>• Is data managed by another organisation? <b>Source continuity arrangements.</b></li> <li>• How will project be affected by demographic changes? <b>Processes to flag up critical information to key people.</b></li> </ul>
<b>Legal</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is any new legislation on the horizon that could change things? <b>Preparation for changes in legislation.</b></li> <li>• Are there going to be difficulties complying with current legislation? <b>Steps to ensure compliance.</b></li> <li>• Are there conflicts between central/local political views? <b>Discussing with key Members.</b></li> <li>• Is the project a statutory responsibility to provide? <b>If not what viability study.</b></li> </ul>

**CESHIRE LAA (2008/11): High Level Identification of Needs.**

**Introduction**

The document aims to identify and signpost, where applicable, particular needs concerning equality and diversity issues, which have been identified by focus group consultation with representatives of a number of different communities. It will be provided to those co-ordinating officers and those responsible for the delivery planning and/or performance management of the new Cheshire LAA (Local Area Agreement).

An extensive ENIA (Equality Needs Impact Assessment) of the original Cheshire LAA (2007/10) was undertaken in 2007 and circulated to the Co-ordinators of each of the countywide thematic partnerships for consideration and action when approaching the delivery planning stage of implementing the Agreement. Early evaluation of the performance management of the original LAA has not produced any evidence of the overarching ENIA of either being monitored, or reported against. Therefore, it is difficult to demonstrate whether progress, on responding to identified risks for equality groups, has been made when delivering LAA targets. Similarly it is difficult to report on success of where opportunities were identified.

It is intended to ensure equality and diversity impact reporting is more robust when evaluating performance for the new Agreement and that greater responsibility of assessments is undertaken by those officers responsible for each of the designated targets. The Government Office has invested in a Neighbourhood Renewal Adviser's (NRA) support to improve the understanding of our local communities. This followed recent Audit Commission advice about the likely outcome of the national CAA (Comprehensive Area Assessment) consultation and the increase in external attention on equality and diversity issues

This document is not intended as an exhaustive evaluation of specific needs and risks, it is only a broad identification of need, which points to further specific action.

**Actions**

A simplified equality impact assessment process will be introduced to partners at two scheduled workshops (10<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> June 2008) by Prof. Richard Tomlins, who is researching local populations as part of the NRA assignment.

Partner organisations responsible for the delivery planning and performance management of the 35 designated indicators of the new model LAA, are required to undertake an ENIA on all new policies and for policies that have been subject to significant change. However, named public bodies (for race) and those providing public services (for gender and disability) there is a legal duty to conduct an EINA, rather than just at a point of significant change to an existing policy (or new policy).

When the two new local authorities of Cheshire West and Chester and East Cheshire and the new LSPs (Local Strategic Partnerships) assume responsibility for LAA implementation on vesting day (1<sup>st</sup> April 2009), they will be provided with this instruction as a legacy to ensure the demonstrable profile on equality and diversity is maintained.

**Comments**

This initial overarching identification of potential risks to specific local community's residents, has been developed following the findings produced, after four focus groups were asked to comment upon the priorities outlined in the LAA themes following recent consultation on an interim Sustainable Community Strategy for Cheshire.

Additional comments have been sought from disabled people and a local organisation representing lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender communities.

There are six equality strands of race, religion, sexual orientation, age, disability and gender. Race, gender and disability require the statutory EINA. Addressing sexuality, age and faith are matters of best practice and there are compelling arguments that make sense to widen the scope of EINA's to cover social inclusion and cohesion issues. Class definitely crops up in the sections below, as part of the 'narrowing the gap' agenda, of which there are a number of related indicators throughout the 35 performance indicators. Focus group work has included representatives from the Cheshire Older People's Network, Gypsies and Travellers, Polish economic migrant workers and black and minority ethnic communities.

(Although we may be some way off having the disaggregated (East/West) data at this stage (June 2008), we ought to be able to action plan to collect it over the three year life time of the new Agreement).

### Theme 1 – Stronger Communities

Outcome	Issues to Consider
NI 4 % of people who feel they can influence decisions in the locality	Needs to address all six equality elements. Worth posing the question of how far data should be further disaggregated to identify the interventions required for specific groups, within these groups. Eg the interventions for Polish communities might need to be identified rather than simply for BME communities.
NI 8 Adult participation in sport and active recreation	<p>Delivery needs to account for greater availability of affordable and accessible sport and leisure services for older adults and closed sessions for female service users from certain faiths.</p> <p>Use of this indicator to bring different communities into contact and to bring them together to promote community cohesion. There will probably be particular needs to promote the involvement of women in sport and recreation.</p> <p>Need to look at the accessibility of sport for disabled people and whether homophobia is preventing the involvement of LGBT communities.</p>

### Theme 2 – Safer Communities

Outcome	Issues
NI 18 Adult re-offending rates for those under probation supervision	Older adults' perceptions of crime (e.g. bail hostels). Plus data issues to identify those most at risk of re-offending. Probation are probably doing this already but we should be asking whether data is being used to identify those communities that are most at risk of re-offending by ethnicity, gender, disability, faith, age and sexuality The targeted outcome should flow from further investigation of that data.
NI 20 Assault with injury crime	The outcome needs to focus on the risks of hate crime and the six equality strands. Are particular groups are more generally at risk? Data about ethnicity, gender, disability, faith, age and sexuality would help identify patterns that would allow us to target risk where it is more subtle than hate crime e.g. activities or patterns of behaviour that put people at risk or require public safety intervention.
NI 21 Dealing with local concerns about anti-social behaviour and crime by the local	Older People have a high level of concern about perceptions of crime. Concern about the harassment of Polish migrant workers have been expressed, does the Police Helpline monitor the background of callers? How is baseline information collected from members of minority communities? There are cultural, religious and gender issues

councils and police	<p>surrounding the perception of alcohol misuse.</p> <p>Is there any local evidence to support national evidence, that people experience discrimination because of their sexuality, faith or disability? The expectation would be that data is disaggregated and monitored by the 6 equality and diversity strands.</p>
NI 30 Re-offending rate of prolific and priority offenders	<p>Older adult's perceptions of crime (bail hostels). Plus data issues to identify those most at risk of re-offending. Probation are probably doing this already but we should be asking whether data is being used to identify those communities where re-offending is greatest by ethnicity, gender, disability, faith, age and sexuality. The targeted outcome should flow from further investigation of that data.</p> <p>We also need to ask how far the premium service offered as part of the PPO scheme is flexible enough to meet PPO's specific requirements by ethnicity, faith, gender, sexuality, age and disability.</p>
NI 32 Repeat incidents of domestic violence	<p>Issues concerning race, mixed race relationships and same sex relationships and cultural sensitivities surrounding the role of the family.</p> <p>Seems an important area of disaggregating data if we are to make the appropriate interventions. Faith, age and disability would also seem to be relevant to discussion of carers/cared for abuse.</p>
NI 33 Arson incidents	<p>Possible issues surrounding the work to be done to ensure cultural events and religious festivals involving the use of candles and fireworks are safe from risks. Concern about the over-crowding of residences by migrant workers.</p> <p>If we're thinking of arson then the disaggregation of equality and diversity seems most important in terms of the victims. So are properties being targeted because of the race, faith, gender, sexuality, age or disability of the residents/owners?</p> <p>Possible less urgency regarding monitoring the perpetrators, although will they be identified anyway through police reporting?</p>
NI 47 People killed or seriously injured in road traffic accidents	<p>Road signage and symbols publicity and training courses catering for non English reading road users and pedestrians (recent Govt. guidance (?)). Are we in a position to target campaigns on the basis of what we already know by race, faith, age, disability, sexuality and sex? e.g. young drink drivers?</p>

### Theme 3 – Children and Young People

Outcome	Issues
NI 56 Obesity in primary school age children in Year 6	Needs to account for gender and cultural differences and the planning and preparation of school meals. So need to disaggregate data and interventions by race, faith, gender and disability (special dietary needs of children with disabilities)?  Do we need the 7 <sup>th</sup> strand of class to make the best interventions?
NI 110 Young people's participation in positive activities	Need data to identify whether particular groups are experiencing barriers to participate. E.g. are disabled young people, boys or girls less likely to participate? Are there barriers in terms of faith and ethnicity that we need to address?  Awareness raising – accessible information/media targeted specifically at young people –e.g. Teen space on CCC website/ availability of pod cast info etc.
NI 111 First time entrants to the Youth Justice System aged 10-17	Data issues to identify those most at risk of entering the YJS. Is the likelihood affected by ethnicity, gender, disability, faith, age or sexuality? Or are there factors of class that are more important than any of these?
NI 112 Under age conception rate	Needs to account for gender and cultural differences. So gender, race, faith and disability issues? Add in class issues as well?
NI 115 Substance misuse by young people	There are cultural, religious and gender issues surrounding the perception of alcohol misuse. Plus also regarding drug issues?  Disaggregation of data and targeted interventions by race, gender, disability, faith and class issues?
NI 117 16 to 18 olds who are not in education, employment and training (NEET)	Access to skills and employment needs to address all six equality strands.  Data capture and interventions by those 6 equality and diversity strands, plus class issues as well. Still need to think throughout these issues of disaggregation about the most meaningful categories, i.e. can we get some consistency about the use of a White Polish category?

### Theme 4 – Adult Health and Wellbeing

Outcome	Issues
NI 120 All-age all cause mortality rate	Disaggregating and targeting of data needed by ethnicity, faith, gender, age, sexuality, disability, class.
NI 121 Mortality rate from all circulatory diseases at ages under 75	Disaggregating and targeting of data needed by ethnicity, faith, gender, age, sexuality, disability, class.
NI 123 Stopping smoking	High instances within migrant workers communities - accessible awareness raising information/evidence of joined up partnership communication.

	Disaggregating and targeting of data needed by ethnicity, faith, gender, age, sexuality, disability, class.
NI 125 Achieving independence for older people through rehabilitation/intermediate care	Clear focus on older people and their needs.  Disaggregating and targeting of data needed by ethnicity, faith, gender, age, sexuality, disability, class.
NI 130 Social Care clients receiving Self Directed Support (Direct Payments and Individual Budgets – adults all ages)	The background of carers and the service user's maybe an issue in some instances.  Disaggregation and targeting of data needed by ethnicity, faith, gender, age, sexuality, type of disability, class.
NI 135 Carers receiving needs assessment or review and a specific carer's service, or advice and information	Reaching out to carers across all 6 strands, age (young & old carer) ethnicity, gender etc plus class.
NI 137 Healthy life expectancy at age 65	Needs to account for. ethnicity, faith, gender, age, sexuality, type of disability, class.

### Theme 5 – Tackling exclusion and promoting equality

Outcome	Issues
NI 141 Percentage of vulnerable people achieving independent living	Access to Supporting People services needs to address all six equality elements plus class. Again there are data issues across the 6 strands but also likely to be service delivery issues across the 6 strands with the need to sub divide the disability category.
NI 142 Percentage of vulnerable people who are supported to maintain independent living	Access to Supporting People services needs to address all six equality elements plus class. There are data issues across the 6 strands but also likely to be service delivery issues across the 6 strands with the need to sub divide the disability category.
NI 153 Working age people claiming out of work benefits in the worst performing neighbourhoods	Access to skills and employment needs to address all six equality elements. Are private sector employers engaged to help better understand the needs of migrant workers and disabled people?  Data issues and service delivery issues by race, gender, age and disability but not faith and sexuality?
NI 154 Net additional homes provided	Housing needs of disabled people and young people.  Are indicators around lifetime homes and wheelchair homes possible?
NI 155 Number of affordable homes delivered	Housing needs of disabled people and newly arrived economic migrant workers, Also young people trying to get on to the property ladder also young people trying to get on to the property ladder

	Are indicators around lifetime homes and wheelchair homes possible? Also the entry level for low cost home ownership regarding gender and class issues.
NI 156 Number of households living in temporary accommodation	Access to housing services need to address all six equality elements.  Disaggregation of data by race, gender, disability and age but not faith and sexuality?

## Theme 6 – Local economy

Outcome	Issues
NI 154 Net additional homes provided	As above I'd be looking at some sub indicators around lifetime homes and wheelchair homes.
NI 163 Proportion of population aged 19-64 for males and 19-59 for females qualified to Level 2 or higher	Access to skills and employment needs to address all six equality elements. Are private sector employers engaged to help better understand the needs of migrant workers? Also disabled people major employment issues/gender issues low paid employment of women etc.  Data capture and interventions by those 6 equality and diversity strands, plus class issues as well. Still need to think throughout these issues of disaggregation about the most meaningful categories, i.e. can we get some consistency about the use of a White Polish category?
NI 164 Proportion of population aged 19-64 for males and 19-59 for females qualified to Level 3 or higher	Access to skills and employment needs to address all six equality elements. Are private sector employers engaged to help better understand the needs of migrant workers?  Disaggregation of data and targeting of interventions by race, gender, disability and age but not faith and sexuality?
NI 168 Principal roads where maintenance should be considered	No equality and diversity considerations or gender public safety and public realm improvements?  Links to class and disadvantaged neighbourhood issues?
NI 169 Non-principal classified roads where maintenance should be considered	No equality and diversity considerations or gender public safety and public realm improvements?  Links to class and disadvantaged neighbourhood issues?
NI 171 New business registration rate	Data capture and interventions by 6 equality and diversity strands, plus class issues as well.

## Theme 7 – Environmental sustainability

Outcome	Issues
NI 186 Per capita reduction in CO2 emissions in the	Do we need to increase the scope to widen the agricultural offer so that "ethnic" foods could be grown locally, rather than being flown in to reduce the carbon footprint.

Local Authority area	More widely the impetus for public transport can be seen in the legal duty to involve disabled people in public life which should be a driver for CO2 reductions. Additionally, older people and women with young families.
NI 191 Residual household waste per household	Major issue around the definition of "per household". Anecdotal evidence that migrant workers are being concentrated in houses in multiple occupations and that hot bedding is occurring. Therefore, there needs to be a disaggregation of data beyond the Census categories. Needs to account for the needs of disabled people, Gypsy and Travellers and older people. Signage and instructions for non English residents catered for adequately.

## **THE VISION & PRIORITIES FOR CHESHIRE**

Our vision is: *"for Cheshire to be a place where everyone can thrive, at work and at play, at home and in the community, in a safe and healthy environment, take an active part in decisions, and continue to learn and develop throughout their lives"*.

This vision will be achieved when the key issues outlined within the Strategy are addressed successfully. When we achieve our vision for a sustainable Cheshire it will be a place where we have:

1. reduced inequalities between the most disadvantaged and successful areas of the county and sectors of the community;
2. addressed the key issues surrounding our ageing population;
3. addressed the priority services for children and young people;
4. improved access to and availability of, affordable and appropriate housing;
5. reduced re-offending;
6. tackled the adverse impact of alcohol;
7. achieved sustainable management of waste resources;
8. been responding to the challenge of climate change;
9. reduced worklessness and improved skills;
10. improved road safety, maintenance and environmental cleanliness and a well maintained and efficient transport network;
11. reduced anti-social behaviour, arson and criminal damage;
12. reducing the risk of industrial and commercial emergencies.

## APPENDIX B

<p><b>Priorities within LAA</b></p>	<p>7</p>	<p>Inability to ensure priorities of the LAA are adopted by partners, <b>leading to</b> ineffective use resources <b>resulting in</b> outcomes not achieved</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>16</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussions with GONW over the areas for improvement in Cheshire</li> <li>• Communication process in place</li> <li>• Evidence base identified so will determine priorities</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	<p>3</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>12</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Localising the evidence base to particular areas or populations</li> <li>• New ways of cross and multi-agency working for new LAA delivery</li> <li>• Clarification of GONW role in managing LAA performance and Audit Commission for CAA</li> </ul>	<p>3</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>12</p>
<p><b>Provider Fails</b></p>	<p>8</p>	<p>Failure of provider organisation <b>leading to</b> resources diverted to making alternative arrangements <b>resulting in</b> outcomes not achieved</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>9</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance management and reporting process</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greater use of risk registers to indicate problems early</li> <li>• Business continuity plans</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>4</p>
<p><b>Commissioning</b></p>	<p>9</p>	<p>Lack of understanding of commissioning <b>leading to</b> overlaps or gaps throughout the partnership <b>resulting in ineffective use of resources and not achieving outcomes</b></p>	<p>4</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>16</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chairs across thematic partnership raising awareness of what commissioning means</li> <li>• Sharing of models for how commissioning operates in different organisation</li> </ul>	<p>3</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>12</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greater understanding of the details of the contracts to ensure meets outcomes</li> <li>• Develop greater clarity over models to use</li> <li>• Operate pilots</li> </ul>	<p>3</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>9</p>

<p><b>Business continuity</b></p>	<p>10</p>	<p>Failure to develop new LSP frameworks in new local authority areas, <b>leading to</b> lack of effective accountability for LAA Years 2 and 3, <b>resulting in</b> loss of PRG and sustained long-term problems remaining un-addressed and loss of partner confidence in LAA and poor CAA results</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>16</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintaining levels of support to the Cheshire Partnership Framework - CCP, Governance Board and Thematic Partnerships, while LGR workstreams are implemented</li> <li>• Maintaining spend levels from ABG in Year 1 2008/09</li> </ul>	<p>3</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>12</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop new LSP frameworks through Partnerships workstreams</li> <li>• Ensure existing partner 'buy in' and commitment remain throughout transition period to establishment of new Councils and partnership structures</li> <li>• Develop new Shadow Member understanding of partnership working via Partnership workstreams</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>8</p>
<p><b>Partnership working</b></p>	<p>11</p>	<p>Lack of cross agency and Thematic Partnership working, <b>leading to</b> ineffective LAA delivery, <b>resulting in</b> poor performance and additional pressure on increased Years 2 and 3 LAA targets and poor CAA inspection results</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>16</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Joint Thematic Partnership Co-ordinators performance meetings</li> <li>• Development of streamlined PMF and delivery plan documentation for ease of use</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis of Year 1 delivery plans to identify opportunities to combine service provision across agencies</li> <li>• ENIA partnership training sessions</li> <li>• Cross evaluation of individual delivery plan risk assessments to provide common LAA Risk Analysis</li> <li>• Ensure momentum of LAA cxelivery development is maintained through LSP and Local Authority abolition: undertake</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>8</p>



# APPENDIX C

## LAA Review Action Plan

<b>FIFTH QUALITY ASSURANCE REPORT FROM THE GOVERNMENT OFFICE NETWORK TO THE PROGRAMME BOARD</b>			
<b>PLANNING FOR REFRESH: SEPTEMBER 2008</b>			
<b>Agenda for refresh</b>			
Refresh is not about re-opening discussions that have already been concluded. It is important that the scope is restricted only to those issues that are genuinely agreed “unfinished business”. The following sections, therefore, provide a framework for planning the key themes that need to be addressed.			
<b>Indicators</b>			
This section is about defining the scope of refresh in terms of indicators. It should set out where indicators are still in play, or remained the subject of debate at sign-off, and will flag up:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Action to be taken where an LAA received a “qualified” approval at sign-off</li> <li>• Action to be taken where the partnership has signalled it may rethink, change or add to the agreed indicator selection</li> <li>• Continued reassurance where an indicator has not been selected (for example, NI 35)</li> </ul>			
<b>Local Indicators</b>			
This section is about telling the story of where the partnership is with local indicators. The kinds of questions the GO will be asking are:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the partnership anticipate any changes in its local indicators?</li> <li>• Has the ending of “old” reward arrangements made any difference to the overall package?</li> </ul>			
<b>Targets</b>			
This section is about defining the scope of refresh in terms of targets. Refresh will focus only on:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Targets that have been deferred and the timetable for agreeing baselines and stretch (including those covered by the Places Survey)</li> <li>• Targets where sign off was concluded with the agreement of the partnership that these would be reconsidered at refresh (for example, NI 112)</li> <li>• Targets where the technical detail of the indicator has yet to be established</li> <li>• Those where there has been a commitment to further disaggregation (to districts, to neighbourhoods, to priority groups)</li> </ul>			
<b>To make for greater clarity and Network consistency (and help departments get a sense of what needs to be done in collaboration with the Network) this will be set out in tabular form, as follows:</b>			
Designated Target	Issue	Action to be taken	Timescale
The Network will be proposing a version of the Tracker to capture this aspect of negotiation, and to ensure that refresh is not used as an opportunity to re-open discussions on targets that have already been agreed.			

<b>Delivery</b>
<b>Named partners</b>
This section should report on what further work has taken place, if any, to strengthen the actions around named partners. It will also flag up if there are any early signs of difficulties with any named partners.
<b>Skills and capacity</b>
If the GO is able to make a judgement, this section should provide a GO view of the extent to which the partnership has, or has arrangements for developing, the right skills for delivery. This would include openness to RIEP support. This section would also set out the lines of questions on capacity that might be asked at review.
<b>Collaboration and cross boundary working</b>
If the GO is able to make a judgement, this section should provide a GO view of the extent to which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data is shared effectively between partners</li> <li>• Partners support and challenge each other to drive improvement</li> </ul> It would also set out the lines of questions on cross agency working that might be asked at review.
<b>Communications</b>
If the GO is able to make a judgement , this section should provide a GO view on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Arrangements that are in place or in hand to ensure key people in the system own delivery messages</li> <li>• The extent to which feedback is obtained from frontline staff and users, and acted on</li> <li>• The extent to which best practice is identified and effectively communicated among partners</li> </ul> It would also set out the lines of questions on communications that might be asked at review.
<b>Duty to involve</b>
If the GO is able to make a judgement, this section should provide a GO view on preparedness for enhancing community empowerment and delivering the duty to involve. It would also set out the lines of questions on engagement that might be asked at review.
<b>Delivery planning</b>
If the GO is able to make a judgement, this section should provide a GO view on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The extent to which a strong performance management culture is in place in the partnership</li> <li>• What action plans are in place to deliver LAA designated targets and the effectiveness of partner arrangements for monitoring and accountability</li> <li>• Transparency of decision making processes around use of pooled funding</li> </ul> It would also set out the lines of questions on delivery planning that might be asked at review.
<b>Innovation and good practice</b>
This section should identify examples of good practice that are worth sharing. They may be about individual targets and activities – or, indeed, partnership involvement. Inevitably, there will always be considerable interest in how the Third Sector, the private sector and citizens are being engaged.

