

**East Midlands Improvement and Efficiency Partnership
Board Meeting
20th January 2010 commencing 10.00am**

**Pera
Lane Fox Room
Melton Mowbray**
(Lunch will be available from 12.00pm)

Agenda

1. Apologies
2. Minutes of the meeting held on the 27th November 2009 Page 3
3. Matters arising
4. Declarations of interest

Items for Discussion

5. Re-Submission of SRP 2009/10 Efficiency and Transformation Capital Projects Page 11
6. Procurement Programme Report Page 19
7. Efficiency Challenge Programme Report Page 25
8. EM IEP Stretch Targets Review Report and Presentation Page 33
9. EM IEP Sub Regional Programmes Review Report Page 47
10. Regional Programme Managers 2010/11 Report Page 49
11. EM IEP Annual Conference Report Page 51

Information Items

12. EM IEP Perception Survey 2009 Page 53
13. EM IEP Interim Report January 2010



East Midlands Improvement Partnership

Board Meeting 27th November 2009

Minutes

In attendance:

Councillor Martin Hill OBE	Lincolnshire CC
Councillor Marion Brighton OBE	North Kesteven DC
Councillor Robin Brown	Northamptonshire CC
Councillor Jeremy Webb	East Lindsey DC
Councillor David Perkins	Northampton BC
Councillor Roger Begy OBE	Rutland CC
Councillor David Sprason	Leicestershire CC
Councillor Mary Malin	Kettering BC
Councillor Alan Rhodes	Nottinghamshire CC

Observers

Councillor Neil Clarke	Rushcliffe BC
Councillor Peter Roffey	Leicestershire CC
Councillor Joan Kirkbride	Northamptonshire CC
Councillor Andy Connelly	Leicester City

Councillor Ken Savidge North East Derbyshire DC
Substituted for Cllr Dave Wilcox Derbyshire CC

Officers

Nick Hodgson (NH)	Derbyshire CC
Chris Allison (CA)	EM IEP
Jean Morgan (JM)	South Northamptonshire C
Heather Parker (HP)	EM IEP
Andrew Foster (AF)	EM IEP
Lisa Butterfill (LB)	LGEM

1. Apologies

Councillor Vi Dempster	Leicester City
Councillor Dave Wilcox	Derbyshire CC
Councillor Fiona Martin	East Lindsey DC
Councillor Chris Williamson	Derby City
Councillor Ranjit Banwait	Derby City

Garry Bryant (GB)
Stuart Young (SY)

GOEM
EMRA

Councillor Hill welcomed Councillor David Perkins to his first meeting of the Board.

2. Minutes of the EM Partnership Board meeting – 16th September 2009

The minutes were approved as an accurate record of the meeting.

3. Matters Arising

The overview of RIEP funding for culture, requested at the last Board meeting, is included in agenda item 7. The Board were advised that culture includes sport and tourism which are both important to LAs in the region. (*Action 1*)

The Board were advised that the requested progress report on the efficiency challenge project will be provided for discussion at 20 January 2010 Board meeting. (*Action 6*)

Northamptonshire SRP representatives were advised that all of their projects had been approved and that they could commence delivery, with the exception of the Public Affairs project. The Northamptonshire SRP Board representatives provided the Board with further clarity on the Public Affairs project. However, the Board agreed that further work still needed to be carried out to identify the benefits being delivered by the project and how these would support the delivery of the EM IEP 12 stretch targets (*Action 14*).

Action 1 - A progress report on the efficiency challenge project will be provided for discussion at 20 January 2010 Board meeting – **AF**.

Action 2 - Northamptonshire SRP proposed that by 15th December 2009, they would provide Chris Allison with further clarity on the Public Affairs project, for further consideration by the Chair of the Board. This would identify the benefits being delivered by the project and how these support the delivery of the EM IEP 12 stretch targets – **Northamptonshire SRP**.

4. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Webb declared an interest as the Director of I&DeA.

5. Presentations:

(a) **Total Place Pilot Project** – Leicester/Leicestershire – Andy Robinson, from Leicestershire County Council, provided a presentation in relation to the Total Place project (access to services & drugs and alcohol misuse).

The following bullet points provide a summary of the key points identified in the presentation:

- 20% of funding is 'lost' between national allocation and LAs
- Data collection – 3,000 data sets; 92 staff involved; £3.7m cost and 83 inspections
- Pooled budgets and shared services for delivery should be supported by simplifying the national agencies and ring fenced budgets
- Drugs and alcohol issues have a high social and economic impact
- Increased focus on prevention, targeting young people
- Improving access to integrated support and offender management
- Improving access to services – CAA issue - coherent joined up approach with improved data sharing and customer profiling
- Total place will also be addressing asset management
- Funding has been set aside by the Leicestershire/Rutland SRP to support implementation

Next steps:

- Report to Government by February 2010
- Joined up financial planning
- Single back office services
- Series of “deep dives” across the services in order to reduce costs

The single service concept – shared services/outsourcing is often perceived as high cost, however, the experience of a number of Board members identified that this is not necessarily the case. The Board agreed that good practice across shared service activity, being delivered across the region, should be shared via the SRP Programme Managers.

(b) **DECATS Pilot Project** – Derby City – Chris Allison, Director EM IEP, provided a presentation to the Board on the DECATS pilot project.

The following bullet points provide a summary of the key points identified in the presentation:

- The DECATS project is one of a number of RIEP national products where good practice is brought together.
- Derby City was a pilot for this diagnostic product developed for RIEPs by PwC and supported by Local Partnerships (4Ps)
- Cost £85k (EM IEP) and £25k (Local Partnership)
- 20 weeks diagnostic process
- 13 business cases delivered and approved by Cabinet in September 2009
- Net Savings of £19.2m over 3 years (£54m in 5 years) predicted
- 10% reduction of staff (465 Fte no compulsory redundancy) required
- Outcomes to reduce the duplication of processing activity and transformation to flatten structures/reduce costs
- Implementation commenced in September 2009
- Derbyshire SRP will be providing funding to support implementation

6. Whole Organisation Diagnostic Support Programme

The Board approved - a mixed economy approach to the organisational diagnostics offer of support of £80k per SRP

Lincolnshire SRP has expressed interest in a systems thinking approach and Nottinghamshire SRP have arranged for a presentation of the offers available for their SRP on 3rd December 2009.

Commitment both politically and materially is required from the authorities that commit to the Organisation Diagnostic process. To date, 258 staff from across the region, have received NVQ BIT training to support service transformation and thus enhance capacity of local authorities to undertake process reengineering activities.

7. Analysis of Performance Across 9 RIEPs

The Board raised the issue of the below average (in comparison to the other RIEPs) investment into procurement activity across the region. The Board were advised of the potential investment opportunities and discussed a number of options:

- Sharing best practice and facilitation of collaboration and access to national (OGC) and sub regional procurement activity
- Facilitation of e-auctions (the Board noted that e-auctions require quality measures, which can be a critical factor)
- Better contract management
- Supporting authorities where there are opportunities for improvement (examples of good practice noted - Procurement Lincolnshire and other similar clusters across the region - however, it was noted that further coordination of collaborative working is still required)

Action 3 - To identify and cost the support required for a procurement investment strategy, to support some of the key issues raised by the Board, and report back to the Board meeting on 20th January 2010 – **AF**.

8. Mid Term Programme Review

The Board discussed the issues raised within the report. The Board were assured that the Regional Adult Care Services Programme (JIP) Board would ensure compliance of the EM IEP project principles, for all of the projects within the JIP Programme, including the completion of mietool for all activities projecting efficiencies. The Board were also assured by the SRP representatives that the mietool assessments were being completed for all SRP efficiency projects.

The Board approved a recommendation that a Peer Review led by a Chief Executive from each sub region, supported by the SRP Programme Manager, would be undertaken with a report back to the Board for their meeting on 15th April 2010.

Action 4 - A report to be provided to the Steering Group on 7th January 2010 outlining the process to achieve the Board's request for a Peer review of SRP programmes (to be completed by April 2010), led by a Chief Executive from each sub region and supported by the SRP Programme Manager– **CA**.

9. Draft Summary Annual Report

The Board were advised that there had been a number of recommended changes to the format of the report, to meet the requirements of the CLG to ensure sign off of year 3 funding.

The Board approved the process for consultation by email of the Summary Annual Report to take place between 14th – 18th December and that the Chair of the Board would sign off the report for submission to the LGA/CLG on 8th January 2010

Action 5 - To circulate the amended Summary Annual Report to the Board and Steering Group for comment, via email, between 14th–18th December 2009 – **HP**.

The Board discussed the issue of reporting local authority performance and the impact for sector led support. The Board also raised concerns of the current position, as outlined in the summary annual report, of performance of the LAs within each sub region, against the 12 stretch targets.

The Board agreed that SRPs would refresh the performance against the 12 stretch targets and that this information would be used to inform the review of the targets in January 2010

Action 6 - To provide an update on the performance of each of the sub regions' local authorities against the 12 stretch targets by the end of December 2009. This will be presented to the Steering Group at their meeting on 7th January 2010 to inform the review of the targets in January 2010 – **SRPs PMs**.

10. Capital Pot Allocations 2009/10

The Board approved the recommendation that the additional £175k capital allocation received is retained to support regional efficiency challenge projects and that any unused capital would be taken back to the Board for reallocation.

The Board discussed the programmes that had been presented by the SRPs for approval. Clarity was sought on a number of projects and the benefits that would be delivered before approval was agreed. The Board were asked to vote to approve one the projects – the provision of electric vehicles (Lincolnshire SRP) – this was passed by 5 to 2.

Concern was raised by the Board on a number of the capital pot projects. The Board requested re-submission of 5 of these to the meeting on 20th January 2010. The re-submissions should identify the benefits delivered by the projects and how these support the delivery of the 12 stretch targets.

Action 7 - To re-submit the following projects to the Board meeting on 20th January 2010 identifying the benefits that the projects will deliver and how these support the 12 stretch targets:

1. Nottinghamshire SRP – CCTV Central Network
2. Derbyshire SRP – CCTV in South Derbyshire
3. Derbyshire SRP – CCTV in Amber Valley
4. Derbyshire SRP – Making the most of World Heritage Site
5. Lincolnshire SRP – Warm Homes

– SRPs.

The Board approved the projects within the programmes submitted by the SRPs with the exception of the 5 listed above.

11. Analysis of EM LAs Member Development activity

The report outlined member development activity across the region and how this was funded with the top 15 themes outlined in the report. The Board were advised that a number of local authorities do not have a specific member development budget available. However, the Board noted that 65% of authorities are providing support for councillor personal development plans.

The Board were advised that currently 1 County Council and 3 District Councils had achieved the Member Development Charter with a further 26 councils signed up to the programme. The Board requested that the 16 councils that had not signed up to the programme be contacted to ascertain their position. The Board also requested that the report on Member Development is circulated to all councils to feed back the survey results.

Action 8 - To contact the 16 councils currently not signed up to the Member Development Charter Programme to ascertain their position and to feed this back to Chris Allison who will report this to the Board at their meeting in January 2010 – **Lisa Butterfill**.

Action 9 - To circulate the Board report on Member Development to all councils to feed back the survey results - **Lisa Butterfill**.

12. Developing a New Accountability Framework for Local Government

The Board resolved that the regional response, circulated at the meeting, should be forwarded to the LGA.

The Board encouraged individual authorities to respond to the 'Freedom to Lead' consultation.

13. Shaping the Market for Looked After Children

The Board were presented with a paper outlining the progress to date with this project. The Board were advised that good practice and learning were being transferred from the Adults Services JIP into the Children's programme. For example the success of the Adult Services Care Funding Calculator is being shared/developed with Children's services.

There was also a request to the Board that Safeguarding should be 'joined up' across Adults and Children's Services. The Chair suggested that further investigation is undertaken to establish the impact of this proposal.

Action 10 - To investigate the impact of joining up the projects around safeguarding across the Adult and Children's JIPs – **Cllr Begy/Cllr Sprason**.

Items for Noting

The Board were recommended to put the following dates in their diaries:

- EM IEP Total Place Seminar – 8th January 2010 at Pera Melton Mowbray
- Joint EM IEP/GOEM - Delivering Better for Less Conference 22nd January 2010 at the Walkers Stadium Leicester
- EM IEP Annual Conference – 29th June 2010 at Pera Melton Mowbray

Reports required for January 20th Board Meeting

- Efficiency Challenge progress report
- Process for Peer Review of regional and sub regional programmes
- Re-submission of 5 SRP 2009/10 capital pot projects
- Report on proposed procurement investment strategy
- Report on performance and review of 12 stretch targets (2009/10)

Priority Actions

Action 1 - A progress report on the efficiency challenge project will be provided for discussion at 20 January 2010 Board meeting – **AF**.

Action 2 - Northamptonshire SRP proposed that by 15th December 2009, they would provide Chris Allison with further clarity on the Public Affairs project, for further consideration by the Chair of the Board. This would identify the benefits being delivered by the project and how these support the delivery of the EM IEP 12 stretch targets – **Northamptonshire SRP**.

Action 3 - To identify and cost the support required for a procurement investment strategy, to support some of the key issues raised by the

Board, and report back to the Board meeting on 20th January 2010 – **AF**.

Action 4 - A report to be provided to the Steering Group on 7th January 2010 outlining the process to achieve the Board's request for a Peer review of SRP programmes (to be completed by April 2010), lead by a Chief Executive from each sub region and supported by the SRP Programme Manager– **CA**.

Action 5 - To circulate the amended Summary Annual Report to the Board and Steering Group for comment, via email, between 14th–18th December 2009 – **HP**.

Action 6 - To provide an update on the performance of each of the sub regions' local authorities against the 12 stretch targets by the end of December 2009. This will be presented to the Steering Group at their meeting on 7th January to inform the review of the targets in January 2010 – **SRPs PMs**.

Action 7 - To re-submit the following projects to the Board meeting on 20th January 2010 identifying the benefits that the projects will deliver and how these support the 12 stretch targets:

1. Nottinghamshire SRP – CCTV Central Network
2. Derbyshire SRP – CCTV in South Derbyshire
3. Derbyshire SRP – CCTV in Amber Valley
4. Derbyshire SRP – Making the most of world heritage site
5. Lincolnshire SRP – Warm Homes

– **SRPs**.

Action 8 - To contact the 16 councils currently not signed up to the Member Development Charter Programme to ascertain their position and to feed this back to Chris Allison who will report this to the Board at their meeting in January 2010 – **Lisa Butterfill**.

Action 9 - To circulate the Board report on Member Development to all councils to feed back the survey results - **Lisa Butterfill**.

Action 10 - To investigate the impact of joining up the projects around safeguarding across the Adult and Children's JIPs – **Cllr Begy/Cllr Sprason**.

Agenda item No: 5

EAST MIDLANDS IMPROVEMENT AND EFFICIENCY PARTNERSHIP BOARD MEETING: 20TH JANUARY 2010

Report of the Director

Re-Submission of SRP 2009/10 Efficiency and Transformation Capital Projects

1. Purpose of the report
 - 1.1 To present the SRPs re-submitted Efficiency and Transformation Capital Projects for approval by the Board.
 - 1.2 To provide the Board with the outline of the Northamptonshire SRP project, re-submitted and approved by the Chair, as agreed at the November Board Meeting.
 - 1.3 Submission of a replacement Efficiency and Transformation Capital Project by Northamptonshire SRP for approval.
2. Background
 - 2.1 At the Board meeting on 27th November, concerns were raised on a number of the 'Capital Pot' projects (*The criterion, specified by the CLG, for the ringfenced 'Capital Pot' funding is to drive out efficiencies and/or transformation of service delivery*). The Board requested re-submission of five 'Capital Pot' projects to this meeting on 20th January 2010. The SRPs were advised that the re-submissions of the following five projects should identify the benefits delivered by the projects and how these support the delivery of the EM IEP stretch targets.
 1. Nottinghamshire SRP – CCTV Central Network
 2. Derbyshire SRP – CCTV in South Derbyshire
 3. Derbyshire SRP – CCTV in Amber Valley
 4. Derbyshire SRP – Making the most of World Heritage Site
 5. Lincolnshire SRP – Warm Homes
3. Re-Submitted SRPs' Efficiency and Transformation Capital Projects
 - 3.1 The following provides a summary of each of the projects, how they support the delivery of the targets and the benefits projected:
 - 3.2 **Nottinghamshire SRP's Project - CCTV Central Network (£160k)**
 - 3.2.1 Local Authorities fibre networks for IT networking have traditionally been developed piecemeal over years, led by demand and budget incurring higher costs and non co-termination of contracts due to their minor scale and development path. If CCTV is to remain sustainable, low cost expansion is essential. The implementation of a Centrally Managed

Network would give the Councils the basis upon which to build and develop closer working relations and open up the potential for shared service and business continuity arrangements.

3.2.2 This scheme allows the CCTV & ICT provision at the partner Authorities to help support the individual Councils to work towards achieving EM IEP targets for example:

- *All CAA organisational assessments (council and partner bodies) are assessed to be at least “performing well” or equivalent* - A major role is played by CCTV and ICT in keeping partnership councils assessment levels high, both in terms of providing a safe environment for people to live and work in and by ensuring that technology is used appropriately and to its maximum effect
- *All Authorities achieving their annual efficiency savings target* - This scheme gives potential for significant ongoing savings in ICT and CCTV transmission and also provides a platform to provide and expand income generating services to the private and public sector around CCTV monitoring. Cost avoidance could be in excess £13,200 per annum, per Authority based on predicted increases in cable costs from the existing suppliers based on current installations.

3.2.3. Project Benefits/Outcomes include:

- The managed network will allow for cost effective simultaneous use of data, voice, CCTV, video conferencing transmissions, which will form the basis for future developments
- Provide a platform for future development of more efficient network usage, enable central monitoring & shared services and provide increased business continuity capacity.
- Provide a framework for other Local Authorities to follow to capitalise on implementing similar digital managed networks
- Ongoing savings and increased expansion potential to allow further income streams for client monitoring

3.3 **Derbyshire SRP's Project - CCTV in Amber Valley (£102K)**

3.3.1 The CCTV initiative in Amber Valley is a collaborative project between Amber Valley Borough Council, Derbyshire County Council, Derbyshire Constabulary and the Derbyshire Fire and Rescue Service. The existing analogue CCTV system uses ageing equipment and is becoming increasingly difficult and expensive to maintain. The improvement and efficiency partnership funding would provide an opportunity to update the system and help reduce crime in Amber Valley.

3.3.2 This scheme allows the partner Authorities to work towards achieving EM IEP targets for example:

- *All local authorities achieving their annual efficiency target* - The Amber Valley CCTV development programme supports this target by taking out costs of £25,000 per year (cable rental costs) enhancing the Borough Council's capability to achieve their annual 3% cashable efficiency saving targets.
- *All local authorities CAA Organisational assessments (councils and partner bodies) are assessed to be at least performing well or*

equivalent- The CCTV development programme will help to contribute to further reductions in crime which it is anticipated will lead to better performance in relation to future CAA organisational assessments.

3.3.3 Project Benefits/Outcomes include:

- The average cost of violence against the person, recorded in the British Crime Survey costs of crime index 2003, is £10,407. Information from Derbyshire Dales District Council, which uses a similar system, suggests that the annual operating cost of the 17-camera system is £16,523. So if two assaults a year are prevented the system would have demonstrated its efficiency.
- The CCTV system will allow the Police to effectively target problematic hotspots of crime to increase sanction detection rates and create positive outcomes when offences are dealt with in court and offenders brought to justice. In these instances CCTV offers members of the public a sense of security which is valuable in decreasing the fear of crime amongst members of the public.

3.4 **Derbyshire SRP's Project - CCTV in South Derbyshire (£68k)**

3.4.1 The CCTV initiative in Swadlincote is a collaborative project between South Derbyshire District Council, Derbyshire County Council, Derbyshire Constabulary and the Derbyshire Fire and Rescue Service. Swadlincote Town Centre does not currently have a CCTV system and is subject to high crime rates.

3.4.2 This scheme allows the partner Authorities to work towards achieving EM IEP targets for example:

- *All local authorities achieving their annual efficiency target* - The introduction of CCTV will enable the Council, Police and Fire Officers to use resources more effectively by reducing the amount of criminal damage that happens to District Council buildings and property with the potential to recover costs of damage from individuals who caused it. The CCTV will also provide the potential for more dog fouling and litter fixed penalty fines to be applied.
- *All local authorities CAA Organisational assessments (councils and partner bodies) are assessed to be at least performing well or equivalent* - The introduction of CCTV is one initiative, along with a range of others, which will help reduce levels of crime in Swadlincote and enable South Derbyshire District Council to work towards meeting its Derbyshire Local Area Agreement targets. The CCTV system is part of a wider strategy in trying to reduce crime; it will link in to other existing initiatives, such as the Business Watch scheme, Alertbox and Pub Watch.

3.4.3 Project Benefits/Outcomes include:

- The CCTV solution is scalable in that other partners can be given access as appropriate
- The CCTV solution provides a public deterrent to those who commit crime and use anti social behaviour and is supported by the Police and Fire Authorities in South Derbyshire and the South Derbyshire Community Safety Partnership

- The presence of CCTV will enable resources to be located differently with recordings used to determine what has happened around a specific incident and then identify any individuals involved
- Amber Valley have also placed a bid for CCTV, if both bids are successful joint procurement of the CCTV solution will be carried out.
- Other partners would be able to see the system in operation and make use of the knowledge and experience gained in South Derbyshire. Documentation generated for the use of a CCTV system would be shared with partners as appropriate

3.5 **Derbyshire SRP's Project - Making the Most of World Heritage Site (£104k)**

3.5.1 Making the Most of World Heritage Site is a collaborative project between Derbyshire County Council and a number of District and Parish Councils. The Derwent Valley Mills World Heritage Site was inscribed on UNESCO's World Heritage List in 2001. It is the only World Heritage Site within the East Midlands. The Partnership established to manage the World Heritage Site has spent the past 8 years putting in place strategic plans for taking advantage of this international designation by using it to boost economic development, and tourism development in particular.

3.5.2 The project 'Making The Most of World Heritage' will contribute to EM IEP targets for example:

- *All local authorities CAA Organisational assessments (councils and partner bodies) are assessed to be at least performing well or equivalent* - The project will contribute to a number of Derbyshire LAA targets by promoting joint working between the 15 participating councils. The Partnership was set up in 2001 and is a model of harmonious joint working; however, it is hampered by limited financial resources.
- *All local authorities achieving their annual efficiency target* - Securing cost effective cross authority promotional work. The lead local authorities, Derbyshire County Council, Derby City Council, Amber Valley Borough Council, Derbyshire Dales District Council and Erewash Borough Council as members of the World Heritage Site Partnership have endorsed an Economic Development Plan which has begun delivering major economic and social benefits to the Derwent Valley.

3.5.3 Project Benefits/Outcomes include:

- The branding, promotion and associated activities will help instigate and foster a sense of pride in shared heritage and create the climate for community engagement in a positive future.
- The website will be instrumental in sustaining the benefits of the Heritage Lottery Fund, raising awareness of the project and flagging up opportunities for volunteering by improving awareness among local communities. This will act as a catalyst for greater engagement, with a consequent increase in community activity, capacity building and skills development.

- Improved branding, signage and the website will encourage more people to explore the Derwent Valley and discover for themselves the many opportunities to get active
- The signs are a long term asset, once erected they will require minimal maintenance.
- The web site is maintained in partnership with Derby University and maintenance of the web site is provided by the University at cost.
- The film will be a long term resource and will be used in a number of ways, but principally for showing on city centre screens throughout the UK as part of the Cultural Olympiad and also within the audio visual theatre at the World Heritage Site Gateway currently being developed at Cromford Mill by the Arkwright Society.

3.6 **Lincolnshire SRP's Project - Warm Homes (£300k)**

3.6.1 This project contributes to the delivery of EM IEP Stretch Target 9 all LAAs achieve 75% of their stretch targets - Lincolnshire has designated Tackling Fuel Poverty as a priority indicator (NI 187) in its LAA 2008-11. This is an indicator set by the county and is essentially delivered by the district councils who lead on energy in housing.

3.6.2 The purpose of the county wide strategy is not to duplicate existing District Strategies but to offer the benefits and opportunities of a county wide approach. There are also services delivered at a county wide level which need to be fully engaged in issues of fuel poverty and its impact on their agendas, for example within the Primary Care Trusts.

3.6.3 This project is an area based approach, bringing energy efficiency to the most needy – those in the worst housing and those with health needs. The solution to fuel poverty is to provide households with affordable warmth. The £300k will be used to purchase insulation materials, this is supported by matched funding from the utility companies.

4. Outline of Northamptonshire SRP Project Approved by the Chair

4.1 Northamptonshire SRP proposed that by 15th December 2009, they would provide Chris Allison with further clarity on the Public Affairs project, for further consideration by the Chair of the Board. However, taking into consideration the Boards previous comments the SRP have refocused the project to address the Northamptonshire CAA red flag for Alcohol Harm (£220k). The following outlines the project approved by the Chair, under delegated responsibility before Christmas, to enable delivery to commence.

4.2 There is a gap in the current provision in treating young people who are abusing alcohol and showing signs of anti-social behaviour. The issue here is early interception before the problem worsens. There is also little provision for treating the alcohol problems which are responsible for up to 80% of young people's anti-social behaviour. It is also the intention to use the work undertaken in Leicester and Leicestershire through the "Total Place" pilot on alcohol services to influence the development of our project.

- 4.3 The objectives of the project will be:
- To improve the partnership's evidence-based response to tackling alcohol issues in the county
 - To better evaluate the costs to public services from alcohol-induced crime and anti-social behaviour
 - To provide a range of services and incentives to work alongside the awareness raising that will support and enable positive behavioural change
 - To embedding the shared strategic ownership of the public trust and confidence measure within local authorities and across the partnership
 - To decrease the cost to public services of alcohol-related harm
 - To raise the profile of what we are doing in Northamptonshire to combat alcohol-induced crime and anti-social behaviour
5. Submission of a Replacement Efficiency and Transformation Capital Project by Northamptonshire SRP
- 5.1 The previously approved Capital project to 'Implement a shared document imaging system' has been withdrawn by the SRP, due to Wellingborough's inability to continue. The SRP are submitting a replacement project to procure 3 large format transportable screens for use by partner organisations for events throughout the county (£90k) for approval.
- 5.2 The purchase of up to 3 large format transportable screens with additional supporting infrastructure is recognised by partners across the cultural sector (public, not-for-profit and voluntary) as key infrastructure that can assist in delivering a lasting legacy in terms of stimulating active audience participation in live outdoor events across the whole of Northamptonshire as part of the Cultural Olympiad, London 2012 Olympics and Paralympics and beyond.
- 5.3 The flexibility of the screens allows them to be placed at strategic locations within the county at key events, festivals and venues e.g. historic homes, country parks, sports venues etc. Further, the screens can be utilised as part of any proposed future civic celebrations and offer the added potential to attract future sponsorship, advertising and hire income from corporate partners.
- 5.4 This scheme allows the partner Authorities to work towards achieving EM IEP targets for example:
- *All local authorities achieving their annual efficiency target* - Hiring this type of equipment and infrastructure, with associated transport costs and profit element from commercial providers, often proves highly restrictive for local authorities and their partner organisations. Based upon consultation with commercial providers, by having access to such a resource within the county the saving to Local Authorities and partners would reasonably equate to c. £2.5-5k per

event. Based on a minimal programme of c.10 events per annum, the cashable saving to partners would be in the region of £25-50k. Over a 5-year lifespan this would equate to between £125-250k. The resource also has the potential to be hired out to for commercial users and other local authorities within the region, and has the added potential to generate sponsorship/ advertising revenue and other earned income which in turn would be used to support associated operational costs, thereby creating further cash saving to partners.

- *All local authorities CAA Organisational assessments (councils and partner bodies) are assessed to be at least performing well or equivalent –by providing:*
 - A unique interface / platform that allows partners to engage more directly with the public – county residents and visitors alike;
 - An opportunity to act as an information service that can inform the public with regard to key priorities, proposals, service performance and success stories;
 - Provide positive activities and impact on targeted groups e.g. young people / teenagers and families;
 - An opportunity to present key regional, national and international sporting and cultural events in the build up to and including the London Olympic and Paralympic Games 2012;
 - Foster enhanced community cohesion, county/civic pride and sense of place;

6. Recommendations

- 6.1 The Board review for approval the re-submitted SRPs' Efficiency and Transformation Capital Projects
- 6.2 The Board note the overview of the refocused Northamptonshire project approved by the Chair under delegated responsibility
- 6.3 The Board review for approval the replacement Efficiency and Transformation Capital Project by Northamptonshire SRP

Chris Allison
Director
EM IEP

Agenda item No: 6

EAST MIDLANDS IMPROVEMENT AND EFFICIENCY PARTNERSHIP BOARD MEETING: 20th JANUARY 2010

Report of the Director

Procurement Programme

1. Purpose of the report
 - 1.1 At the EM IEP Board Meeting on 27 November 2009, under item 7: EM IEP Performance Review, the Board noted that Procurement activity was under represented compared to other RIEPs and given the need for quick win financial savings going forward requested that a programme of support be developed and reported to the Board at its 20th January 2010 meeting.

2. Background
 - 2.1 Appendix one attached to this report is the outline of the programme which has been developed in conjunction with the regional procurement officers' network. The investment of £225k can be found from the unallocated reserves, which currently stands at c£450k.
 - 2.2 The anticipated minimum savings ratio of 10:1 will produce a minimum return on investment of £2.25m for participating councils.
 - 2.3 Whilst there are established procurement networks at sub regional and regional level the attached programme is additional to these and designed to enhance their activities and collective delivery.

3. Officer Steering Group Comments
 - 3.1 The Steering Group had sought some clarity on the benefits from the investment of the £225k. As an example they were advised that as part of the - Supporting Adoption of National Initiatives element – it is intended that Procurement Lincolnshire will lead on the Consultancy Value Programme (CVP). The CVP relates to improving the engagement and management of consultants with anticipated savings of 20% on a regional spend of c£45m. This is based on the example of central government departments which have achieved a reduction of 30% on consultancy spend through the CVP which involves improving engagement and governance processes, contract management, business case adoption, and a better understanding of consultants pricing techniques. If approved the pilot currently being developed in Lincolnshire will be rolled out regionally from March 2010.

3.2 The Steering Group had requested clarity on what the £225k would be used to fund and were advised that currently there is no regional resource within the region to undertake the initiatives outlined in the report. The grant allocation requested will be supporting the authorities who are providing the resources with the funds to back fill posts.

3.3 The Steering Group agreed to recommend the report to the Board.

4. Recommendations

4.1 The Board approve the Procurement Programme activity as outlined in the report.

4.2 The Board approve the £225k grant allocation, which can be found from the unallocated reserves, which currently stands at c£450k.

Chris Allison
Director
EM IEP

Smarter Procurement Programme Outline

1 Project Description

The East Midlands local authorities spend circa £3bn on externally provided goods and services.

Value for money is always high on the public sector agenda and the anticipated financial settlements in the current economic climate are expected to be especially challenging. Smarter Procurement can directly support the delivery of cashable savings required to help balance budgets.

CSR07 under the heading of “Smarter Procurement” recognised that Construction (25.7% of external spend), Care Services (14%) and Environment Services (6%) are the three largest spend areas and consequently placed considerable emphasis on these. These three areas are excluded from this project since there are already specific initiatives which target these areas. This leaves 54% of external spend under the general banner of Procurement.

2 Programme Approach / What we are going to do? / How are we are doing it?

The programme approach will be to focus on four areas

- Supporting national initiatives
- Facilitating collaboration
- Best Deals & benchmarking service
- Sharing & supporting best practice

Supporting adoption of National Initiatives within the East Midlands

There are a number of national projects based around the OGC Category programme which includes Energy, Fleet, Professional Services, Food, ICT, and Office Solutions.

This activity will support the transfer of knowledge and information from the national initiatives programmes so that authorities within the East Midlands can adopt such best practice initiatives in their contracting approaches.

One initiative which is already identified is.

- The CVP programme within Professional Services (Consultancy) (regional spend £100m)

This project will build up the work being undertaken by Lincolnshire CC and support other large councils in their adoption of the tools and techniques identified from within this work stream to (a) challenge the requirement for consultants (b) reduce the spend on consultants (c) better contract manage approved contracts.

Facilitating collaboration & supporting e auctions

Public Buying Organisations (PBOs) and local authorities instigate framework contracts at various times. It is recognised that framework contracts provide better deals when there is commitment from local authorities at the point which the framework is offered to the market.

The role of the support officer will be to liaise with the PBOs and local authorities to identify forthcoming framework contract opportunities, communicate these to local authorities within the region, facilitate participation in the specification requirements design stage and gain commitment into the opportunity that is put to the market.

Such activities will, over a period of time reduce duplicating framework contracts and enhance volumes with a resulting improvement in the offer.

In addition there is a major e auction programme being led by OGC. These require committed volumes from authorities.

Examples of where such auctions have delivered in other regions are:

- Taxis - Home to school transport (As an example the West Midlands have saved £2.8m across 4 authorities in 2009/10 to date)
- IT Hardware
- Telecoms

A Best Deals & Benchmarking Service

In many commodity areas such as stationery, printer consumables, photocopiers, washroom materials there already exist a variety of framework contracts available from various public buying organisations, local authorities and central government departments.

With limited resources procurement departments should be concentrating their efforts on the more strategic issues and opportunities and not on the limited efficiency opportunities provided by the generic commodity products. To assist local authorities in their decision making, it is proposed that a “best deals & benchmarking “service be offered on an agreed list of commodity products.

This service would be provided by a Support Officer, in which the specific commodity areas are researched, available deals compared and benchmarked with the resulting information, including pros and cons, made available to councils. In doing so they can encourage collaboration into existing arrangements and develop further collaboration.

Sharing best practice.

Linking the best deals & benchmarking, facilitating collaboration, and supporting national initiatives is the sharing of best practice through workshops and networks.

3 Outline Business Benefits

- Tangible cost efficiency savings and delivery of increased value for money over the long term
- Deliver a minimum return on investment in the ratio of 10:1
- Support the region to deliver its agreed collective targets contained within the Regional Improvement & Efficiency Strategy (March 2008) with regard to the 3% efficiency targets
- A move towards a more joined up, cohesive contracting approach to major spend areas across the region
- The opportunity to transform services and so deliver improved services for users

4 Project Budget

Description	2010/11 £'s
Support and associated costs (travel etc)	124,000
Tender & e auction costs	25,000
Consultancy Programme support	36,000
Communication, printing, costs	10,000
Research & Facilitation	30,000
Total	225,000

Note. It is anticipated that the support will be provided by Local Authorities in the region and that the support costs include the cost to back file posts

5 Time scale

The programme will commence upon approval and terminate March 2011. The Consultancy element can commence in February 2010, and the OGC e auction programme is already underway.

Benefits will be captured by individual authorities participating in the collaborative work streams.

The programme will be guided by the Regional Heads of Procurement Group.

Agenda item No: 7

EAST MIDLANDS IMPROVEMENT AND EFFICIENCY PARTNERSHIP BOARD MEETING 20th JANUARY 2010

Report of the Director

Efficiency Challenge Programme

1. Purpose of the report
 - 1.1 To update the Board on the Efficiency Challenge Programme, provide the findings from the Efficiency Survey undertaken and consider the challenge element of the programme.
2. Background
 - 2.1 Previously the Board approved funding for an Efficiency Challenge Programme at their meeting on the 16 June 2009. Appendix 1 provides the project outline.
 - 2.2 Cllr Jeremy Webb as the Efficiency Member lead is sponsor for the programme. A steering group has been established with representation from each of the 5 sub regions (Appendix 2)
 - 2.3 The Efficiency Challenge Programme covers two phases,
 - Data Collection
 - The Challenge & Implementation
 - 2.4 It should be recognised, however, that there are a number of linkages to other activities such as the shared service agenda, business transformation programme and projects such as those around waste collection and Local Environmental Quality.
 - 2.5 An efficiency prospectus outlining the range of support available will be made available at the meeting.
3. Data Collection.
 - 3.1 The data collection phase is designed to collect information to support the challenge activity, to help show authorities what others have done, how they compare with others, and what can be done.
 - 3.2 A survey of the region's 45 authorities and 14 large authorities in the West Midlands has been undertaken. The purpose of the survey was to capture project information and be able to show others what is being done, what has been delivered but also better understand each authorities position in regard to the efficiency agenda. A copy of the survey findings will be made available at the meeting.

- 3.3 A comparative analysis of 2008/09 revenue outturn data across all cost centre headings for East Midlands local authorities has been commissioned and should be available by mid January. The analysis will provide a relevant unit cost against each cost centre such as head of population or per household by local authority.
- 3.4 A cost/performance benchmarking exercise across services for District Councils has been commissioned. However there is some concern about the completeness of consistent performance information available, as such there is a milestone review in January 2010 to review the information to be made available.
- 3.5 Separately, as part of the Lincolnshire SRP programme, Lincolnshire CC are providing some benchmarking for their Districts. It was hoped that this could be recreated for the rest of the region but this was not practical.

4. Associated projects and activities

- 4.1 The University of Northampton has been commissioned to undertake research, identify best practice, map contracts to identify opportunities for efficiencies, opportunities for collaboration and joint procurement around waste collection, and to facilitate network meetings. This project has the involvement of GOEM, and the WIN team supporting RIEPs on waste at a national level.
- 4.2 Included within the specification for this project by the University is an examination and report on why previous collaborative projects such as the route optimisation projects in Northamptonshire and Nottinghamshire failed to deliver the predicted benefits.
- 4.3 Similarly Keep Britain Tidy (KBT) has been commissioned to deliver similar outputs on Local Environmental Quality (street cleaning). This will also involve working with five authorities to convert theoretical best practice into actual practice and deliverable cashable savings.
- 4.4 The KBT project brief includes the provision of a critical evaluation of alternative delivery methods which must be considered since minor improvements will not deliver the savings required.
- 4.5 A Local Improvement Advisor (LIA) has been utilised in Leicestershire to help Districts in particular around the efficiency agenda and opportunities for closer working and shared services.

5. Challenge & Implementation

- 5.1 The Challenge is about helping local authorities understand the opportunities for efficiencies and how they can implement savings. It is clear however that the challenge must be adopted at a senior level if significant savings are going to be made.

- 5.2 Thinking on the Challenge element is still developing. Capital Ambition for example is conducting a peer challenge for each London Borough.
- 5.3 In the East Midlands it is anticipated that challenge will be delivered at both authority level and at service specific level and this will be a mix of regional workshops, service specific workshops, service specific support groups and specific local authority support.
- 5.4 As a pilot a LIA is being identified to support East Lindsey DC with a focus on providing a challenge on core costs. The LIA model may be used for other authorities if appropriate.
- 5.5 A joint workshop targeted at County and Unitary authorities under the banner of "Where do I get cashable savings from" is being held in conjunction with the West Midlands and Yorkshire & Humberside regions to showcase examples where authorities have delivered savings, and also to develop networks between transformation and efficiency leads.
- 5.6 A wider dissemination event has been discussed for April/May 2010, when the benchmarking exercise is complete, for the purpose of launching the Challenge phase.
- 5.7 In addition to the waste and street cleaning networks, other networks such as the CIPFA benefits benchmarking club are being explored as suitable avenues for supporting the challenge.
- 5.8 Associated to this efficiency programme, a Use of Resources Improvement Programme has been developed in conjunction with Cipfa / KPMG and 11 authorities have so far indicated that they will participate. Appendix 3 shows the regions Use of Resources scores.

6. Officer Steering Group Comments

- 6.1 The Steering Group noted that the Efficiency Survey identified that a significant number of LAs will rely on reserves to balance budgets and that forecast savings were significantly less than delivered previously. Comment was made that delivering savings in the current economic climate is difficult for all LAs, however, some districts were finding it hard to release savings when most of their services have been outsourced.
- 6.2 The Steering Group considered that the Total Place concept should be included within the programme and were advised that there are two events planned around this theme, one of which was to identify opportunities for future support in this area.
- 6.3 The Steering Group recommended that the SRPs should be involved with the Challenge & Implementation phase of this programme and requested that the Finance Officers Steering Group is extended to include the SRPs managers. This would ensure that there is no duplication of activity between sub regional and regional activity.

7. Recommendations

- 7.1 The Board discuss the report and support the activity and engagement required from the SRPs and individual authorities.

Chris Allison
Director EM IEP

Project outline - Approved at the 16 June 2009 EM IEP Board meeting.
The East Midlands Efficiency Challenge Programme (£250k Capital Pot Funding)

Project Objectives

Against a background of anticipated increasingly challenging financial settlements the EM IEP has agreed targets that “All authorities achieve their annual efficiency savings target” and that “All authorities scoring at least level 3 in use of resources”.

This programme will support delivery

- Provide a comparison of authorities cost / performance relative to their peers
- Identify best practice structures to deliver efficiency programmes.
- Identify and communicate real practical efficiency opportunities – what others are doing. Share best practice & transfer knowledge around the region
- Provide a focus on the cost of corporate services
- Provide a tailored challenge to authorities on their efficiency plans according to a survey findings to test the robust nature and their realistic opportunity to fully deliver.
- Provide a challenge to those authorities' services which are considered to be in the bottom quartile of cost / performance compared to peers to facilitate the re-modelling and improvement of services.

Governance would require the establishment of a finance director level efficiency steering group coupled with a network of Efficiency leads. The budget for the programme is £250,000

Project Description

The programme consists of 4 elements:

Phase 1 - June – Oct 2009.

1. Desktop benchmark exercise across all authorities in the region by service cost linked to service performance based on published data to identify bottom quartile performance by service by cost by authority, (including % of corporate services by authority).
2. Survey of each authority's efficiency NI179 programmes. To identify the detail of how they are intending to achieve their published targets, what structures are in place, what projects have previously delivered efficiency gains and the level of savings, what projects they plan to undertake with a forecast of savings coupled with a delivery confidence level. The purpose being to (a) capture the project information and be able to show others what is being done, has been delivered and (b) provide the base information for the challenge programme. This would be achieved in part by data collection by way of a web site and in part by interviews

There would be a review at the end of phase one to consider the findings and to establish the most suitable way forward.

Phase 2.

3. Series of best practice workshops to show authorities what can be achieved and what others are undertaking.
4. An “East Midlands Efficiency Challenge” programme tailored for each authority and based on the benchmark and survey data enabling a focus on lower quartile cost performance delivery and an external challenge to future efficiency delivery plans.

Outline Business Benefits

The benefits that this programme will seek to achieve are:

- A shared learning on what can be done
- A challenge to efficiency delivery plans to test the robust nature and their realistic opportunity to fully deliver and so enable the region to achieve its target of all authorities achieving their annual efficiency savings.
- Providing the basis for further efficiencies in light of anticipated future challenging government financial settlements to provide political choice for other priorities.

Project Steering / Advisory Group

Name	Title	Authority	Representing
Malcolm Staley	Deputy Chief Executive	Broxtowe BC	Nottinghamshire
Isabel Proctor	Director of Resources	Northampton BC	Northamptonshire
David Forbes	Asst Director of Resources	Lincolnshire CC	Lincolnshire
Chris Tambini	Deputy Head of Strategic Finance	Leicestershire CC	Leicestershire
John Gilbert	Asst Director Transformation Service	Derbyshire CC	Derbyshire

Appendix 3

Council	Council type	County area	Managing Performance	Use of Resources	Managing finances	Governing the business	Managing resources	Participate in Improvement Programme
Amber Valley	District	Derbyshire	2	2	2	2	2	
Bolsover	District	Derbyshire	2	2	2	2	2	Yes
Chesterfield	District	Derbyshire	2	2	2	2	2	
Derby City UA	Unitary	Derbyshire	3	2	2	3	2	Yes
Derbyshire	County	Derbyshire	3	2	2	2	2	
Derbyshire Dales	District	Derbyshire	3	3	3	3	2	
Erewash	District	Derbyshire	2	2	2	2	1	
High Peak	District	Derbyshire	3	2	2	2	2	
North East Derbyshire	District	Derbyshire	2	2	2	2	2	Yes
South Derbyshire	District	Derbyshire	3	3	3	3	2	
Blaby	District	Leicestershire	3	2	2	2	2	
Charnwood	District	Leicestershire	2	2	2	2	2	
Harborough	District	Leicestershire	2	2	2	2	2	
Hinckley & Bosworth	District	Leicestershire	3	3	3	3	2	
Leicester City UA	Unitary	Leicestershire	2	2	2	2	3	
Leicestershire	County	Leicestershire	4	3	3	3	3	
Melton	District	Leicestershire	3	2	2	2	2	Yes
North West Leicestershire	District	Leicestershire	2	2	2	2	2	
Oadby & Wigston	District	Leicestershire	2	2	2	2	2	Yes
Rutland UA	Unitary	Leicestershire	3	2	2	2	2	
Boston	District	Lincolnshire	1	1	2	1	1	Yes
East Lindsey	District	Lincolnshire	3	2	3	2	2	
Lincoln	District	Lincolnshire	2	2	2	2	2	
Lincolnshire	County	Lincolnshire	3	2	3	2	2	
North Kesteven	District	Lincolnshire	3	3	3	3	2	
South Holland	District	Lincolnshire	3	3	3	3	2	
South Kesteven	District	Lincolnshire	2	2	3	2	2	
West Lindsey	District	Lincolnshire	2	2	2	2	2	
Corby	District	Northamptonshire	3	2	2	2	2	
Daventry	District	Northamptonshire	2	2	2	2	2	
East Northamptonshire	District	Northamptonshire	2	2	2	2	2	
Kettering	District	Northamptonshire	2	2	2	2	2	
Northampton	District	Northamptonshire	2	2	2	2	2	Yes
Northamptonshire	County	Northamptonshire	3	2	2	2	2	
South Northamptonshire	District	Northamptonshire	2	2	2	2	2	
Wellingborough	District	Northamptonshire	2	2	2	2	2	
Ashfield	District	Nottinghamshire	1	2	2	2	1	Yes
Bassetlaw	District	Nottinghamshire	2	2	2	2	3	
Broxtowe	District	Nottinghamshire	3	2	2	2	2	Yes
City of Nottingham UA	Unitary	Nottinghamshire	3	2	2	2	2	
Gedling	District	Nottinghamshire	3	2	3	2	2	
Mansfield	District	Nottinghamshire	2	2	2	2	2	Yes
Newark & Sherwood	District	Nottinghamshire	2	2	2	2	2	Yes
Nottinghamshire CC	County	Nottinghamshire	3	2	2	2	2	
Rushcliffe	District	Nottinghamshire	4	3	3	3	3	
Peak National Park								
Fire Authority		Derbyshire	2	2	2	2	2	
Fire Authority		Leicestershire CC						
Fire Authority		Lincolnshire						
Fire Authority		Northamptonshire						
Fire Authority		Nottinghamshire						

Agenda item No: 8

EAST MIDLANDS IMPROVEMENT AND EFFICIENCY PARTNERSHIP BOARD MEETING: 20th JANUARY 2010

Report of the Director

EM IEP Stretch Targets Review

1. Purpose of the report
 - 1.1 To provide the Board with an overview of the outcomes of the email consultation exercise to review the 12 Stretch Targets.
2. Background
 - 2.1 The Board had previously agreed that the 12 Stretch Targets would be reviewed in light of the new inspection regime. The Board agreed at their meeting on 27th November that the SRP programme managers refresh the RAG ratings, previously provided to the Board, after publication of the CAA results on 9th December 2009. This would provide an interim reflection on performance of the region against achieving the 12 stretch Targets in March 2011.
3. Steering Group Comments
 - 3.1 The Steering Group were advised that SRP returns against the 12 Stretch Targets (attached as appendix 1) show inconsistency in the allocating of the RAG ratings. This inconsistency is caused by the interpretation of progress in achieving the target by March 2010.
 - 3.2 The Steering Group considered whether the current 12 targets were the right measures of the EM IEP's performance and what was the benefit of this performance information balanced against the time and effort involved in the collection of the data.
 - 3.2 The Steering Group agreed that the EM IEP should retain some targets to ensure that evidence can be provided to CLG of the added value of the EM IEP. It was agreed that the revised targets should reflect the 4 reporting requirements currently required by CLG by evidencing:
 1. Sector Lead Improvement
 2. Return on Investment
 3. NI179 Cashable Savings
 4. Supporting LAs and Partners to deliver excellent LAAs
 - 3.3 The Steering Group agreed that 'green flags' should be acknowledged and celebrated more by the EM IEP and LAs.
 - 3.4 The Steering Group agreed to recommend to the Board that a small sub group is established to develop the detail of the revised targets.

4. Recommendations

4.1 The Board approve the recommendation of the Steering Group to revise the targets to reflect the 4 reporting requirements currently required by CLG as outlined in the report.

4.1 The Board approve the recommendation of the Steering Group to establish a small sub group to develop the detail of the revised targets to be presented to the next Board meeting in April.

Chris Allison

Director

EM IEP

EM IEP Stretch Regional Targets – Derbyshire Report – December 2009**Targets:**

1. All relevant authorities achieving at least "performing well" for Adult Social Services.
2. All relevant authorities achieving at least "performing well" for Children's Services.
3. All relevant authorities achieving a score of at least 3 out of 4 for looked after and safeguarding children.
4. All CAA organisational assessments (councils and partner bodies) are assessed to be at least "performing well" or equivalent.
5. All authorities scoring at least level 3 in use of resources.
6. All 9 LAAs achieving at least 75% of their targets.
7. All authorities achieving their annual efficiency savings target.
8. All local authorities paying at least 95% of non-disputed invoices within 30 days.
9. All authorities to reduce the DWP key performance indicator 1 i.e. "the average number of days to process new benefit claims to below 20 days".
10. The 8 LAAs with NI 117, "Not in Education Employment or Training" (NEET) to achieve 100% of each specific target set.
11. The 8 LAAs with NI 1, "the percentage of people who believe people from different backgrounds get on well together in the local area", should increase their percentage to the target established in their LAA.
12. All authorities to reach their NI 185 target, "reduction of CO2 from local authority operations".

Overall Ratings for Derbyshire:

Target	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Progress RAG rating	G	G	G	A	R	R	G	A	A	A	A	R

The above ratings have been derived from the following:

CAA:

	Targets				
	1	2	4	5	10
Amber Valley BC			Adequately	2	
Bolsover DC			Adequately	2	
Chesterfield BC			Adequately	2	
Derby City	Well	Well	Well	2	Improving
Derbyshire CC	Well	Well	Well	2	Deteriorating
Derbyshire Dales DC			Well	3	
Erewash BC			Adequately	2	
High Peak BC			Well	2	
North East DDC			Adequately	2	
South Derbyshire DC			Well	3	
Peak District NPA			n/a	n/a	
Fire Service			Well	2	

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Amber Valley BC				A	R		G	G	A			G
Bolsover DC				A	R		G	A	G			A
Chesterfield BC				A	R		G	G	A			A
Derby City	G	G	G	G	R	R	G	G	A	G	A	R
Derbyshire CC	G	G	G	G	R	R	G	A		A	A	R
Derbyshire Dales DC				G	G		G	G	A			A
Erewash BC				A	R		G	A	G			A
High Peak BC				G	R		G	A	G			A
North East DDC				A	R		G	G	G			G
South Derbyshire DC				G	G		G	G	G			A
Peak District NPA				G	G		G	G				G
Fire Service				G	R	G	G	G				

Notes:

Derbyshire County Council:

"The 8 LAAs with NI 117, "Not in Education Employment or Training" (NEET) to achieve 100% of each specific target set. Currently Green (exceeding target) at 5.85% v target of 6%. This is not strictly accurate.

The performance in 2008 was ultimately disappointing as, although the target of 6.2% was exceeded in November with 5.85%, the recession had a serious impact in the succeeding months (Dec 6.6% & Jan 7.6%) - leading to an overall average of 6.7%. However, because of the move to the 3 month measuring period there is now an ongoing mismatch between the target and the methodology – a renegotiation of targets will be required for future years (this will apply to other authorities not just Derbyshire).

Throughout 2009, the recession has continued to have a negative impact on comparable NEET figures year on year - with the latest data for October 2009 at 5.86%

The County NEET stretch target for 2009 (which will be measured Nov09/ Dec09 / Jan10) is further reduced to 5.7% which we will struggle to meet".

Peak District National Park Authority:

The CAA organisational assessment doesn't apply to National Park authorities and the annual efficiency target doesn't apply in the same way either. However they have our own versions of both. At the last National Park Authorities Performance Assessment process they had more strengths outweighing weaknesses and so class this as the equivalent of at least a 'performing well' score i.e green. They have also had their own efficiency measures and received an unqualified opinion from the Audit Commission on value for money (they looked at three case studies for efficiency savings) so again this has been rated green.



East Midlands
Improvement and
Efficiency Partnership

EAST MIDLANDS IMPROVEMENT AND EFFICIENCY PARTNERSHIP
Leicestershire/Rutland Sub- Region
REVISED REGIONAL TARGETS TO MARCH 2011 (Final Draft)

Measure and Target by March 2011		Current Status
1	All relevant authorities achieving at least "performing well" for Adult Social Services	
2	All relevant authorities achieving at least "performing well" for Children's Services.	Leicester City currently performing "adequately"
3	relevant authorities achieving a score of at least 3 out of 4 for looked after and safeguarding children.	Leicester City currently performing "adequately"
4	All CAA organisational assessments (councils and partner bodies) are assessed to be at least "performing well" or equivalent	Leicestershire Performs" Excellently", 3 Perform Well, 7 perform adequately
5	All authorities scoring at least level 3 in use of resources	City, LFRS and 4 Districts currently receiving 2
6	All 9 LAAs achieving at least 75% of their targets.	Excludes Rutland DCFS figures
7	All authorities achieving their annual efficiency savings target	
8	All local authorities paying at least 95% of non disputed invoices within 30 days	Leicestershire County and Rutland Not currently achieving this
9	All authorities to reduce the DWP key performance indicator 1 ie "the average number of days to process new benefit claims to below 20 days. This is a District council measure.	
10	The 8 LAAs with NI1, "the percentage of people who believe people from different backgrounds get on well together in the local area", should increase their percentage to the target established in their LAA.	Annual measure, not relevant for Rutland.
11	The 8 LAAs with NI 117, "Not in Education Employment or Training" (NEET) to achieve 100% of each specific target set.	Awaiting Leicester City confirmation
12	All authorities to reach their NI 185 target, "reduction of CO2 from local authority operations	Melton are not currently reporting on this figure

Red = Currently significant distance from 2011 target

Yellow = Currently below the 2011 target- some improvement required in next 18-months

Green = Already meeting 2011 target - maintain current performance

Grey = Awaiting data

Target	Target Description	Target Value	Date of data	Actual Value		Comments	RAG	Comments on RAG
1	All relevant authorities achieving at least "performing well" for Adult Social Services.	Performing well (3)	09/12/09	Performing well (3)	●	Lincolnshire County Council	G	Met
2	All relevant authorities achieving at least "performing well" for Children's Services.	Performing well (3)	09/12/09	Performing well (3)	●	Lincolnshire County Council	G	Met
3	All relevant authorities achieving a score of at least 3 out of 4 for looked after and safeguarding children.	3	09/12/09	4	★	Lincolnshire County Council	G	Exceeded
4	All CAA organisational assessments (councils and partner bodies) are assessed to be at least "performing well" or equivalent.	All Performing Well (3)	09/12/09	Fail	▲	No authorities are 'performing strongly', four are 'performing well', two are 'performing adequately' and one is 'performing poorly'. RIEP Team has advised that Police and NHS are not part of this target despite the description.	R	Not all achieving Level 3 therefore RED
	Lincolnshire County Council	Performing well (3)	09/12/09	Performing well (3)	●			
	Boston Borough Council	Performing well (3)	09/12/09	Performing poorly (1)	▲			
	East Lindsey District Council	Performing well (3)	09/12/09	Performing well (3)	●			
	Lincoln City Council	Performing well (3)	09/12/09	Performing adequately (2)	▲			
	North Kesteven District Council	Performing well (3)	09/12/09	Performing well (3)	●			
	South Holland District Council	Performing well (3)	09/12/09	Performing well (3)	●			

Target	Target Description	Target Value	Date of data	Actual Value		Comments	RAG	Comments on RAG
	South Kesteven District Council	Performing well (3)	09/12/09	Performing adequately (2)	▲			
	West Lindsey District Council	Performing well (3)	09/12/09	Performing adequately (2)	▲			
	Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue	Performing well (3)	09/12/09	Performing well (3)	●			
	Lincolnshire Police	Performing well (3)	09/12/09	-	-			
	NHS Lincolnshire	Performing well (3)	09/12/09	-	-			
5	All authorities scoring at least level 3 in use of resources.	All level 3	09/12/09	Fail	▲	No authorities scored level 4, two scored level 3, six scored level 2 and one scored level 1. RIEP Team has advised that Police and NHS are not part of this target. Does the target take into account the harder CAA Use of Resources assessment?	R	Not all achieving Level 3 therefore RED
	Lincolnshire County Council	3	09/12/09	2	▲			
	Boston Borough Council	3	09/12/09	1	▲			
	East Lindsey District Council	3	09/12/09	2	▲			
	Lincoln City Council	3	09/12/09	2	▲			
	North Kesteven District Council	3	09/12/09	3	●			
	South Holland District Council	3	09/12/09	3	●			
	South Kesteven District Council	3	09/12/09	2	▲			
	West Lindsey District Council	3	09/12/09	2	▲			
	Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue	3	09/12/09	2	▲			

Target	Target Description	Target Value	Date of data	Actual Value		Comments	RAG	Comments on RAG
	Lincolnshire Police	3	09/12/09	-	-	Finance, 2; Resources, 2; Governance, 2.		
	NHS Lincolnshire	3	09/12/09	-	-	Finance, 2; Resources, 3; Governance, 2.		
6	All 9 LAAs achieving at least 75% of their targets.	75%	31/03/09	71%	▲	Calculated using the LAA Performance Reward Grant formula based on performance at 31/03/09 against annual targets in LAA. Not all LAA designated targets could be evaluated at that date. Please note that we set a locally based target of 60% for 31/03/09 because the LAA would only have been in force for nine months.	R	Not achieving 75% therefore RED
7	All authorities achieving their annual efficiency savings target.	All achieving target (£k)	31/10/09	Fail	▲	As a county, we are achieving the overall designated LAA target based on October 2009 NI reporting (forecast of performance at 31/03/2010). Individual council targets are non-designated. Some issues re NI179 target calculations are currently being discussed with CLG and GOEM.	R	Some councils not meeting target therefore RED. (If designated LAA target used this would be GREEN and performing 18% above target)

Target	Target Description	Target Value	Date of data	Actual Value		Comments	RAG	Comments on RAG
	LINCOLNSHIRE	41,661	31/10/09	49,153	★	As above		
	Lincolnshire County Council	29,172	31/10/09	38,473	★	As above		
	Boston Borough Council	913	31/10/09	503	▲	As above		
	East Lindsey District Council	2,153	31/10/09	2,466	★	As above		
	Lincoln City Council	2,815	31/10/09	2,815	●	As above		
	North Kesteven District Council	1,038	31/10/09	1,038	●	As above		
	South Holland District Council	1,002	31/10/09	731	▲	As above		
	South Kesteven District Council	1,646	31/10/09	1,654	●	As above		
	West Lindsey District Council	1,109	31/10/09	1,473	★	As above		
8	All local authorities paying at least 95% of non disputed invoices within 30 days.	All achieving at least 95%	31/03/09	Fail	▲		R	Some councils not meeting target therefore RED
	Lincolnshire County Council	95%	30/09/09	92.79%	▲	Includes Lincolnshire Fire & Rescue. CC does not exclude disputed invoices due to overhead of doing so. For this reason there is a 90% target locally.		
	Boston Borough Council	95%	31/03/09	93.86%	▲			
	East Lindsey District Council	95%	31/03/09	98.76%	★			
	Lincoln City Council	95%	31/03/09	95.08%	●			
	North Kesteven District Council	95%	31/03/09	99.13%	★			
	South Holland District Council	95%	31/03/09	92.75%	▲			
	South Kesteven District Council	95%	31/03/09	97.76%	★			

Target	Target Description	Target Value	Date of data	Actual Value		Comments	RAG	Comments on RAG
	West Lindsey District Council	95%	31/03/09	98.22%	★			
9	All authorities to reduce the DWP key performance indicator 1 ie "the average number of days to process new benefit claims to below 20 days".	All below 20 days	30/09/09	Pass	★	These figures are based on the new National Indicator NI181 which includes both new claims and changes to circumstances.	G	All District Councils meeting the DWP standard
	Boston Borough Council	20	30/09/09	12.91	★			
	East Lindsey District Council	20	30/09/09	10.13	★			
	Lincoln City Council	20	30/09/09	13.5	★			
	North Kesteven District Council	20	30/09/09	17.71	★			
	South Holland District Council	20	30/09/09	14.57	★			
	South Kesteven District Council	20	31/03/09	15.9	★	Not able to produce Q2 figures		
	West Lindsey District Council	20	30/09/09	17.51	★			
10	The 8 LAAs with NI1, "the percentage of people who believe people from different backgrounds get on well together in the local area", should increase their percentage to the target established in their LAA.	-	31/03/09	74.2%	-	2008/09 was the baseline year for this indicator. It cannot be measured again until 31/03/11(2010 Place Survey)	-	Not possible to evaluate this at present
	Boston Borough Council	-	31/03/09	54.6%	-	As above		
	East Lindsey District Council	-	31/03/09	67.5%	-	As above		
	Lincoln City Council	-	31/03/09	75.8%	-	As above		
	North Kesteven District Council	-	31/03/09	81.8%	-	As above		
	South Holland District Council	-	31/03/09	64.1%	-	As above		

Target	Target Description	Target Value	Date of data	Actual Value		Comments	RAG	Comments on RAG
	South Kesteven District Council	-	31/03/09	81.0%	-	As above		
	West Lindsey District Council	-	31/03/09	84.2%	-	As above		
11	The 8 LAAs with NI 117, "Not in Education Employment or Training" (NEET) to achieve 100% of each specific target set.	4.2	31/03/09	4.36	●	NI is based on average for November, December, January so last year provided her.	R	100% of LAA designated target not met therefore RED
12	All authorities to reach their NI 185 target, "reduction of CO2 from local authority operations".	-	31/03/09	-	-	2008/09 was the baseline year for this indicator. The reduction can only be measured from 2009/10 onwards.	-	Not possible to evaluate this at present

Worse than tolerance / Within tolerance / Better than tolerance (Tolerance is +/-2% variance)



East Midlands
Improvement and
Efficiency Partnership

EAST MIDLANDS IMPROVEMENT AND EFFICIENCY PARTNERSHIP
Northamptonshire Sub- Region
REVISED REGIONAL TARGETS TO MARCH 2011 (Final Draft)

Measure and Target by March 2011		Current Status
1	All relevant authorities achieving at least "performing well" for Adult Social Services	Northamptonshire currently "performing well"
2	All relevant authorities achieving at least "performing well" for Children's Services.	Northamptonshire currently "performing adequately"
3	relevant authorities achieving a score of at least 3 out of 4 for looked after and safeguarding children.	No requirements were identified in the "unannounced inspection". There will be an "announced inspection" for Northamptonshire sometime before March 2012, for which we get 2 weeks notice. We should be rated at least 2, but are targetting a rating of 3 in our plans.
4	All CAA organisational assessments (councils and partner bodies) are assessed to be at least "performing well" or equivalent	Corby = "Performs well". NCC and the other 6 Districts = "Performs Adequately"
5	All authorities scoring at least level 3 in use of resources	NCC and all 7 districts currently level 2.
6	All 9 LAAs achieving at least 75% of their targets.	Q2 2009/10 Northamptonshire LAA is achieving 72% of designated targets
7	All authorities achieving their annual efficiency savings target	Corby - Yes Northampton - Yes Wellingborough - Yes NCC - No East northants- No Kettering - No Daventry - No South Northants - No
8	All local authorities paying at least 95% of non disputed invoices within 30 days	NCC achieving 98.3% within 30 days for Apr-Sep09
9	All authorities to reduce the DWP key performance indicator 1 ie "the average number of days to process new benefit claims to below 20 days. This is a District council measure.	All Districts processing new benefit claims in under 15 days (NI 181)
10	The 8 LAAs with NI1, "the percentage of people who believe people from different backgrounds get on well together in the local area", should increase their percentage to the target established in their LAA.	Northamptonshire actual 2008/09 = 76.1%, LAA target 2010/11 = 78.4%
11	The 8 LAAs with NI 117, "Not in Education Employment or Training" (NEET) to achieve 100% of each specific target set.	Northamptonshire actual Sep09 = 10.4%, LAA Target Sep09 = 10.2%, LAA target 2010/11 = 6.5%
12	All authorities to reach their NI 185 target, "reduction of CO2 from local authority operations	Countywide target not set, as NI185 is not part of LAA, but county council are seeking an annual reduction. Latest data issued by government shows CO2 emissions have decreased in Northants from 8.5 tonnes CO2 per capita in 2005 to 8.1 tonnes CO2 in 2007.

Red = Currently significant distance from 2011 target

Yellow = Currently below the 2011 target- some improvement required in next 18-months

Green = Already meeting 2011 target - maintain current performance

Grey = Awaiting data



East Midlands
Improvement and
Efficiency Partnership

EAST MIDLANDS IMPROVEMENT AND EFFICIENCY PARTNERSHIP
Northamptonshire Sub- Region
REVISED REGIONAL TARGETS TO MARCH 2011 (Final Draft)

Measure and Target by March 2011		Current Status
1	All relevant authorities achieving at least "performing well" for Adult Social Services	Northamptonshire currently "performing well"
2	All relevant authorities achieving at least "performing well" for Children's Services.	Northamptonshire currently "performing adequately"
3	relevant authorities achieving a score of at least 3 out of 4 for looked after and safeguarding children.	No requirements were identified in the "unannounced inspection". There will be an "announced inspection" for Northamptonshire sometime before March 2012, for which we get 2 weeks notice. We should be rated at least 2, but are targetting a rating of 3 in our plans.
4	All CAA organisational assessments (councils and partner bodies) are assessed to be at least "performing well" or equivalent	Corby = "Performs well". NCC and the other 6 Districts = "Performs Adequately"
5	All authorities scoring at least level 3 in use of resources	NCC and all 7 districts currently level 2.
6	All 9 LAAs achieving at least 75% of their targets.	Q2 2009/10 Northamptonshire LAA is achieving 72% of designated targets
7	All authorities achieving their annual efficiency savings target	Corby - Yes Northampton - Yes Wellingborough - Yes NCC - No East northants- No Kettering - No Daventry - No South Northants - No
8	All local authorities paying at least 95% of non disputed invoices within 30 days	NCC achieving 98.3% within 30 days for Apr-Sep09
9	All authorities to reduce the DWP key performance indicator 1 ie "the average number of days to process new benefit claims to below 20 days. This is a District council measure.	All Districts processing new benefit claims in under 15 days (NI 181)
10	The 8 LAAs with NI1, "the percentage of people who believe people from different backgrounds get on well together in the local area", should increase their percentage to the target established in their LAA.	Northamptonshire actual 2008/09 = 76.1%, LAA target 2010/11 = 78.4%
11	The 8 LAAs with NI 117, "Not in Education Employment or Training" (NEET) to achieve 100% of each specific target set.	Northamptonshire actual Sep09 = 10.4%, LAA Target Sep09 = 10.2%, LAA target 2010/11 = 6.5%
12	All authorities to reach their NI 185 target, "reduction of CO2 from local authority operations	Countywide target not set, as NI185 is not part of LAA, but county council are seeking an annual reduction. Latest data issued by government shows CO2 emissions have decreased in Northants from 8.5 tonnes CO2 per capita in 2005 to 8.1 tonnes CO2 in 2007.

Red = Currently significant distance from 2011 target

Yellow = Currently below the 2011 target- some improvement required in next 18-months

Green = Already meeting 2011 target - maintain current performance

Grey = Awaiting data

Agenda item No: 9

EAST MIDLANDS IMPROVEMENT AND EFFICIENCY PARTNERSHIP BOARD GROUP MEETING 20th JANUARY 2010:

Report of the Director

End of Year EM IEP Sub Regional Programmes Review

1. Purpose of the report
 - 1.1 To outline a suggested process for conducting an end of year (2009/10) review of the Sub Regional projects as requested by the Board at its last meeting in November 2009.
2. Background
 - 2.1 Following the presentation of the self assessment results conducted on the Sub Regional Projects (150) to the Board last November, the Board resolved that *'a report be provided to the Steering Group on the 7th January 2010 outlining the process to achieve the Board's request for a Peer review of SRP programmes (to be completed by April 2010), led by a Chief Executive from each sub region and supported by the SRP Programme Manger'*.
3. Process
 - 3.1 The Board's objective is to provide reassurance across the extensive programmes commissioned by the 5 Sub Regions, that projects are on track to deliver the defined improvements and cost benefits, given the high confidence levels displayed in the self assessment analysis, when contrasted with the relative dearth of good news stories that can be safely reported to government in the Interim EM IEP report. The latter was delivered to the CLG/LGA on the 8 January 2010.
 - 3.2 As stated above the review in each sub region should involve the designated SRP Programme Manger and a visiting Chief Executive from a neighbouring sub region. The following principles should apply:
 - The review should be undertaken via a visit to the relevant SRP office to examine evidence on the scale of achievement so far and to make an assessment of the likely completion date of projects and the prospects for implementing improvements and/or realising cashable savings.
 - The SRP Programme Manager will then produce a spreadsheet with the assessment against each project, signed off by the visiting Chief Executive for onward presentation to the Board
 - The work should be completed during February/March to allow a composite report to be prepared for the Steering Group (31st March) and the Board (15th April)

- The SRP Programme Manager will be responsible for assembling the project review highlight reports and the identification of hot spots, which could prove detrimental to the delivery of project(s) benefits
- The following allocation of Chief Executives to Sub regional reviews is proposed as follows:
 1. Derbyshire to review Northamptonshire
 2. Lincolnshire to review Nottinghamshire
 3. Leicestershire to review Derbyshire
 4. Northamptonshire to review Lincolnshire
 5. Nottinghamshire to review Leicestershire

4. Officer Steering Group Comments

4.1 The Steering Group considered the process outlined above at their meeting on 7th January and agreed to the proposal that one Chief Executive (or Senior Officer) from each sub region review the progress of the delivery of each of the SRP Programmes. It was recommended that the Chief Executive/Senior Officer has some knowledge of the EM IEP Programmes.

4.2 The Steering Group agreed that a template should be provided for the review and the report back to the Steering Group. The templates would include the following areas: Progress on Delivering Benefits; Project and Programme Issues; Project and Programme Risks; Budget Spend Profile and Project/Programme Delivery Timeframe.

4.3 The Steering Group requested that the SRPs should provide the visiting Chief Executive/Senior Officer with information prior to the visit, using the template as a guide.

5. Recommendations

5.1 That the Board consider the comments made by the Steering Group, outlined above, and approve the process to complete end of Year EM IEP Sub Regional Programmes Review

Chris Allison
Director
EM IEP

Agenda item No: 10

EAST MIDLANDS IMPROVEMENT AND EFFICIENCY PARTNERSHIP BOARD MEETING: 20th JANUARY 2010

Report of the Director

Regional Programme Managers 2010/11

1. Purpose of the report
 - 1.1 To obtain Approval for funding the three regional programme managers for 2010/11 from the indicative regional funding.
2. Background
 - 2.1 Previously the Board has approved the funding for three programme managers to support the delivery of regional programmes for the first two years of the EM IEP programme.
 - 2.2 The three regional programme managers are currently supporting the delivery of the approved regional programmes: Children's Services/Adult Social Care, Environmental Services/Climate Change and Business Transformation/Efficiency.
 - 2.3 The funding of £173k is required to pay salaries (and additional employment costs) for the three programme managers to continue to support the delivery of these programmes from 1st April 2010.
 - 2.4 Subject to confirmation of the EM IEP core grant, from the minister Rt Hon Rosie Winterton, it is anticipated that the 30% available for the regional programme 2010/11 will be £1.967m. The cost of the three programme managers will be a charge against the regional 30% allocation.
3. Steering Group Comments
 - 3.1 The Steering Group agreed to recommend the report to the Board. However, the Steering Group requested that the Regional Programme Managers make presentations to the Steering Group on the added value that their programmes are delivering within the region at future meetings.
4. Recommendations
 - 4.1 That the Board approve funding for the three regional programme managers, subject to confirmation of the anticipated funding of £1.967m

Chris Allison
Director EM IEP

Agenda item No: 11

EAST MIDLANDS IMPROVEMENT AND EFFICIENCY PARTNERSHIP BOARD MEETING: 20th JANUARY 2010.

Report of the Director

EM IEP Annual Conference

1. Purpose of the report
 - 1.1 To outline the theme and arrangements for the EM IEP 2010 Annual Conference.
2. Background
 - 2.1 The Board has approved the Conference date as the 29th June 2010 to ensure it is beyond the next general election date.
 - 2.2 Given that the incoming government will be preoccupied with solving the economic crisis and reducing public expenditure, and aiming to ensure that service quality is not compromised, it is suggested the conference theme should be ***'Planning for public service excellence over the medium term with diminishing financial resources'***.
 - 2.3 Experience has shown that half day events are preferable and to our target audience of Elected Members, Senior Managers and key public sector partners.
 - 2.4 As in previous years it is suggested that the Conference contain a mix of high profile speakers from the Government, Local Government Association, Communities and Local Government Department, and regional contributors. The event should also attempt to showcase good practice from around the region.
 - 2.5 The performance of the EM IEP over its many investments and programmes will need to be showcased in some form, possibly via video clips.
3. Steering Group Comments
 - 3.1 The Steering Group agreed to recommend the suggested conference to the Board. Volunteers for a small task group were requested with offers from GOEM, Derbyshire CC and Derby City.
4. Recommendations
 - 4.1 The Board agree the general theme for the conference as set out in the report.

Chris Allison, Director EM IEP

Agenda item No: 12

EAST MIDLANDS IMPROVEMENT AND EFFICIENCY PARTNERSHIP BOARD GROUP MEETING: 20th JANUARY 2010

Report of the Director

EM IEP Customer Perception Survey November 2009

1. Purpose of the report
 - 1.1 To provide a summary of the results from the EM IEP Customer Perception Survey 2009.
2. Background
 - 2.1 The National RIEP Programme Team supported the 9 RIEPs to carry out their annual perception surveys. The results of these surveys are included in the 9 RIEPs' Interim and Annual Reports to indicate to CLG the level of engagement of each region's local authorities with the RIEPs Improvement and Efficiency Programmes and support activities.
 - 2.2 The EM IEP survey was emailed to contacts, which included all councillors and chief executives, service specific officers and other stakeholders. In total we had 443 responses, which is exceptional, given that last year we received only 99.
3. Summary of Survey Results
 - 3.1 The following bullet points provide a summary of survey results:
 - 34% of respondents were elected members and 53% were local authority officers
 - 68% of respondents found it very easy/easy to get involved in the work of the EM IEP with 18% stating that it was difficult
 - 67% of respondents said that they were very/fairly informed about the EM IEP
 - 66% of respondents stated that they were very/fairly engaged with the EM IEP with 12% stating they were not very well/at all engaged
 - 73% of respondents stated that they have accessed support provided by the EM IEP (please note **all** EM LAs and F&R authorities are currently engaged in EM IEP funded projects)
 - 75% of respondents support the principle of funding the RIEPs to encourage collaboration between councils and partners with 11% opposing.
 - 69% of respondents stated that the EM IEP was making a contribution to improving services and achieving greater efficiencies with 5% stating no contribution was made

- 3.2 Generally the comments made by respondents were positive. Respondents noted that the EM IEP was well managed both politically and managerially. Respondents also noted that they valued the:
- Opportunity to attend seminars/workshops and training events
 - Opportunities to network to foster consistent approaches and allow the exchange of good ideas and good practice
 - Regional programmes in particular the climate change, service transformation, adults and children's services programmes were mentioned
 - Opportunity to engage in collaboration projects funded by EM IEP
 - Facilitation of bringing together of a range of organisations/partners to develop and lead innovation in the way to operate in the future
 - Opportunities to enhance county relationships and support through the SRPs
 - Support provided by the EM IEP support staff as open, inclusive and easy to engage
- 3.3 There were very few negative comments made, however, communication is still an issue. The refresh of the website and distribution of the Interim Report in January 2009, to all councillors across the region, may address this in part. However, it is important that at regional and sub regional levels there is engagement with councillors to explain what the EM IEP is (i.e. a partnership of the East Midlands 46 councils and 5 F&R authorities) and how this partnership is enabling collaboration, service improvement and greater efficiency gains across the region.

4. Steering Group Comments

- 4.1 The Steering Group agreed that the survey findings were a positive reflection on EM IEP. It was noted that this reflected the engagement of the Board and Cllrs at both regional and sub regional level. It also reflected the positive impact of the structure of the EM IEP which incorporates the SRPs and how this structure had enabled engagement and inclusion of all of the LAs and F&R authorities across the region.
- 4.2 The Steering Group requested that it would be of benefit if there could be some comparison made with the other RIEPs and to ascertain the proportion of Cllrs/officers that identified that they were not engaged with or informed about the EM IEP.
- 4.3 Communication was recognised as an issue and the Steering Group agreed that it was the responsibility of the SRPs to ensure that they engaged with Cllrs and officers within their sub region's authorities.

5. Recommendations

- 5.1 That the Board note the perception survey results and encourage the SRPs to engage with councillors and officers to improve sector engagement.

Chris Allison, Director EM IEP