

AGENDA

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Date: **Friday 14 September 2012**

Time: **10.30 am**

Place: **The Council Chamber, Brockington, 35 Hafod Road,
Hereford**

Notes: Please note the **time, date** and **venue** of the meeting.

For any further information please contact:

Tim Brown, Governance Services

Tel: 01432 260239

Email: tbrown@herefordshire.gov.uk

If you would like help to understand this document, or would like it in another format or language, please call Tim Brown, Governance Services on 01432 260239 or e-mail tbrown@herefordshire.gov.uk in advance of the meeting.

Agenda for the Meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Membership

Chairman

Councillor A Seldon

Vice-Chairman

Councillor JW Millar

Councillor AM Atkinson

Councillor PL Bettington

Councillor WLS Bowen

Councillor MJK Cooper

Councillor PGH Cutter

Councillor EPJ Harvey

Councillor MAF Hubbard

Councillor RC Hunt

Councillor TM James

Councillor Brig P Jones CBE

Councillor JLV Kenyon

Councillor R Preece

Councillor SJ Robertson

Councillor P Rone

Councillor PJ Watts

Statutory co-optees (for educational matters only)

Mr P Burbidge - Roman Catholic Church

Miss E Lowenstein – Secondary School Parent Governor

Mr T Plumer – Primary School Parent Governor

Mr P Sell – Church of England

AGENDA

		Pages
1.	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE To receive apologies for absence.	
2.	NAMED SUBSTITUTES (IF ANY) To receive details of any Member nominated to attend the meeting in place of a Member of the Committee.	
3.	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST To receive any declarations of interest by Members in respect of items on the Agenda.	
4.	MINUTES To approve and sign the Minutes of the meeting held on 28 August 2012	1 - 4
5.	SUGGESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ON ISSUES FOR FUTURE SCRUTINY To consider suggestions from members of the public on issues the Committee could scrutinise in the future. <i>(There will be no discussion of the issue at the time when the matter is raised. Consideration will be given to whether it should form part of the Committee's work programme when compared with other competing priorities.)</i>	
6.	QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC To note questions received from the public and the items to which they relate. <i>(Questions are welcomed for consideration at a Scrutiny Committee meeting so long as the question is directly related to an item listed on the agenda. If you have a question you would like to ask then please submit it no later than two working days before the meeting to the Committee Officer. This will help to ensure that an answer can be provided at the meeting).</i>	
7.	WEST MIDLANDS AMBULANCE SERVICE NHS TRUST - IMPACT OF MAKE READY ON PERFORMANCE AND HALF YEAR UPDATE To receive an updated presentation on the progress of the Make Ready Ambulance system and the work of the West Midlands Ambulance Service NHS Trust.	5 - 6
8.	2GETHER NHS FOUNDATION TRUST PROGRESS REPORT To receive a half year review on progress for the 2gether NHS Foundation Trust, which demonstrates trends in delivery and highlights emerging issues.	7 - 8
9.	AGRESSO/FRAMWORKI UPDATE To consider a report on progress with implementation of the Agresso and Frameworki systems.	9 - 12
10.	STREETSCENE ROOT AND BRANCH REVIEW AND STRATEGIC SERVICE DELIVERY PARTNERSHIP REPROCUREMENT PROCESS To update the Committee in relation to the Streetscene Root and Branch review following the Cabinet's decision on 12 th July 2012 regarding the services currently included in the Amey Service Delivery Agreement.	13 - 20

11. REVIEW OF THE SCRUTINY STRUCTURE	21 - 44
To consider the proposals arising from the recent review of the scrutiny structure.	
12. COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME	45 - 52
To consider the Committee's Work Programme.	

PUBLIC INFORMATION

Public Involvement at Scrutiny Committee Meetings

You can contact Councillors and Officers at any time about Scrutiny Committee matters and issues which you would like the Scrutiny Committee to investigate.

There are also two other ways in which you can directly contribute at Herefordshire Council's Scrutiny Committee meetings.

1. Identifying Areas for Scrutiny

At the meeting the Chairman will ask the members of the public present if they have any issues which they would like the Scrutiny Committee to investigate, however, there will be no discussion of the issue at the time when the matter is raised. Councillors will research the issue and consider whether it should form part of the Committee's work programme when compared with other competing priorities.

2. Questions from Members of the Public for Consideration at Scrutiny Committee Meetings and Participation at Meetings

You can submit a question for consideration at a Scrutiny Committee meeting so long as the question you are asking is directly related to an item listed on the agenda. If you have a question you would like to ask then please submit it **no later than two working days before the meeting** to the Committee Officer. This will help to ensure that an answer can be provided at the meeting. Contact details for the Committee Officer can be found on the front page of this agenda.

Generally, members of the public will also be able to contribute to the discussion at the meeting. This will be at the Chairman's discretion.

(Please note that the Scrutiny Committee is not able to discuss questions relating to personal or confidential issues.)

The Public's Rights to Information and Attendance at Meetings

YOU HAVE A RIGHT TO: -

- Attend all Council, Cabinet, Committee and Sub-Committee meetings unless the business to be transacted would disclose 'confidential' or 'exempt' information.
- Inspect agenda and public reports at least five clear days before the date of the meeting.
- Inspect minutes of the Council and all Committees and Sub-Committees and written statements of decisions taken by the Cabinet or individual Cabinet Members for up to six years following a meeting.
- Inspect background papers used in the preparation of public reports for a period of up to four years from the date of the meeting. (A list of the background papers to a report is given at the end of each report). A background paper is a document on which the officer has relied in writing the report and which otherwise is not available to the public.
- Access to a public Register stating the names, addresses and wards of all Councillors with details of the membership of Cabinet and of all Committees and Sub-Committees.
- Have a reasonable number of copies of agenda and reports (relating to items to be considered in public) made available to the public attending meetings of the Council, Cabinet, Committees and Sub-Committees.
- Have access to a list specifying those powers on which the Council have delegated decision making to their officers identifying the officers concerned by title.
- Copy any of the documents mentioned above to which you have a right of access, subject to a reasonable charge (20p per sheet subject to a maximum of £5.00 per agenda plus a nominal fee of £1.50 for postage).
- Access to this summary of your rights as members of the public to attend meetings of the Council, Cabinet, Committees and Sub-Committees and to inspect and copy documents.

Please Note:

Agenda and individual reports can be made available in large print. Please contact the officer named on the front cover of this agenda **in advance** of the meeting who will be pleased to deal with your request.

The Council Chamber where the meeting will be held is accessible for visitors in wheelchairs, for whom toilets are also available.

A public telephone is available in the reception area.

Public Transport Links

- Public transport access can be gained to Brockington via the service that runs approximately every half hour from the 'Hopper' bus station at the Tesco store in Bewell Street (next to the roundabout junction of Blueschool Street / Victoria Street / Edgar Street).
- The nearest bus stop to Brockington is located in Old Eign Hill near to its junction with Hafod Road. The return journey can be made from the same bus stop.

If you have any questions about this agenda, how the Council works or would like more information or wish to exercise your rights to access the information described above, you may do so either by telephoning the officer named on the front cover of this agenda or by visiting in person during office hours (8.45 a.m. - 5.00 p.m. Monday - Thursday and 8.45 a.m. - 4.45 p.m. Friday) at the Council Offices, Brockington, 35 Hafod Road, Hereford.



Where possible this agenda is printed on paper made from 100% Post-Consumer waste. De-inked without bleaching and free from optical brightening agents (OBA). Awarded the Nordic Swan for low emissions during production and the Blue Angel environmental label.

HEREFORDSHIRE COUNCIL

BROCKINGTON, 35 HAFOD ROAD, HEREFORD.

FIRE AND EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

In the event of a fire or emergency the alarm bell will ring continuously.

You should vacate the building in an orderly manner through the nearest available fire exit.

You should then proceed to Assembly Point A which is located at the southern entrance to the car park. A check will be undertaken to ensure that those recorded as present have vacated the building following which further instructions will be given.

Please do not allow any items of clothing, etc. to obstruct any of the exits.

Do not delay your vacation of the building by stopping or returning to collect coats or other personal belongings.

HEREFORDSHIRE COUNCIL

MINUTES of the meeting of Overview and Scrutiny Committee held at The Council Chamber, Brockington, 35 Hafod Road, Hereford on Tuesday 28 August 2012 at 2.00 pm

Present: Councillor A Seldon (Chairman)
Councillor JW Millar (Vice Chairman)

Councillors: AM Atkinson, PL Bettington, WLS Bowen, MJK Cooper, RC Hunt, TM James, JLV Kenyon, JW Millar, R Preece and SJ Robertson

In attendance: None

Officers: J Davidson, Director for People's Services, E Shassere, Director of Public Health, C Chapman, Assistant Director, Law, Governance and Resilience, T Brown, Governance Services; NHS Herefordshire: P Ryan, Head of Contracts, and S Spencer, Service Improvement Manager Stroke Lead Herefordshire; Wye Valley NHS Trust: M Clarke, Director of Nursing.

21. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillors EPJ Harvey, and Brigadier P Jones and from Mr P Burbidge, Miss E Lowenstein and Mr P Sell.

22. NAMED SUBSTITUTES

There were no named substitutes.

23. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

24. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the meeting held on 4 July 2012 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

The Chairman requested that it be recorded that, in order to develop the Committee's role in pre-decision scrutiny and ensure that this was discharged effectively, it was essential that there was a clear and transparent mechanism in place for ensuring that Cabinet's response to recommendations made by the Committee was clear and on the record.

25. SUGGESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ON ISSUES FOR FUTURE SCRUTINY

No suggestions had been received.

26. QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No questions had been received.

It was acknowledged that there had been a delay in responding to questions from Members of the public submitted to the Committee's previous meeting. The Chairman made clear his

expectation that public questions should be dealt with in a clear and systematic way and the questions and answers published with the relevant Minutes.

27. NHS MIDLANDS AND EAST STROKE SERVICES REVIEW

The Committee considered the arrangements for a review of Stroke Services in the NHS Midlands and East Strategic Health Authority Area.

Mr Paul Ryan, Head of Contracts, NHS Herefordshire gave a presentation. A copy of the presentation has been included with the agenda papers on the Minute Book.

In discussion the following principal points were made:

- Members questioned the arrangements in place to ensure prompt diagnosis of stroke. They were informed that 6 consultants would be required to maintain a 24/7 rota for stroke services. Currently Wye Valley NHS Trust employed one consultant. Efforts to recruit a second consultant had been unsuccessful. It was noted that other Trusts in the Region had also found it difficult to recruit consultants for stroke services. Currently Herefordshire and Worcestershire formed a stroke network. Most networks were larger and the likelihood was that across the Country there would be a move to fewer but larger networks.
- It was requested that a briefing note should be produced providing more information on the Herefordshire context. It was noted that whilst Wye Valley NHS Trust had improved the service the improvement had not been as fast and far reaching as was required. However, Herefordshire was not alone in facing this challenge.
- It was confirmed that submissions to the review had already made clear and would continue to make clear that account needed to be taken of the significant number of patients in east Powys who received treatment in Herefordshire.
- It was necessary to acknowledge that the sparsity of the County's population meant that it was difficult to justify the recruitment of the number of senior staff required to sustain some services. In these circumstances the focus had to be on seeking to achieve the best level of service for the county that could reasonably be achieved.
- It was confirmed that the review would explore the scope for improved preventative primary care.

RESOLVED:

That (a) a Task and Finish Group be established to consider the proposals for reviewing stroke services and authorised to respond on the Committee's behalf as appropriate;

(b) the following Members be appointed to serve on the Task and Finish Group: Councillors WLS Bowen, JLV Kenyon, JW Millar and A Seldon; and

(c) a briefing note be circulated providing more detail on the Herefordshire context.

28. CONSULTATION ON LOCAL AUTHORITY HEALTH SCRUTINY

The Committee considered a response to a Department of Health consultation on Local Authority Health Scrutiny.

The report set out a draft response to the specific questions posed in the consultation document.

In discussion the following amendments to the proposed response were suggested:

- In relation to the response to questions 1 and 2 relating to timescales it was proposed to add that any timescales should be realistic and deliverable.
- That in the response to question 3 it should be added that the provision of support and information to assist authorities in assessing financial and resource considerations should be welcomed and should include assistance in assessing possible alternatives.
- The draft response to questions 4-6 was not accepted. Members instead supported the introduction of a formal intermediate referral stage to the NHS Commissioning Board (NHSCB). It was considered that this would be a practical measure reflecting the changes in accountability flowing from the Health and Social Care Act and the likelihood that if a matter were referred direct to the Secretary of State one of the first things he would be likely to do would be to seek the views of the NHSCB. A formal arrangement would encourage local dispute resolution and help to reduce the risk of the politicisation of service reconfiguration proposals.

However, to avoid unnecessary delays occurring, Members considered there should be a clear time limit within which the NHSCB must consider and determine a referral, with the Council having the discretion to refer a matter direct to the Secretary of State if that timescale was not met.

RESOLVED:

- That (a) the response to the consultation set out in the report be approved as amended; and**
- (b) the Head of Governance be authorised to finalise the response after further consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee.**

The meeting ended at 3.12 pm

CHAIRMAN

MEETING:	OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
DATE:	14 SEPTEMBER 2012
TITLE OF REPORT:	WEST MIDLANDS AMBULANCE SERVICE NHS TRUST - IMPACT OF MAKE READY ON PERFORMANCE AND HALF YEAR UPDATE
REPORT BY:	Commissioning Director, West Midlands Ambulance Trust

CLASSIFICATION: Open

Wards Affected

County-wide

Purpose

To receive a presentation from the West Midlands Ambulance Trust. A report from the Trust will be circulated under separate cover.

MEETING:	OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
DATE:	14 SEPTEMBER 2012
TITLE OF REPORT:	²GETHER NHS FOUNDATION TRUST – HALF YEARLY REVIEW
REPORT BY:	Chief Operating Officer, ²gether NHS Foundation Trust

CLASSIFICATION: Open

Wards Affected

County-wide

Purpose

To receive a presentation from the ²gether NHS Foundation Trust.

MEETING:	OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY
DATE:	14 SEPTEMBER 2012
TITLE OF REPORT:	AGRESSO/Frameworki UPDATE
REPORT BY:	CHIEF OFFICER: FINANCE & COMMERCIAL

CLASSIFICATION: Open

Wards Affected

County-wide

Purpose

The purpose of the report is to update committee on progress with implementation of the Agresso and Frameworki systems.

Recommendation(s)

THAT: Committee notes the content of the report.

Key Points Summary

- The Council has implemented the core elements of Agresso and Frameworki.
- Further functionality of both systems is being delivered.
- The full integration of both systems will yield process benefits.

Alternative Options

- 1 There are no Alternative Options.

Reasons for Recommendations

- 2 The recommendation asks the committee to note the report requested at its 12 July meeting.

Introduction and Background

- 3 At Overview & Scrutiny on 12 July 2012 officers were requested to update committee on progress to date with the implementation of the Agresso system and the Frameworki system.

Key Considerations

Agresso

- 4 Following a comprehensive selection process the council and NHS partners (Herefordshire PCT and Wye Valley NHS Trust) selected the Agresso system as its integrated system. Agresso is known as an Enterprise Resource Planning system (ERP).
- 5 There has been a phased approach to the implementation of Agresso with initial modules being implemented during 2010/11. A Project Team managed by the Council, was initiated to manage the implementation. The team was primarily staffed with third party contractors and the supplier of Agresso (Unit 4). In house future users and managers of the Agresso system provided key support to the implementation and acceptance of the application.
- 6 The Agresso system now provides the Council's core financial information and has done so since implementation in April 2011. The importance of its role in this area cannot be overstated as it is the prime financial record for the Council's financial activity. Its integrity is essential in order to fulfil the requirement to record financial activity. The first phase of implementation therefore delivered a system that operated in a manner to support financial management activities. For example, suppliers were paid on time and financial transactions are correctly recorded.
- 7 All local authorities have a core financial system and the Council's previous system had been in place for 10 years and was effective with a good track record of performance and development. However it had reached the limit of its ability to act as an integrated system. The former system was characterised by numerous "feeder" activities to present managers with an overall position.
- 8 The selection of Agresso was agreed by the Council, PCT and the Hospital Trust. However, due to national changes in the health organisational structure, the Trust's decision to pursue foundation status and the potential for an overall financial system for health this was not progressed by partners. They formally withdrew from deployment of Agresso at the end of 2011.
- 9 Joint implementation of Agresso commenced in June 2010 and the Agresso system was delivered as a functioning and operational financial system in April 2011. The "go live" was delivered in less than a year from project commencement. This was the first phase of the delivery and provided a sound basis for the next phase that seeks to maximise the systems functionality. A project board is in place to lead the system's deployment.
- 10 The Agresso ERP system has delivered a new platform for resource planning in Herefordshire Council and Hoople. Several systems have been brought together into a single integrated solution. Typical business processes prior to its deployment were activities such as numerous independent spreadsheets and databases; used to manage activity and supply management information.
- 11 A notable feature of Agresso is the ability to set financial control limits for payment of suppliers. This means that payments can be checked and if required, challenged by managers. For example, payment to a contractor may be above a budget holder's limit. In such circumstances an email is generated to the budget holder's manager who typically has a higher payment limit. The manager is required to clear the payment electronically once it has been accepted.
- 12 The removal of manual interfaces through the use of greater automation has removed duplicate data entry activity. In addition, the new e-tendering portal is in use. This has provided increased value for money in procurement.

- 13 Payroll has now been transferred onto Agresso from the former system and self-service entry for customer invoicing is in place. Self-service expansion into HR areas has positioned Agresso as an important part of the transformation agenda. Linked to this is the requirement to change business processes and behaviours.
- 14 The second phase of the implementation of Agresso has delivered benefits including the following to date:
- Reduced payroll processing times from 14 hours to 35 minutes
 - Deployed finance self-service to five pilot schools
 - Deployed employee self-service to Hoople (online pay advices and self-service amendments to personal details such as address, emergency contact and diversity data)
 - Launched on line catalogues for WMS and other suppliers

Framework*i*

- 15 The original Framework*i* project formed a part of the Herefordshire Connects transformation programme which was commissioned in 2008 to replace the in-house Clix database. The current Framework*i* case management system went live on the 10th November 2008 with 700 registered users. Since May 2010 there have been on-going project activities to introduce costed purchase episodes (Adults) to enable commitment accounting.
- 16 The main project drivers are as follows:
- **Decommissioning** multiple systems. One of the main aims was to move the organisation away from multiple applications/spreadsheets/access databases to a more uniformed approach.
 - **Commitment accounting** across all corporate systems.
 - **Selima decommissioning** (Payroll system used for foster care payments). This solution has time limited access due to the version currently maintained no longer supported by the suppliers post March 2012. This functionality can be provided FWI/Agresso integration.
 - **Ezitracker** (EMS) integration with FWI to ensure that all time completed on domiciliary care is recorded and reconciled within FWI to further support commitment accounting, to reduce manual entry and duplication of work and to speed up payments to providers.
 - **Maintaining Client Details** – it had been identified that the CLIX system was not fit for purpose to maintain the client details and without a replacement system there was real concern that the authority may be taken into “Special Measures”
- 17 The integration of Framework*i* and Agresso is a strategic goal so that the single overall system can produce benefits. The current end to end process for assessing, approving, purchasing and reporting on adult social care activity utilises four key systems (Framework*i*, Abacus, Isis, Agresso) and a range manually produced spreadsheets. Systems that stand alone require manual intervention and rekeying to transfer data. This means that there are complications in reporting for management and reporting purposes with financial reporting being a labour intensive process.

- 18 A key benefit arising from the integration of Agresso and Framework*i* will be a comprehensive commitment accounting system for care packages. This will bring greater levels of accuracy to financial forecasting. Current processes already provide a basic commitment forecast but this requires data to be analysed in spreadsheets. Volumes of care packages are approximately 750 invoices per week for domiciliary care and 650 payments every four weeks for residential care.
- 19 The Framework*i* finance module enables all payments to be made by the system. This eliminates intervention required under the existing approach. In addition this means that finance staff can spend more time on value added activity such as advice rather than checking the integrity of current forecasts.
- 20 The current position is that finance staff have reviewed the Framework*i* standard reports against the commitment accounting specification developed and discussed the format with the Framework*i* supplier (Core Logic). The view is that the current reports are not appropriate and the in house development team is being tasked with writing reports with the required output.
- 21 Recent changes adopted by the Council in December 2011 have improved the Assessment and Approve processes, and the council has worked with partners to review current processes, including panel authorisation. A joint approach led by the Director of People Services and involving Hoople, Wye Valley and 2gether is now driving the implementation of this review work which will inform the development of Framework*i* and Agresso. This will address key issues such as there is no automation of accruals or commitments and purchase orders have to be entered manually into different systems resulting in delays and possible increased error levels.

Community Impact

21. The report has no direct community impact.

Financial Implications

22. The report is for information and does not have any consequent financial implications.

Legal Implications

23. None have been identified as part of the report.

Risk Management

24. The Agresso project and Framework I project have risk registers that identify key risk areas and mitigating actions.

Consultees

25. Project managers have been consulted as part of the report process.

Appendices

26. None.

Background Papers

- None identified.

MEETING:	OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
DATE:	14TH SEPTEMBER 2012
TITLE OF REPORT:	STREETSCENE ROOT AND BRANCH REVIEW AND STRATEGIC SERVICE DELIVERY PARTNERSHIP REPROCUREMENT PROCESS
REPORT BY:	ASSISTANT DIRECTOR PLACE BASED COMMISSIONING

CLASSIFICATION: OPEN

Wards Affected

Countywide

Purpose

To update Members in relation to the Streetscene Root and Branch review following the Cabinet's decision on 12th July 2012 regarding the services currently included in the Amey Service Delivery Agreement. Cabinet decided that the Council should commence a procurement process to put in place new contracts for these services at the earliest practical opportunity. It was agreed that this should be done alongside other opportunities identified through the root and branch programme. It was also decided that the current contractual arrangement with Amey is not extended except where required to support the procurement timetable.

Recommendation(s)

THAT:

- (a) the contents of this report be noted; and**
- (b) Members comment and identify objectives be taken into consideration during the proposed re-procurement of services currently provided through the Amey Service Delivery Partnership.**

Key Points Summary

- This report describes the approach being taken to the Streetscene review. In particular the re-procurement of services currently delivered by Amey and the market consultations which will also provide information to assist with consideration of options for the Housing, Economic and Regulatory Services review.
- The principle focus of the Streetscene review has been to examine the future commissioning arrangements for services that are within the scope of the current partnership with Amey. This

Further information on the subject of this report is available from
Richard Ball, Assistant Director Place Based Commissioning on (01432) 260965

delivers a wide range of services which includes highways, parks, public rights of way, building services, technical consultancy, as well as a range of ancillary services such as catering and printing.

- A procurement exercise is planned to put in place new arrangements when the current contract comes to an end in September 2013. The first stage of procurement involves a consultation with the market, members, and others which will be used to help shape the procurement.
- Opportunities for cooperation with other authorities both during the procurement and through the life of the future contracts are being explored.
- The views of Overview and Scrutiny are sought to help inform the Streetscene review and decision making in relation to the approach to procurement.

Alternative Options

- 1 None

Reasons for Recommendations

- 2 To inform Members of the approach being taken in relation to services within scope of the Streetscene Root and Branch review and seek contributions to help improve the process for re-procurement of services currently provided through the Amey Service Delivery Partnership.

Introduction and Background

- 3 The Streetscene Root and Branch review is one of four first phase reviews being undertaken as part of the overall programme. This programme of reviews is intended to be a fundamental re-think about which services should be commissioned to meet the needs and priorities of Herefordshire's local communities. The scope of the Streetscene Root and Branch review is as follows:
 - Roads and paths construction and maintenance
 - Street cleaning, lighting, amenities
 - Links with regeneration , LTP etc.
 - Public sector property holdings, including locality asset plans
- 4 The review brings together a number of related "in flight" projects and service improvement initiatives including:
 - *Strategic partnership review* – reviewing our partnership with Amey
 - *World class highways* – regional initiative lead by Herefordshire to examine in detail how highways services are currently delivered and identify improvements to help the service better meet local aspirations
 - *Asset Management and Property Services review* – review of Herefordshire's Property Services following previous Shared Services Cabinet decision to strategically commission the service
 - *Public convenience review* – detailed review of service delivery to explore opportunities for savings and greater community involvement



- 5 The principle focus of the streetscene review has been to examine the future commissioning arrangements for services that are within the scope of the current partnership with Amey. This delivers a wide range of services which includes highways, parks, public rights of way, building services, technical consultancy, as well as a range of ancillary services such as catering and printing.
- 6 The contracts for these services were originally agreed in 2003 and are now coming to the end of their ten-year term. Members will be aware that on the 12th July 2012, Cabinet agreed to begin the process to re-procure the services currently provided through the Amey partnership.
- 7 A major procurement exercise is being developed to take place over the next 12 months which will result in new contracts for these services. It is worth noting that, until the new contracts are in place, it is business as usual, with Amey maintaining responsibility for delivering the full range of services throughout the procurement process. We are continuing to work closely with Amey to take forward improvements and ensure a smooth transition.
- 8 Market consultations for the streetscene and the housing, economic, and regulatory services (HERS) reviews are being carried out in parallel.
- 9 A further report on the whole first phase of the Root and Branch programme is due to be considered by a future meeting of Overview and Scrutiny and this report is intended to give a brief update in relation to Streetscene and provide an early opportunity for Members to comment on the strategic procurement exercise and highlight any aspirations for changes or improvements to services.
- 10 As part of ensuring wider engagement in the review, a workshop for Members who have registered a particular interest in the Streetscene review has been arranged for the morning of the 21st September to review the findings of the World Class Highways project and consider in more detail the approach to the re-procurement of the Amey contract with a particular focus on the highway aspects of the service.

Key Considerations

- 11 The scope of services included in the Cabinet decision in July is broad. Services within scope of the Streetscene review together with other services from related phase one root and branch reviews represent an annual spend of approximately £40m. The approach to the current market consultation for this wide range of services has been carefully designed to:
 - a. Prioritise market engagement for those services that require re-procurement, i.e. services currently delivered by Amey
 - b. Understand what the market can, and cannot, offer and the pros and cons of developing a relationship with the private sector across all services in scope
 - c. Explore the potential for innovative solutions that could be put in place in cooperation with the private sector e.g. capital investment, local delivery of services
 - d. Understand how to get the maximum benefits from working with the private sector. This information will be fed into the root and branch reviews to support option development and appraisal
 - e. Engage with potential suppliers to develop their interest in any future procurement initiated by the council
 - f. Understand how best to improve the way that we work with, and support the development of, the local supply chain

- 12 The services in scope of the market consultation have been divided into four groupings (packages included in Appendix A) to help structure the conversation with potential suppliers:
 - a. Public realm services – these services include highways and related services. They are the services that are expected to be part of the replacement highways contract. The intention is to explore the possibility of putting in place a more focussed approach to highways delivery.
 - b. Regeneration services – the aim of this package is to help us better understand how to structure services related to economic regeneration (including asset management and property services) in order to rationalise the public sector estate and maximise the revenue and other benefits of these services
 - c. Community services – these services are part of the housing, economic, and regulatory services (HERS) root and branch review. They are services that are currently within Herefordshire, and have traditionally been delivered in-house by local authorities. Recently, however, a market has started to develop where these services are delivered in partnership with private sector organisations. The aim with these services will be to understand what benefits could be gained from working with a partner and whether such a partnership should be a simple outsourcing arrangement or whether a partner would be willing to work with the council to restructure and commercialise these services. Feedback will be used to inform decisions in relation to the HERS Root and Branch review.
 - d. Ancillary services – these are services that have been identified as likely to be attractive to the wider supply chain. The intention is to increase the competition for these services, encouraging participation by the local supply chain

- 13 A prior information notice (PIN) was published in the official journal of the European Union (OJEU) on 25th August. This announced Herefordshire Council's intention to consider a procurement of the services listed in Appendix A and marked the start of market consultations. The consultation will continue until the end of September and will inform the

procurement strategy.

- 14 To support the PIN an information page has been set up on the Council's internet, which includes an on-line questionnaire for interested organisations to complete, as well as a form to request an appointment to discuss the opportunities in more detail with officers. A press release has also been issued jointly with the Chamber of Commerce to generate wider awareness and encourage participation from local suppliers.
- 15 Due to anticipated demand, the consultation has been phased, with Highways and HERS being prioritised during September and Ancillary Services (such as catering; couriers; printing) will follow from October onwards.
- 16 The discussions with potential private sector partners will inform both the outcome of the HERS review and the approach to procurement. We will examine how services can be packaged to widen competition and ensure that the services commissioned best meet the needs of the people of Herefordshire, deliver value for money and support the local economy.
- 17 The consultation also seeks views from potential suppliers regarding innovative forms of service delivery. This could include:
 - a. An investment programme to improve the condition of the highways thereby reducing the long term requirement for revenue spending on routine maintenance, and
 - b. The ways in which any new arrangements can support the council's localities working and localisation agenda

Conclusion

- 18 A range of important local services provided by the Council are within the scope of this review. Over recent years, Members, stakeholders and customers have provided considerable feedback regarding these services and this has been used to help develop the approach outlined above. Engagement will continue throughout the procurement process to help ensure a successful outcome for Herefordshire. However, at this early stage in the process, Members of the committee are invited to provide comments and suggestions regarding objectives and issues that they would wish to see taken into consideration.

Community Impact

- 19 The Streetscene review covers a range of services, including Highways, which affect the quality of the local environment. The re-procurement of these services presents opportunities to support the local economy and ensure service delivery is tailored to meet the needs of localities.

Equality and Human Rights

- 20 This proposal will pay due regard to our public sector equality duty. An equality impact assessment will be carried out on the proposed solutions.

Financial Implications

- 21 The Council spends in the region of £40 million per annum on services within the scope of the market consultations. The procurement process outlined above will explore the best ways to ensure value for money and deliver financial savings. The intelligence gathered will inform the development of options for the root and branch reviews.

Legal Implications

- 22 Legal Services are providing advice in relation to the procurement exercise to ensure compliance with current contractual commitments and European procurement rules. Legal Services have been involved throughout the process so far and are aware of current risks and issues.

Risk Management

- 23 A detailed risk register is in place to identify and manage the risks associated with the delivery of this project. Key risks relate to the commercial procurement, service continuity and quality. Mitigation measures have been identified to manage risks associated with the project. Legal, financial and procurement resources and expertise has been identified to support the project team.

Consultees

- 24 The first stage of this procurement exercise includes extensive consultations involving the market: both national organisations and, in conjunction with the Chamber of Commerce and others, local organisations; Members, and via, for example, the Quality of Life Survey, service users.

Appendices

- 25 Appendix A: Services as listed in the PIN

Background Papers

- None identified.

Services as listed in the PIN

PACKAGE A: PUBLIC REALM SERVICES

1. Highways Management Services;
2. Highways Maintenance and Improvement works;
3. Traffic Control Systems Maintenance;
4. Street Lighting;
5. Street Cleaning;
6. Public Rights Of Way;
7. Parks & Open Spaces; (some elements may also be included within Package D)
8. Land Drainage;
9. Local Flood Risk Management; and
10. Associated Professional Services

PACKAGE B: REGENERATION SERVICES

11. Economic Development
12. Regeneration Programmes
13. Sustainable Communities Service
14. Sustainability Management Service
15. Asset Management and Property Services
16. Associated Professional Services
17. Energy and Utilities Management Services
18. Building Services (some elements may also be included within Package D)
19. Parking Services
 - a. Car Parking and Traffic Management
 - b. Street Parking Enforcement
 - c. Shopmobility Services

PACKAGE C: COMMUNITY SERVICES

20. Housing Services
 - a. Housing needs & development
 - b. Private sector housing
 - c. Home improvement agency
 - d. Homelessness and housing advice services
21. Planning Services
 - a. Planning – development management
 - b. Planning – forward/strategic planning
 - c. Planning – conservation
 - d. Planning – archaeology
 - e. Building control

22. Environmental Health Services
 - a. Environmental health - environmental protection
 - b. Environmental health – air pollution inc. Industrial permitting service; air quality
 - c. Environmental health - private water supplies service
 - d. Environmental health - contaminated land service
 - e. Closed landfill site management
 - f. Environmental health - commercial
23. Associated Professional Services
24. Bereavement Services
25. Licensing Services
26. Trading Standards Services
27. Markets, Fairs and Street Trading Services
28. Community Protection Services
29. Travellers' Services
30. Animal health and Welfare

PACKAGE D: ANCILLARY SERVICES

31. Courier Service
32. Pest Control Services
33. Fleet Management
34. Building Cleaning (some elements may also be included within Package B)
35. Catering
36. Print
37. Building Services (some elements may also be included within Package B)
38. Parks & Open Spaces (some elements may also be included within Package A)

MEETING:	OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
DATE:	14 SEPTEMBER 2012
TITLE OF REPORT:	REVIEW OF OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY STRUCTURE
REPORT BY:	MONITORING OFFICER

CLASSIFICATION: Open

Wards Affected

County-wide

Purpose

To consider whether to submit any comments to the Audit and Governance Committee on the proposed restructure of the Overview and Scrutiny function.

Recommendation

THAT: the Committee considers whether it wishes to submit any comments to the Audit and Governance Committee on the proposed restructure of the Overview and Scrutiny function.

Introduction and Background

- 1 Council in May 2011 agreed a revised Structure for the Overview and Scrutiny (O and S) Function.
- 2 At Council in July 2011 the Leader committed to ensuring a review of the effectiveness of the new scrutiny model was undertaken after twelve months of operation.
- 3 Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC) have expressed a number of concerns about the new scrutiny model during its first year of operation. They held a Scrutiny workshop on 27 April 2012 at which a proposal for structural change and the establishment of three scrutiny Committees emerged.
- 4 Members and Officers were informed of the issues raised at the workshop (including the proposed new scrutiny structure) and invited to comment.
- 5 Subsequently the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee supported a model based on two scrutiny committees and this formed the basis of an external review undertaken by Mr John Lamb. The report of this review (Update Report on the O and S Function in Herefordshire Council 2012 is appended. Mr Lamb had conducted a previous review of the Council's scrutiny function (December 2008) and recommendations in that review had underpinned the decision by Council to change its scrutiny model in May 2011. This report is available on the Council's website as part of a supplementary pack.

Further information on the subject of this report is available from
John Jones, Head of Governance on (01432) 260222

- 6 Council is responsible for adopting the Council's Constitution and approving changes to it. The Audit and Governance Committee is responsible for reviewing the Constitution and making recommendations to Council to amend it.
- 7 The draft report to the Audit and Governance Committee recommending approval of the recommendations in the Update Report on the O and S Function and containing a number of other recommendations to give effect to the recommendations in the Update Report is appended.
- 8 This Committee is invited to make comments for the Audit and Governance Committee to consider in making its recommendations to Council. Particular regard should be had to the draft remit of each Committee.

Appendices

Draft Report to Audit and Governance Committee on 28 September: Review of Overview and Scrutiny Structure

Update Report on the Overview and Scrutiny Function in Herefordshire Council – John Lamb August 2012

Background Papers

- Review of the Overview and Scrutiny Function in Herefordshire Council – December 2008 by John Lamb and Mari Davis

MEETING:	AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE
DATE:	21 SEPTEMBER 2012
TITLE OF REPORT:	REVIEW OF OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY STRUCTURE
REPORT BY:	MONITORING OFFICER

CLASSIFICATION: Open

Wards Affected

County-wide

Purpose

To consider proposed changes to the Overview and Scrutiny Structure.

(These changes involve alternative arrangements for the purposes of the Local Authorities (Committees and Political Groups) Regulations 1990.)

Recommendation(s)

THAT: it be recommended to Council that:

- (a) The recommendations of the report on the Overview and Scrutiny (O&S) Function as set out at pages 3-4 of appendix 1 to this report be adopted;**
- (b) the authority to exercise the Authority's statutory health scrutiny functions be delegated to the Health and Social Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee;**
- (c) the Terms of Reference of the General Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Health and Social Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee be as set out at paragraph 23 of the report ;**
- (d) each Overview and Scrutiny Committee consists of 13 Councillors and seats on each Committee be allocated by political proportionality as set out at paragraph 13 of the report appointments to those seats to be confirmed by Group Leaders;**
- (e) the change to two Overview and Scrutiny Committees takes effect from Monday 15 October 2012;**
- (f) Council approves the appointments to the offices of Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the General Overview and Scrutiny Committees and the Health and Social Care Scrutiny Committee;**

Further information on the subject of this report is available from
John Jones, Head of Governance (01432) 260222

- (g) **statutory co-optees serve on the General Overview and Scrutiny Committee;**
- (h) **the operating principles set out at paragraph 18 of the report form the basis of the new scrutiny model;**
- (i) **the rules of proportionality are not applied to Task and Finish Groups appointed by either of the two Overview and Scrutiny Committees;**
- (j) **the Head of Governance be designated as the Authority's statutory Scrutiny Officer; and**
- (k) **the Monitoring Officer be authorised to make any consequential amendments to the Constitution.**

Key Points Summary

- Council in May 2011 agreed a revised Structure for the Overview and Scrutiny Function. At Council in July 2011 the Leader committed to ensuring a review of the effectiveness of the new scrutiny model was undertaken after twelve months of operation.
- Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee have expressed a number of concerns about the new model over the first year. .
- The principal proposal is that two Overview and Scrutiny Committees are established each with a Chairman and Vice-Chairman. The proposed Committees are: a Health and Social Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee and a General Overview and Scrutiny Committee that deals with all other matters.
- The report outlines a number of other measures to give effect to the principal proposal above.
- To ensure a smooth transition to a new scrutiny model it is proposed that this takes effect on 15 October 2012.
- It is proposed to designate the Head of Governance as the Authority's Scrutiny Officer.

Alternative Options

- 1 A number of alternative structures could be considered.

Reasons for Recommendations

- 2 The recommendations have been put forward following a review of the effectiveness of the new scrutiny model that it was agreed would be undertaken after twelve months of operation. The recommendations respond to concerns by Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee that the current system is proving impractical given the complexity and volume of Scrutiny work and the findings of an external review.

Introduction and Background

- 3 Council in May 2011 agreed a revised Structure for the Overview and Scrutiny (O and S) Function.
- 4 Under the structure in place prior to May 2011 O and S was undertaken by the Overview and

Scrutiny Committee (OSC), supported by a number of themed Scrutiny Committees.

- 5 The structure approved in May 2011 consists of one politically proportionate O and S Committee with the power to set up task and finish groups, with six vice-Chairmen each responsible for a particular themed area. The Statutory Education Co-optees sit on the O and S Committee.
- 6 At Council in July 2011 the Leader committed to ensuring a review of the effectiveness of the new scrutiny model was undertaken after twelve months of operation.

Key Considerations

- 7 Members of the OSC have expressed a number of concerns about the new scrutiny model during its first year of operation. They held a Scrutiny workshop on 27 April 2012 at which a proposal for structural change and the establishment of three scrutiny Committees emerged.
- 8 Members and Officers were informed of the issues raised at the workshop (including the proposed new scrutiny structure) and invited to comment.
- 9 Subsequently the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee supported a model based on two scrutiny committees and this formed the basis of an external review undertaken by Mr John Lamb. The report of this review (Update Report on the O and S Function in Herefordshire Council 2012 is appended. Mr Lamb had conducted a previous review of the Council's scrutiny function (December 2008) and recommendations in that review had underpinned the decision by Council to change its scrutiny model in May 2011. This report is available on the Council's website alongside the agenda papers.

Membership of Committees

- 10 The Localism Act 2011 (S 9FA) continues the provision in the Local Government Act 2000 that O and S Committees should be politically proportionate.
- 11 In determining the allocation of seats on a politically proportionate basis the Council must apply the following four principles as far as reasonably practicable:
 - (a) that not all the seats on the body are allocated to the same political group;
 - (b) that the majority of the seats on the body is allocated to a particular political group if the number of persons belonging to that group is a majority of the authority's membership;
 - (c) subject to paragraphs (a) and (b) above, that the number of seats on the ordinary committees of a relevant authority which are allocated to each political group bears the same proportion to the total of all the seats on the ordinary committees of that authority as is borne by the number of members of that group to the membership of the authority; and
 - (d) subject to paragraphs (a) to (c) above, that the number of the seats on the body which are allocated to each political group bears the same proportion to the number of all the seats on that body as is borne by the number of members of that group to the membership of the authority.
- 12 An arithmetic calculation of the number of seats allocated to a particular group is unlikely to result in a set of whole numbers. The 1989 Act gives no guidance on the correct approach in these circumstances, leaving authorities to follow the principles "as far as reasonably practicable". For the purposes of this report, it is assumed that part numbers of 0.5 and above will be rounded up, while part numbers below 0.5 will be rounded down

- 13 Under the Council's current composition, if all four Political Groups on the Council were to be represented on each O and S Committee, the minimum size a Committee can be is 13. This would mean each Committee having 7 Conservative Group Members, 3 Independent Group Members, 2 It's Our County Group Members and 1 Liberal Democrat Group Member.
- 14 The Constitution provides that Council must appoint the Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of the Committees.

Statutory Co-optees

- 15 The Council is required to include diocesan and parent governor representatives with voting rights on an O and S Committee dealing with education functions. The Council has two diocesan representatives and three parent governor representatives.
- 16 It is acknowledged that the move to a single O and S Committee has made the role of the statutory co-optees less attractive than it was when there was a dedicated Children's Services Scrutiny Committee. Under the proposal above education matters would fall to be dealt with by the General OSC and it is proposed that the statutory co-optees would therefore sit on that Committee with voting powers on educational matters only.

Operating Principles

- 17 The recommendations in the Lamb 2012 Update Report identified the need for further work on the detailed arrangements and proposed the establishment of a working party to consider how to implement the recommendations.
- 18 The following operating principles are proposed at this stage:
- To minimise bureaucracy the two Committees would be independent of each other. Each Committee would have the authority to make recommendations direct to the Executive, Council and others.
 - Each Committee would approve its own work programme.
 - Call-ins would be heard by the relevant Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the basis that this will provide the most effective challenge as the Members of each Committee develops its specialist knowledge.
 - The Chairmen of the General Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee would by agreement manage any potential overlap between the two Committees and with the work of the Audit and Governance Committee.
 - Each Committee would have a Chairman and a Vice-Chairman.
 - Task and Finish Groups would be established by each Committee drawn from the Committee membership and the wider non-executive membership of the Council. As appropriate, people with specialist knowledge and or expertise could be co-opted to support the task. Co-opted members of Task and Finish Groups would not have voting powers. The relevant Overview and Scrutiny Committee would seek someone to lead a Task and Finish Group as and when each one is established. The nature of the work of Task and Finish Groups is that they are advisory and the rules of proportionality apply unless the Council makes alternative arrangements. Council would be required to approve this proposal with no Member voting against it.

Training and Development

- 19 It is recognised that a training and development programme needs to be developed to support Members in their O and S role.

Member Allowances

- 20 If accepted the proposals will require the Independent Remuneration Panel to meet to consider the appropriate level of special responsibility allowances.

Constitutional Changes required

- 21 Under the Functions Scheme at Part 3 of the Constitution Council is responsible for setting the terms of reference of Committees, deciding on their composition and allocating seats on them.
- 22 The Functions Scheme will require slight amendment to reflect the roles of the two Committees.
- 23 Draft terms of reference for the two Committees are as follows:

Committee	Remit
General Overview and Scrutiny Committee	Functions conferred on or exercisable by the Council in its capacity as a local education authority; Budget and Policy Framework Issues Any other matter not reserved to the Health and Social Care Scrutiny Committee.
Health and Social Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee	To discharge the Council's statutory health scrutiny powers including the review and scrutiny of any matter relating to the planning provision and operation of health services affecting the area and to make reports and recommendations on these matters. Overview and scrutiny of: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Children and Adult Safeguarding• Social care functions relating to children• the Health and Wellbeing Board• any other matters relating to health and social care

Transitional Arrangements

- 24 Meetings of the current O and S Committee are scheduled to take place on 3 and 12 October. If the proposals in this report are accepted, some further preparatory work needs to be undertaken to establish the two new Committees. It is therefore proposed that the meetings on 3 and 12 October are conducted by the O and S Committee as currently constituted and that the introduction of a new scrutiny model should take effect from 15 October 2012.

Designation of Scrutiny Officer

- 25 The Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 required the Council to formally designate one of their officers as the authority's statutory "scrutiny officer". In May 2010 Council approved a number of changes to the Constitution including the designation of the Deputy Chief Executive as Statutory Scrutiny Officer.
- 26 Section 9FB of the Localism Act 2011 replicates this provision. The designated officer is required to discharge the following functions:
- (a) to promote the role of the authority's O and S committee or committees;
 - (b) to provide support to the authority's O and S committee or committees and the member of that committee or committees
 - (c) to provide support and guidance to : (i) members of the authority, (ii) members of the Executive of the authority, and (iii) Officers of the authority – in relation to the functions of the authority's O and S committee or committees.
- 27 Although the post of the authority's Scrutiny Officer is a statutory post it is not subject to the same recruitment and discipline procedures as the Council's other statutory posts. The statutory scrutiny officer role must, however, be recognised within the council's constitution and designated to a post.
- 28 The authority may not designate the Head of Paid Service, the Monitoring Officer or the Chief Finance Officer as the authority's Scrutiny Officer.
- 29 The role has to date sat with the Deputy Chief Executive. It is proposed that the Head of Governance be designated as the authority's Scrutiny Officer.

Community Impact

- 30 One of the recommendations in the update report identifies the need for the scrutiny function to identify and prioritise the issues and concerns of the people of Herefordshire and the strategic issues which are key to the Council's delivery of its corporate objectives and concentrate on these.

Equality and Human Rights

- 31 The proposals in this report have no particular implications for equality and human rights.

Financial Implications

- 32 The financial implications of the proposals in this report will be met from within existing budgets.

Legal Implications

- 33 The Localism Act 2011 requires local authorities, which are operating executive arrangements to set up one or more O and S committees. The proposals in the report are consistent with that requirement. The Health and Social Care Act 2012 confers health scrutiny functions on the local authority itself, rather than on an O and S committee specifically. It is for the full council of each local authority to determine which arrangement is adopted. The Health and Social Care Scrutiny Committee would be an appropriate place for the Council to delegate its statutory health scrutiny powers.

Risk Management

- 34 The Council is required to have an O and S function. The proposals in this report are designed to ensure that this will operate effectively.

Appendices

Update Report on the Overview and Scrutiny Function in Herefordshire Council – John Lamb August 2012

Background Papers

- Review of the Overview and Scrutiny Function in Herefordshire Council – December 2008 by John Lamb and Mari Davis

DRAFT

Update Report on the Overview and Scrutiny Function in Herefordshire Council

August 2012

Herefordshire Council Update Report on the Overview and Scrutiny Function

1. Introduction and Background

During 2008 a review of the overview and scrutiny function was carried out at Herefordshire Council (Review of the Overview and Scrutiny Function in Herefordshire Council – December 2008 – herein-after referred to as the 2008 Review) . The Council has since commenced implementation of some of the key recommendations of the report and has also carried out an internal review of the effectiveness of the scrutiny function. Following the 2011 elections changes were made to the structure of overview and scrutiny and further changes are now proposed. This Update Report has been commissioned by the Council and its purpose is to provide commentary on how the current proposals are viewed by councillors, review progress that has been made since the 2008 report and make recommendations on the most effective way of taking scrutiny forward in Herefordshire. It is recommended that this Update Report is read in conjunction with the 2008 Review since some of the recommendations of the Update Report are supported by findings outlined in the 2008 Review. The recommendations from the 2008 Review are shown at Appendix 1.

2. Acknowledgements

The review was carried out with the very full and excellent co-operation of the Council at member and officer level and the author of this report would like to place on record thanks to all those who contributed to the process in such an open way. Organisational help and assistance was provided by Mr Tim Brown and for this the author is grateful.

3. Methodology and Approach

The update review was carried out in three phases: a short document review, on site meetings and discussions with individuals and groups and finally the ‘write up’ phase. The people who contributed to individual and group discussions during phase two of the update review is shown in Appendix 2 to this report. Responses from the on-site meetings and discussions have been used to inform the commentary and observations contained in this report and fall into four broad areas:

- Role and Purpose of Overview and Scrutiny
- Proposed Structure
- Managing Changes to the Overview and Scrutiny arrangements and relationship with Cabinet.
- Overview and Scrutiny’s Vision, the Annual Work Programme and Protocols

Where appropriate this report contains references to and extracts from the 2008 Report and are only included where this re-enforces a point or avoids the need to repeat an argument.

4. Executive Summary / Recommendations

A good understanding of the role and purpose of overview and scrutiny in the context of the overall governance arrangements of the Council is fundamental to good progress. Arguably, the structure of the overview and scrutiny function matters less. With the right approach it is possible to make the existing structure work well but a ‘flawed’ understanding of the purpose of scrutiny will always act as a barrier to progress.

The current proposals for structural changes are in line with the original recommendation and the reasons set out in the 2008 Report and should be welcomed. The establishment of a health and social care scrutiny committee recognises the huge changes occurring in the sector and would be the natural place for the Council to delegate its statutory health scrutiny powers. The emphasis on ‘task and finish’ groups is in line with good practice and would enable councillors to join a group working on a particular topic according to personal motivation, interest and perhaps prior or current expertise.

The proposals for further changes to the scrutiny structure should be made more widely available and consideration given to the establishment of a working party consisting of Party Leaders and the Chair and Vice Chair of Scrutiny with appropriate officer support to work out what needs to happen to implement the recommendations of this Update Report.

During interviews both councillors and officers commented that scrutiny appeared to have lost its way. There is a sense that there is no clear vision for Scrutiny and that councillors are not clear about where scrutiny is ‘heading for’. None of this is surprising given the ‘tension’ that exists between those who wish to revert to the thematic committee arrangements covering the breadth of council services and those who wish to see the scrutiny function doing far less but what is done, done very well. These two different approaches are difficult to reconcile but a resolution is crucial to making good progress.

The Recommendations:

- 1. That work be undertaken by O&S scrutiny chairs and cabinet members to identify and be clear about roles and responsibilities in relation to the role and purpose of the O&S function and Cabinet arrangements. (from 2008 Review)**
- 2. That methods, outside the overview and scrutiny arrangements, be developed to ensure that all councillors have opportunities to gain an understanding of the way the Council and its partners function.**
- 3. That the proposals for the establishment of two main scrutiny committees – one for health and social care and the other a general overview and scrutiny committee each with the ability to hold ‘task and finish groups’ as required**

- to undertake more detailed projects identified from the approved work programme be accepted.**
- 4. That further work be undertaken to work out and agree the detailed arrangements for the proposed overview and scrutiny structure e.g. political proportionality etc.**
 - 5. That a working party consisting of Party Leaders and the Chair and Vice Chair of Scrutiny with appropriate officer support be established to work out what needs to happen to implement the recommendations of this Update Report and the relevant recommendations of the 2008 Review.**
 - 6. That the working party established at recommendation 5 consider and agree the appropriate arrangements for on-going regular Scrutiny / Cabinet liaison.**
 - 7. That the Scrutiny function leads an annual process to identify and prioritise the issues and concerns of the people of Herefordshire and the strategic issues which are key to the Council’s delivery of its corporate objectives and concentrate on these.**
 - 8. That existing processes and protocols are reviewed and/or developed that support a disciplined approach to the delivery of the Annual Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme (e.g. topic selection criteria, scoping, terms of reference, variations etc.)**

5. Findings

5.1 Role and Purpose of Overview and Scrutiny

Scrutiny – a simple definition

To look at the quality of council services and other issues that affect the lives of people in Herefordshire.

Scrutiny will listen to the concerns of local people to check out how the council and other organisations are performing and where necessary recommend improvement.

(from a training session for Herefordshire Council 2009)

The 2008 Report found that “There are some good examples of scrutiny review work that has been of value, interest and concern to the communities served by the Council (Day care services review, younger people’s transition from younger people’s services to adult social care). Members of the public are always given an opportunity to ask questions at the commencement of each formal meeting of O&S committees. These practices need to be built upon. Chairs and Vice chairs of O&S committees need to reflect on whether the

current approach to O&S agendas, which tends to very much mirror the work of the Cabinet, is diverting energy and attention away from addressing the concerns of the people of Herefordshire. Are members giving ‘voice’ to the issues that matter most to residents on an everyday basis? A theme that emerged from interviews and group discussion was that O&S need to “do less better”.”

(Review of the Overview and Scrutiny Function in Herefordshire Council – December 2008 – p. 10)

A good understanding of the role and purpose of overview and scrutiny in the context of the overall governance arrangements of the Council is fundamental to good progress. Arguably, the structure of the overview and scrutiny function matters less. With the right approach it is possible to make the existing structure work well but a ‘flawed’ understanding of the purpose of scrutiny will always act as a barrier to progress.

From interviews with councillors, while some are very keen to see changes to the way scrutiny is conducted in the council there is still a strong sense that there is a need for an approach that ensures that all aspects of the work of the cabinet is ‘shadowed’. During interviews the view was expressed that councillors need to understand how the council works and that it is important that councillors gain service specific knowledge. The rationale for this is that only then can effective scrutiny be carried out. Frequently mentioned was the need for ‘thematic’ committees as the vehicle for both ensuring councillors gain the necessary knowledge and the means by which scrutiny is undertaken. There remains a tendency for councillors to request reports and information in pursuit of a ‘monitoring’ role. Some councillors seem to be concerned that unless this wide ranging monitoring and questioning of decisions is carried out then they may miss something serious but this is to misunderstand the role and purpose of the overview and scrutiny function.

The Local Government Act of 2000, provided for, among other governance arrangements, a cabinet system supported by overview and scrutiny arrangements. Decision making service committees were abolished. Herefordshire Council opted for the cabinet system whereby decision making is limited to a number of councillors appointed to the cabinet with limited referrals to full Council. A challenge for all councils, opting for the cabinet system, was the development of effective and meaningful scrutiny to be carried out by ‘non-executive’ councillors. By definition the adoption of the cabinet system means that ‘non-executive’ councillors are considerably less involved in decision making when compared to the pre-2000 Act arrangements i.e. decision making service committees. The Council’s constitution prescribes the decisions that need to be made by full Council – approval of the Council’s annual budget being one of these. The question raised by councillors about how they and especially new councillors learn about local government is a valid one and is asked in many local authorities. Indeed it is one of the criticisms of the cabinet system but scrutiny should not be seen as the place where councillors gain their general knowledge. The Council needs to think about how this requirement can be better met.

Councillors, including cabinet members, need to develop their thinking about the fundamental purpose of overview and scrutiny and this needs to be done in the light of the reality of the governance arrangements that the council has adopted.

The 2008 Report made the following recommendation “ *ii) That work be undertaken by O&S scrutiny chairs and cabinet members to identify and be clear about roles and responsibilities in relation to the role and purpose of the O&S function and Cabinet arrangements.*”

It appears that this remains a fundamental issue and the recommendation still stands but should be pursued in the light of the comments above. For clarity, it is not the responsibility of overview and scrutiny to provide a comprehensive performance monitoring role. What would be more appropriate is for scrutiny to check out what arrangements the Council and cabinet have in place for monitoring performance (seeking assurance) rather than actually doing it. That is not to say that there is no role for scrutiny in monitoring because that is not the case. Scrutiny has a key role to play in budget monitoring. Scrutiny needs to be very selective about the work it undertakes. Scrutiny does not have regulatory responsibilities. Ultimate accountability for the effective delivery of services is with the Cabinet in the case of Herefordshire Council and its partner organisations such as the NHS, Police and so on.

Recommendations:

- 1. That work be undertaken by O&S scrutiny chairs and cabinet members to identify and be clear about roles and responsibilities in relation to the role and purpose of the O&S function and Cabinet arrangements. (from 2008 Report)**
- 2. That methods, outside the overview and scrutiny arrangements, be developed to ensure that all councillors have opportunities to gain an understanding of the way the Council and its partners function.**

5.2 Proposed Structure

The proposed structure further develops changes to the Overview and Scrutiny structure that was approved by the Council in May 2011. It is proposed that the current structure of a single scrutiny committee supported by thematic ‘task and finish’ groups is replaced by two main scrutiny committees – one for health and social care and the other a general overview and scrutiny committee each with the ability to hold ‘task and groups’ as required to more detailed projects identified from the approved work programme.

A number of councillors expressed concerns about the proposed structure which is explored in section 5.1 above and a suggestion was made to create further ‘thematic’ committees. However there was also support for the proposed arrangements and a

comment was made that ‘let’s leave things as they are and just make scrutiny work better’.

The 2008 Review made the following recommendation: v) *That the Member organisation of O&S be reviewed with an emphasis on moving more towards Task and Finish groups and away from the existing formal committee structure. (a phased approach may be helpful here perhaps with an annual review to evaluate the effectiveness of changes made)*

This recommendation was mindful of the then structure in place (Strategic Monitoring Committee supported by thematic scrutiny committees). The recommendation was supported in the 2008 Report with the following:

“ The format and organisation of O&S committees has an impact on how business is conducted. For example, formal committee style meetings will tend to lead to formal committee style approaches to how business is conducted (officer reports, minutes, requests to officers for more information, monitoring etc.). On the other hand Task and Finish groups consisting of a smaller number of members and officers with a specific task and a short time scale will tend to operate in a very different way to that of a committee. The Task and Finish approach usually leads to research, interviewing of witnesses / specialists, focused discussion, deeper understanding and with members heavily involved in the production of the report. We heard comments from members that when they have worked in a ‘task and finish’ format they found this approach much more rewarding and productive.” (Review of the Overview and Scrutiny Function in Herefordshire Council – December 2008 – p. 11)

The current proposals are in line with the original recommendation and the reasons set out in the 2008 Report and should be welcomed. The establishment of a health and social care scrutiny committee recognises the huge changes occurring in the sector and would be the natural place for the Council to delegate its statutory health scrutiny powers.

The emphasis on ‘task and finish’ is in line with good practice and would enable councillors to join a group working on a particular topic according to personal motivation, interest and perhaps prior or current expertise. As the work of the ‘task and finish’ groups concludes then the group can be dissolved then ‘re-constituted’ according to the next new topic. This would enable the more agile moving ‘quickly and lightly’ from topic to topic as described by one councillor during the interviews. It is more likely that the proposed structure will result in more satisfying roles for scrutiny councillors as the ‘task and finish’ group focuses on a topic and is able to get under the surface of issues and gain deeper and better understanding of the subject resulting in better and clearer recommendations to cabinet and other partner organisations.

The proposals are at an early stage but were questioned by some councillors around the working detail and this should be addressed before full Council approval is sought. For example, are the Chairs of the two main committees of equal standing? Whilst it was accepted that there would be a need for political proportionality on the main committees

does this apply to the task and finish groups? Delegation of the Council’s health scrutiny powers (the Council may wish to be mindful of the current Department of Health Local Authority Health Scrutiny Consultation proposals published on 12th July 2012)

Recommendations:

- 3. That the proposals for the establishment of two main scrutiny committees – one for health and social care and the other a general overview and scrutiny committee each with the ability to hold ‘task and groups’ as required to more detailed projects identified from the approved work programme be accepted.**
- 4. That further work be undertaken to work out and agree the detailed arrangements for the proposed overview and scrutiny structure e.g. political proportionality etc.**

5.3 Managing Changes to the Overview and Scrutiny arrangements and relationship with cabinet.

A number of councillors commented on the way the changes to the scrutiny structure had been made following the 2011 elections. There was a sense that the new arrangements had been quickly imposed thereby removing the opportunity to comment. It is helpful that a review after 12 months was promised and this Update Report forms part of that review. The proposals for further changes to the scrutiny structure should be made more widely available and consideration given to the establishment of a working party consisting of Party Leaders and the Chair and Vice Chair of Scrutiny with appropriate officer support to work out what needs to happen to implement the recommendations of this Update Report.

Recommendation:

- 5. That a working party consisting of Party Leaders and the Chair and Vice Chair of Scrutiny with appropriate officer support be established to work out what needs to happen to implement the recommendations of this Update Report and the relevant recommendations of the 2008 Review.**

The internal Herefordshire Council report (Review of the Overview and Scrutiny Structure page 5) draws attention to the relationship between scrutiny and cabinet. There are many ways in which this can be carried out from an informal monthly meeting between the Chair of Scrutiny and the Leader of the Council to a more formal meeting of a larger group representing Scrutiny and the Cabinet. The ‘rolling programme’ appears to offer an opportunity for Cabinet to inform and discuss with Scrutiny future challenges facing the Council and what opportunities there might be for Scrutiny input to policy development [as long as this does not become the norm (see boxed extract below) i.e. Scrutiny must be selective about the areas it chooses to engage with].

The 2008 Review commented:

Cabinet members do involve O&S and invite early participation in the development of policy. This is a good approach since many O&S members complain that by the time they get involved with a major policy area, very often it is too late to influence the outcome. However, care needs to be taken that by involving O&S in policy development and “getting too close to the decision making” that O&S then finds it difficult to effectively challenge.

(Review of the Overview and Scrutiny Function in Herefordshire Council – December 2008 – p. 6)

It is good practice to periodically review the effectiveness of scrutiny, against agreed criteria (the Centre for Public Scrutiny has such a tool) and such reviews should involve all councillors and chief officers of the Council.

Recommendation:

- 6. That the working party established at recommendation 5 consider and agree the appropriate arrangements for on-going regular Scrutiny / Cabinet liaison.**

5.4 Overview and Scrutiny’s Vision, the Annual Work Programme and Protocols

During interviews both councillors and officers commented that scrutiny appeared to have lost its way. There is a sense that there is no clear vision for Scrutiny and that councillors are not clear about where scrutiny is ‘heading for’. None of this is surprising given the ‘tension’ that exists between those who wish to revert to the thematic committee arrangements covering the breadth of council services and those who wish to see the scrutiny function doing far less but what is done, done very well. These two different approaches are difficult to reconcile. To the ‘Thematic Committee’ lobby the annual work programme with the associated restriction on what is included will never make complete sense while to the ‘Less is More’ lobby there will be continual frustration as colleagues call for reports and further information in an effort to monitor the work of the Cabinet. There is a need for the Political Leadership of the Scrutiny Function to be clear and firm and provide direction. To a large extent councillor and officer resources will determine how much scrutiny work can be practically covered in any twelve month period. The Scrutiny function is not able to do all that it might wish to. By necessity there is a need for focus on the things that really matter to the delivery of services to the people of Herefordshire and this implies the need for very careful selection and prioritisation of topics. Once the annual work programme is agreed the Chairs of the scrutiny committees need to be very disciplined about any additions / variations to the topic scope.

The 2008 Review made the following two recommendations in this connection: *i) That the SMC and thematic O&S committees continue to review the business they regularly deal with and identify the strategic issues which are key to the Council’s delivery of its corporate objectives and concentrate on these. (This recommendation is concerned with ‘internally’ facing issues such as budget and performance management – see recommendation vi for ‘externally’ facing issues)*

And *vi) That a process be developed for determining and reviewing the annual programme for each O&S that captures the concerns of residents and communities of Herefordshire (sources could include the Councils own complaints recording system, matters arising during councillors surgeries, councillors own knowledge of issues. The PACT meetings will be a source of community concerns as will be the ‘Leadership of Place’ work proposed for the Council. A very effective method of capturing issues is by getting members into groups to identify the issues that matter to their constituents. (This recommendation is concerned with ‘externally’ facing issues that matter to communities – see recommendation i for ‘internally’ facing issues)*

The 2008 recommendations remain valid but are now updated as follows:

Recommendation:

- 7. That the Scrutiny function leads an annual process to identify and prioritise the issues and concerns of the people of Herefordshire and the strategic issues which are key to the Council’s delivery of its corporate objectives and concentrate on these.**

If the Scrutiny function is to remain focused and deliver its work programme then the function needs to be supported by a robust set of protocols. The 2008 Review in recognising this made the following recommendation: *vii) That any existing protocols for developing O&S recommendations be reviewed for clarity and effectiveness and that a process be agreed between O&S and the Cabinet which covers timescales for, responses to, reaching consensus and monitoring of recommendations.*

In addition to this recommendation and in support of a more disciplined approach in support of delivering a focused work programme the following recommendation is made:

Recommendation:

- 8. That existing processes and protocols are reviewed and/or developed that support a disciplined approach to the delivery of the Annual Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme (e.g. topic selection criteria, scoping, terms of reference, variations etc.)**

Appendix 1

Review of the Overview and Scrutiny Function in Herefordshire Council – December 2008 - Recommendations

- i) That the SMC and thematic O&S committees continue to review the business they regularly deal with and identify the strategic issues which are key to the Council's delivery of its corporate objectives and concentrate on these. (This recommendation is concerned with 'internally' facing issues such as budget and performance management – see recommendation vi for 'externally' facing issues)
- ii) That work be undertaken by O&S scrutiny chairs and cabinet members to identify and be clear about roles and responsibilities in relation to the role and purpose of the O&S function and Cabinet arrangements.
- iii) That protocols be enhanced or developed which clearly set out the role of O&S in the development of policy areas in a manner which does not compromise the ability of O&S to challenge effectively.
- iv) That O&S members be provided with training to improve the effectiveness of challenge through appropriate techniques such as questioning and analytical skills and improved understanding of the subject areas covered by the various O&S committees.
- v) That the Member organisation of O&S be reviewed with an emphasis on moving more towards Task and Finish groups and away from the existing formal committee structure. (a phased approach may be helpful here perhaps with an annual review to evaluate the effectiveness of changes made)
- vi) That a process be developed for determining and reviewing the annual programme for each O&S that captures the concerns of residents and communities of Herefordshire (sources could included the Councils own complaints recording system, matters arising during councillors surgeries, councillors own knowledge of issues. The PACT meetings will be a source of community concerns as will be the 'Leadership of Place' work proposed for the Council. A very effective method of capturing issues is by getting members into groups to identify the issues that matter to their constituents. (This recommendation is concerned with 'externally' facing issues that matter to communities – see recommendation i for 'internally' facing issues)
- vii) That any existing protocols for developing O&S recommendations be reviewed for clarity and effectiveness and that a process be agreed between O&S and the Cabinet which covers timescales for, responses to, reaching consensus and monitoring of recommendations.
- viii) That consideration be given to the appointment of a dedicated Overview and Scrutiny Manager at an appropriate grade and level within the organisational structure that reflects the value and importance attached to the O&S function by the Council.

ix) That a Chairs and Vice Chairs Group (Overview and Scrutiny Committees) be established to discuss and debate and take forward and oversee the improvement agenda. (Chairs and Vice Chairs currently make up the SMC. The recommendation here is about that group meeting in a far less formal, facilitated style to encourage an exchange of views and deeper discussion about how the O&S function can be even more effective).

x) That the Councils own free publication contains, on a regular basis, articles about the work of overview and scrutiny related to outcomes with which the people of Herefordshire can identify.

Appendix 2

Those Interviewed

REVIEW OF HEREFORDSHIRE SCRUTINY MODEL

13-14 August 2012

Timetable

(Phone Call to Jo Davidson (Director of People’s Services) - 2 August)

(Phone Call from Dean Taylor (Deputy Chief Executive – Director of Corporate Services)- 10 August 2.00 pm)

Monday 13 August

Time	Interviewee (s)	Room
9.15	Tim Brown re administrative arrangements	
9.30 – 10.30	John Jones (Head of Governance)	19A
10.30-11.30	Councillor Bob Matthews (Leader of Independent Group)	19A
11.30-12.30	Councillor Jeremy Millar (Vice-Chairman Overview and Scrutiny Committee – with responsibility for Health and Wellbeing theme)	19A
Lunch		
1.30 – 2.30	Councillor Terry James (Liberal Democrat Group Leader)	19A
2.30-3.30	Phone call to Councillor Alan Seldon (Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee)	19A
3.30 – 5.30	Session with Members of Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Cllrs Andrew Atkinson, Phil Bettington, Sebastian Bowen, Mark Cooper, Mark Hubbard, Roger Hunt, Peter Jones, Jim Kenyon, and Jeremy Millar)	22A or Council Chamber depending on numbers

Tuesday 14 August

Time	Interviewee (s)	Room
9.30 – 10.30	Councillor Mark Hubbard (It's Our County Group Leader)	19A
10.30-11.30	Tim Brown/ Paul James/David Penrose	19A
11.30-12.00	Free	
12-1	Geoff Hughes (Director for Places and Communities)	19A
Lunch		
1.30 – 2.30	Councillor John Jarvis (Leader)	Leader's Office
2.30-3.30	Cabinet Members Russell B Hamilton (Environment Housing and Planning) Patricia Morgan (Health and Wellbeing) Graham Powell (Education and Infrastructure) Phillip Price (Corporate Services – Deputy Leader)	19A
3.30 – 4.30	Dean Taylor	19A

MEETING:	OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
DATE:	14 SEPTEMBER 2012
TITLE OF REPORT:	OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME
REPORT BY:	ASSISTANT DIRECTOR – LAW, GOVERNANCE AND RESILIENCE

CLASSIFICATION: Open

Wards Affected

County-wide

Purpose

To consider the Committee's work programme.

Recommendation

THAT: the work programme as appended be noted, subject to any comments the Committee wishes to make.

Key Points Summary

- The Committee is asked to note its work programme and to note progress on current work. .

Alternative Options

- 1 It is for the Committee to determine its work programme as it sees fit to reflect the priorities facing Herefordshire. Any number of subjects could be included in the work programme. However, the Committee does need to be selective and ensure that the work programme is focused on the key issues, realistic and deliverable within the existing resources available.

Reasons for Recommendations

- 2 The Committee needs to develop a manageable work programme to ensure that scrutiny is focused, effective and produces clear outcomes.

Introduction and Background

- 3 An outline work programme only is appended for this meeting. This is because the programme is under review. The appendix also contains a chart showing progress to date on the review of 'Safeguarding arrangements for Children'.

Further information on the subject of this report is available from
Tim Brown, Democratic Services, on (01432) 260239

Community Impact

- 5 The topics selected for scrutiny should have regard to what matters to the County's residents.

Financial Implications

- 6 The costs of the work of the Scrutiny Committee will have to be met within existing resources. It should be noted the costs of running scrutiny will be subject to an assessment to support appropriate processes.

Legal Implications

- 7 The Council is required to deliver an Overview and Scrutiny function.

Risk Management

- 8 There is a reputational risk to the Council if the Overview and Scrutiny function does not operate effectively. The arrangements for the development of the work programme should help to mitigate this risk.

Consultees

- 9 Following initial consultation on topics for scrutiny with Directors and Members of the Cabinet, all Members of the Council were invited to suggest items for scrutiny.

Appendices

- 10 Overview and Scrutiny Committee outline Work Programme
Herefordshire Public Services Rolling Programme (To be circulated separately on publication of latest edition)

Background Papers

- None identified.

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – 14 SEPT 2012
ITEMS IDENTIFIED FOR INCLUSION IN THE WORK PROGRAMME**

THE CURRENT WORK PROGRAMME

3 OCTOBER 2012	
Root and Branch Reviews X4	To consider the outcome from Four Root and Branch Reviews prior to being considered by Cabinet.
12 OCTOBER 12	
Discussion with: Wye Valley NHS Trust Clinical Commissioning Group NHS West Mercia Cluster	NOTE: Content of future updates to ensure they present clear picture of service delivery; with performance information to be provided in advance of the meeting and with each meeting to have a particular purpose. (May 12) The 3 organisations to be invited at the same time to ensure that common issues are debated and each would have a chance to respond to matters of concern (July 12) Cluster performance data to be monitored quarterly. Committee to assess the impact on population. (July 12)
Strategic Plan for Delivering Adult Services	To consider a quarterly report containing a schedule of performance reports outlining the savings that are being achieved through the Strategic Plan. (July12)
Hereford Futures	To receive a report.
ICT Strategy	Report on digital channels strategy and links with Broadband to be made to the Committee in October to identify what needs to be reviewed.
Locality Working	Report to be made to Committee in October to identify what needs to be reviewed.
Corporate Plan	To comment on the Plan. <i>(moved from Sept to reflect the Rolling Programme)</i>
Task and Finish Group Report – Safeguarding Arrangements for Children	To consider the Group’s report. <i>(moved from Sept as Group not finalised the report)</i>
9 NOVEMBER 12	
Budget And Emerging Options 2013/14	To consider the position.
Executive Responses to Task and Finish Review - Safeguarding of Children	To receive the Executive response to the Task & Finish Review into Safeguarding of Children and to consider the Executive’s Action Plan.
Health Systems update	Following a review of the West Midlands Ambulance Service, NHS Integrated Pathways and Make Ready System in Herefordshire the Committee requested an update in Nov 2012 on how the systems were working in practice.

10 DECEMBER 12	
Discussion with 2gether NHS Trust	NOTE: Content of future updates to ensure they present clear picture of service delivery; with performance information to be provided in advance of the meeting and with each meeting to have a particular purpose. (May 12)
Discussion with West Midlands Ambulance NHS Trust	NOTE: Content of future updates to ensure they present clear picture of service delivery; with performance information to be provided in advance of the meeting and with each meeting to have a particular purpose. (May 12)
Completed Task & Finish Reviews: Monitoring progress against the Executive Action Plans	To monitor progress against the Executive Action Plan arising from the following Task & Finish Reviews: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adult Safeguarding in Herefordshire. • Planning System Review – Development Control and the operation of the Constitution. • Council Procurement Policy and Local Business and Local Employment. • Income and Charging. • Tourist and Temporary Event Signage.
11 JANUARY 2013	
Medium Term Financial Strategy	To make recommendations to Cabinet.
Discussion with: Wye Valley NHS Trust Clinical Commissioning Group NHS West Mercia Cluster	NOTE: Content of future updates to ensure they present clear picture of service delivery; with performance information to be provided in advance of the meeting and with each meeting to have a particular purpose. (May 12) The 3 organisations to be invited at the same time to ensure that common issues are debated and each would have a chance to respond to matters of concern (July 12) Cluster performance data to be monitored quarterly. Committee to assess the impact on population. (July 12)
15 FEBRUARY 2013	
22 MARCH 2013	
Discussion with 2gether NHS Trust	NOTE: Content of future updates to ensure they present clear picture of service delivery; with performance information to be provided in advance of the meeting and with each meeting to have a particular purpose. (May 12)
Discussion with West Midlands Ambulance NHS Trust	NOTE: Content of future updates to ensure they present clear picture of service delivery; with performance information to be provided in advance of the meeting and with each meeting to have a particular purpose. (May 12)

12 APRIL 2013	
Discussion with: Wye Valley NHS Trust; Clinical Commissioning Group; and NHS West Mercia Cluster.	NOTE: Content of future updates to ensure they present clear picture of service delivery; with performance information to be provided in advance of the meeting and with each meeting to have a particular purpose. (May 12) The 3 organisations to be invited at the same time to ensure that common issues are debated and each would have a chance to respond to matters of concern (July 12) Cluster performance data to be monitored quarterly. Committee to assess the impact on population. (July 12)
10 MAY 2013	
JULY 2013	
Music Service	Agreed in July 2011 to review after 2 years.
OCTOBER 2013	
T&F – Income & Charging - Projected additional Income	O&SC 19 March 2012 added to the T&F Report that a report be made in Oct setting out how much of the projected additional income had been achieved and reviewing the intended and unintended consequences of new/additional charges.

The following issues have been identified for consideration but not scheduled:

Local Development Framework
Local Transport Plan
Corporate Delivery Plan
Root and Branch Reviews – (pre consideration by Cabinet)
Performance Report on Amey
Performance Report on Hoople
Performance Report on Waste Management
Children’s health and wellbeing (a focus on Childhood obesity)
Broadband
Access to health
Park and ride (latest position requested by briefing note – see 4 July 12)
Community Safety – (19 March on considering the Community Safety Strategy – decided to consider how to include community Safety in the work programme.)
Review of the Public Health Transformation Plan.
Performance Monitoring
Health Trust Quality Accounts (annually in spring if required)
National Health Policies

Document control and information including the website;
Cycle Routes; (latest position requested by briefing note – see 4 July 12)
Governance of Health Watch; (V-Chair to discuss and report back if necessary)
Health & Wellbeing Board – governance and operation;
Committee visit to 2Gether Trust followed by update on user feedback.

Suggestions from the Public (30 September 2011 on)

Suggestion that the Council's consultation processes were flawed, exposing the Council's decisions to the risk of challenge, and the processes should therefore be reviewed by the Committee.	OSC September 11
Request that the Committee consider the future of the libraries programme for the County.	OSC November 11
That the possibility of creating an Eastern Bypass for Hereford along a route close to the Aylestone Ridge should be explored.	OSC December 11
That the quality of Council surveys and the use of results of surveys should be examined. (Later clarified by e-mail – to refer to "the integrity of the Council's research process"/ how research is commissioned, conducted, appraised and used.	OSC December 11 & OSC 13 April, and OSC 4 July 2012.
LTP3 and the Link Road. How Cabinet anticipates making a decision on a compulsory purchase order for the 'Link Road' on 14 June 2012 when the new Local Transport Plan (LTP3) is not due to be considered by Council until July 2012	OSC 13 April
Concern over the ever expanding remit of Hereford Futures. When will the company provide a formal report to Council and make its accounts available?	OSC 13 April
The role of organisations which are promoting via the Herefordshire Council Parish Liaison Officer, the Living Villages and Herefordshire 20/20 events.	OSC 13 April
The role of the Parish Liaison Officer and whether it should be allowed to promote political events.	OSC 13 April
That the Committee carry out a full review of the Local Transport Plan (LTP) at its earliest opportunity and sustain its focus on the Plan by including it within the Committee's work plan.	OSC 8 June
That the Committee should examine how the plans for development of the Enterprise Action Zone at Rotherwas could proceed without links to the LTP and LDF in place	OSC 8 June

Task and Finish Reviews –Progress Report

REVIEWS IDENTIFIED FOR FEASIBILITY STUDY	
Proposed Review	Status
Safeguarding of Adults in their own homes (with Healthwatch and CQC)	Feasibility Work commenced. Review Group will meet on 7 th September.
Road Surfaces (Potholes)	Feasibility Study complete. Officer response is that topic will be covered by Street Scene Root and Branch Review.
Tourism Use of the River Wye	Feasibility Study on-going.
Legal Services	Feasibility Study complete. Scoping to be confirmed.
Governance & Management of Joint Ventures/Partnering Arrangements –	Feasibility Study complete. Scoping to be confirmed
Accommodation Strategy	Feasibility Study complete. Scoping to be confirmed.
ICT Strategy	Feasibility Study complete. Report on digital channels strategy and links with Broadband to be made to the Committee in October to identify what needs to be reviewed.
Locality Working	Feasibility Study complete. Scoping to be confirmed. Report to be made to Committee in October to identify what needs to be reviewed.
GP and Out of Hours Services	Feasibility Study work commenced.
Traffic Speed Signs	Feasibility Study complete. Officer response is that topic will be covered by Street Scene Root and Branch Review.
Market Towns Shop Fronts	Feasibility Study on-going. Officer response is that this could be incorporated in a Root and Branch Review looking into the part that building conservation work in general and market town shop fronts can play in a conservation-led regeneration of our market towns.
Children and Mental Health Service	Feasibility Study yet to commence. (See Minute No 120)

REVIEWS IN PROGRESS		
Review	Meetings	Comment
NHS Midlands and East Stroke Services Review	4/9/12	Initial meeting of the Review Group.
Community Infrastructure Levy – draft policy for Herefordshire	17/9/12	Initial meeting of the Review Group.
Safeguarding arrangements for Children	4/9/12	Report finalised. Listed on 12th October Agenda for consideration.
Housing Allocations Policy and Effective Use of the Housing Stock	18/6/12 6/9/12	Consideration of background material. Will meet to discuss policy options.
REVIEWS COMPLETED AND AWAITING RESPONSE FROM THE EXECUTIVE		
Review	Comment	
There are currently no reviews in this section.		
REVIEWS COMPLETED AND SUBJECT TO MONITORING OF THE EXECUTIVE ACTION PLAN		
Review	Comment	
Council Procurement Policy and Local Business and Local Employment	Executive response to review reported to OSC 4 July. Six month monitoring of Executive action plan programmed for December 2012.	
Income and Charging	Executive response to review reported to OSC 4 July. Six month monitoring of Executive action plan programmed for December 2012.	
Planning System Review – Development Control and the operation of the Constitution	Executive response to review reported to OSC 4 July. Six month monitoring of Executive action plan programmed for December 2012.	
Safeguarding Adults in Herefordshire	Executive response to review reported to OSC 4 July. Six month monitoring of Executive action plan programmed for December 2012.	
Tourist Signing (Brown Signs)	Executive response to review reported to OSC 4 July. Six month monitoring of Executive action plan programmed for December 2012.	