

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

AGENDA

DATE: Tuesday 14 June 2011

TIME: 7.30 pm

VENUE: Committee Rooms 1&2
Harrow Civic Centre

MEMBERSHIP (Quorum 4)

Chairman: Councillor Jerry Miles

Councillors:

Sue Anderson
Ann Gate
Sachin Shah
Victoria Silver

Kam Chana
Barry Macleod-Cullinane
Paul Osborn (VC)
Stephen Wright

Representatives of Voluntary Aided Sector: Mrs J Rammelt/Reverend P Reece
Representatives of Parent Governors: 2 Vacancies

(Note: Where there is a matter relating to the Council's education functions, the "church" and parent governor representatives have attendance, speaking and voting rights. They are entitled to speak but not vote on any other matter.)

Reserve Members:

1. Nana Asante
2. Varsha Parmar
3. Krishna Suresh
4. Sasi Suresh
5. Krishna James

1. Chris Mote
2. Tony Ferrari
3. Christine Bednell
4. Susan Hall

Contact: Alison Atherton / Claire Vincent, Senior Professional - Democratic Services
Tel: 020 8424 1266 / 1637 E-mail: alison.atherton@harrow.gov.uk /
claire.vincent@harrow.gov.uk

AGENDA - PART I

1. ATTENDANCE BY RESERVE MEMBERS

To note the attendance at this meeting of any duly appointed Reserve Members.

Reserve Members may attend meetings:-

- (i) to take the place of an ordinary Member for whom they are a reserve;
- (ii) where the ordinary Member will be absent for the whole of the meeting; and
- (iii) the meeting notes at the start of the meeting at the item 'Reserves' that the Reserve Member is or will be attending as a reserve;
- (iv) if a Reserve Member whose intention to attend has been noted arrives after the commencement of the meeting, then that Reserve Member can only act as a Member from the start of the next item of business on the agenda after his/her arrival.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

To receive declarations of personal or prejudicial interests, arising from business to be transacted at this meeting, from:

- (a) all Members of the Committee, Sub Committee, Panel or Forum;
- (b) all other Members present in any part of the room or chamber.

3. MINUTES (Pages 1 - 16)

That the minutes of the meeting held on 27 April 2011 and of the Special meeting held on 12 May 2011 be taken as read and signed as correct records.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

To receive questions (if any) from local residents/organisations under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 17 (Part 4B of the Constitution).

5. PETITIONS

To receive petitions (if any) submitted by members of the public/Councillors under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 15 (Part 4B of the Constitution).

6. DEPUTATIONS

To receive deputations (if any) under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 16 (Part 4B) of the Constitution.

7. REFERENCES FROM COUNCIL/CABINET

(if any).

8. COMMUNITY SAFETY PLAN (To Follow)

Report of the Divisional Director of Partnership Development and Performance.

9. SAFER HARROW ANNUAL STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT 2011/12 (To Follow)

Report of the Divisional Director of Partnership Development and Performance.

10. UPDATE ON RECOMMENDATIONS FROM DELIVERING A STRENGTHENED VOLUNTARY AND COMMUNITY SECTOR (Pages 17 - 26)

Report of the Divisional Director of Community and Culture

11. STANDING SCRUTINY REVIEW OF THE BETTER DEAL FOR RESIDENTS PROGRAMME - INTERIM REPORT, PROJECT MANAGEMENT (Pages 27 - 48)

Report of the Divisional Director of Partnership Development and Performance

12. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Which the Chairman has decided is urgent and cannot otherwise be dealt with.

AGENDA - PART II

Nil

This page is intentionally left blank

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MINUTES

27 APRIL 2011

Chairman:	* Councillor Jerry Miles	
Councillors:	* Sue Anderson * Nana Asante (1) * Kam Chana * Barry Macleod-Cullinane	* Paul Osborn * Bill Phillips * Sachin Shah * Stephen Wright
Voting Co-opted:	(Voluntary Aided) † Mrs J Rammelt Reverend P Reece	(Parent Governors) 2 vacancies
In attendance: (Councillors)	Mrs Rekha Shah	Minutes 130 and 132

- * Denotes Member present
- (1) Denotes category of Reserve Member
- † Denotes apologies received

122. Welcome

The Chairman welcomed everyone to this last Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting of the Municipal Year, in particular Councillor Mrs Rekha Shah, Portfolio Holder for Community and Cultural Services, Brendon Hills, Corporate Director of Community and Environment, Marianne Locke, Divisional Director of Community and Cultural Services, Julie Alderson, Interim Corporate Director of Finance, and Susan Dixson, Service Manager – Internal Audit.

123. Attendance by Reserve Members

RESOLVED: To note the attendance at this meeting of the following duly appointed Reserve Member:-

Ordinary Member

Reserve Member

Councillor Ann Gate

Councillor Nana Asante

124. Declarations of Interest

RESOLVED: To note that the following interests were declared:

Agenda Item 7 - Council's Use of Performance Information - Review Report

Councillor Paul Osborn declared a personal interest in that he had previously received hospitality from Capita. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Agenda Item 8 – Update on Actions Arising from the Scrutiny Review 'Delivering a Strengthened Voluntary Sector'

Councillor Sue Anderson; declared a personal interest in that she was a member of the Grants Advisory Panel. She would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Councillor Nana Asante declared a personal interest in that she was Chair of the Grants Advisory Panel and was part of the scrutiny review 'Delivering a Strengthened Voluntary Sector'. She would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane declared a personal interest in that he was a member of the Cabinet that had agreed revised funding for voluntary sector grants, and was an employee of London Councils which administered the London Boroughs Grants Scheme. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Councillor Paul Osborn declared a personal interest in that he was a member of the Cabinet that had agreed revised funding for voluntary sector grants, but was absent from the Cabinet meeting on 17 September 2009 when the grant funding criteria had been agreed. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Councillor Bill Phillips declared a personal interest in that he was a Trustee of the Harrow Association of Voluntary Service. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Agenda Item 9 - Grants Update Report

Councillor Sue Anderson declared a personal interest in that she was a member of the Grants Advisory Panel. She would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Councillor Nana Asante declared a personal interest in that she was Chairman of the Grants Advisory Panel. She would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane declared a personal interest in that he was a member of the Cabinet that had agreed revised funding for voluntary sector grants, and was also an employee of London Councils that administered the London Boroughs Grants Scheme. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Councillor Paul Osborn declared a personal interest in that he was a member of the Cabinet that had agreed revised funding for voluntary sector grants, but was absent from the Cabinet meeting on 17 September 2009 when the grant funding criteria had been agreed. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Councillor Bill Phillips declared a personal interest in that he was a Trustee of Harrow Association of Voluntary Service. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Agenda Item 12 – Scrutiny Lead Members Report

Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane declared a personal interest in that he was the Portfolio Holder for Housing at the time of the Housing Quality Network inspection and the approval of the Housing Ambition Plan. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Agenda Item 13 - Report of the Chair of the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Sub-Committee

Councillor Sue Anderson declared a personal interest in that she was a health trainer and walk leader for Harrow Primary Care Trust, and also a Neighbourhood Champion. She would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Agenda Item 17 - Internal Audit Report - Grants to Voluntary Organisations

Councillor Sue Anderson declared a personal interest in that she was a member of the Grants Advisory Panel. She would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Councillor Nana Asante declared a personal interest in that she was Chairman of the Grants Advisory Panel. She would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane declared a personal interest in that he was a member of the Cabinet that had agreed revised funding for the voluntary sector, and was also an employee of London Councils that administered the London Boroughs Grants Scheme. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Councillor Paul Osborn declared a personal interest in that he was a member of the Cabinet that had agreed revised funding for the voluntary sector, but was absent from the Cabinet meeting on 17 September 2009 when the grant

funding criteria had been agreed. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Councillor Bill Phillips declared a personal interest in that he was a Trustee of Harrow Association of Voluntary Service. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

125. Minutes

In accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, the minutes of the meeting held on 5 April 2011 were admitted late to the agenda in order that they could be approved at the earliest opportunity. Due to the proximity of the last meeting to this, the minutes had not been finalised at the time the agenda was printed and circulated.

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 5 April 2011 be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

126. Public Questions, Petitions and Deputations

RESOLVED: To note that no public questions were put, or petitions or deputations received at this meeting under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rules 17, 15 and 16 (Part 4B of the Constitution) respectively.

RECOMMENDED ITEMS

127. Draft Scrutiny Annual Report 2010/11

The Committee received the draft Scrutiny Annual Report for 2010/11, which summarised the work undertaken during the year by each of the scrutiny committees and the scrutiny Lead Members.

The Committee endorsed the Annual Report and it was

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (to Council)

That the Scrutiny Annual Report for 2010/11 be noted.

RESOLVED: That the Scrutiny Annual Report for 2010/11 be agreed.

RESOLVED ITEMS

128. Council's Use of Performance Information - Review Report

The Committee received a reference from the Cabinet meeting on 7 April 2011, which set out the Cabinet's response to the recommendations of the Scrutiny Review of the Council's Use of Performance Information.

There was concern that some of the responses to the individual recommendations were vague with respect to the timescale in which they would be implemented, and this would make it difficult to measure progress.

The response, for example, to the recommendation that a suite of indicators be developed for the performance of the IT service following its transferral to Capita was simply that this was agreed and in hand. A Member questioned whether there was a Service Level Agreement for the IT service and queried how data would be collected and what would be done with it. He was concerned that if data was not generated automatically it could be expensive to capture.

RESOLVED: That the reference and the Committee's comments thereon be noted.

129. Update on Actions Arising from the Scrutiny Review 'Delivering a Strengthened Voluntary Sector'

At its meeting on 6 April 2011, the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Sub-Committee had received an update on actions taken to address the recommendations of the scrutiny review report produced in December 2008 on 'Delivering a Strengthened Voluntary Sector'. The Committee now considered a recommendation from the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Sub-Committee in that regard.

The Sub-Committee had expressed concern that that the update report did not fully consider the impact of the closure of the Harrow Association of Voluntary Service (HAVS) on the delivery of the recommendations, and it had therefore requested that officers prepare a report on this for a future meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

The Committee echoed the sentiments of the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Sub-Committee in that much of the information in the report was out of date and this made it impossible for scrutiny members to monitor progress. HAVS was referred to throughout the report as if it were still in operation, and there was no explanation as to what had happened to the Funding Officer appointed jointly with HAVS since its closure. Members stated that some of the documents which were reported to be on the website were not. A Member also highlighted that the actions set out in response to the recommendation that voluntary sector representatives on the Harrow Strategic Partnership report back more systematically to their sector colleagues did not address the recommendation. In general, Members felt that the report was unsatisfactory and were concerned as to whether it had had the appropriate approvals prior to publication.

Officers noted Members' concerns and undertook to submit a further report to the June meeting of the Committee.

RESOLVED: That officers prepare a report for the Committee that outlined the implications of the HAVS closure on the delivery of the recommendations made by the scrutiny review.

130. Grants Update Report

The Committee received a report of the Corporate Director of Community and Environment, which set out information relating to the process for administering the 2011/12 main grants programme.

Members had a number of detailed questions and comments on issues arising from the report. It was noted that the Funding Officer at the Harrow Association of Voluntary Service (HAVS) had helped a number of organisations with their applications for the 2011/12 grants round, and that £20,781 had been ring-fenced to replace the support previously provided by HAVS. Members questioned what form this would take. Officers advised that they were looking at an interim solution, and were considering an offer from 4 voluntary sector representatives to provide services in the short term, but that they would be working with the voluntary sector to find a long-term solution, which it was hoped to implement from November 2011. It was unlikely, however, to be a like-for-like replacement for HAVS. It was also proposed to carry forward the remainder of the HAVS grants for 2010/11.

Members questioned whether the organisations that had availed themselves of the information sessions on the revised grant application process had been more successful than those who had not. Officers advised that no such analysis had been carried out but that it could be done. Members suggested that there should be evaluation of the information sessions. A Member also felt that there had been an issue about the way in which changes to the process had been communicated, and in particular that applicants had not been aware of the introduction of a word limit.

Concern was expressed about the timeline for resolving the issue of grant appeals in 2010/11, and specifically that this had been resolved via a decision of the Leader on 8 February 2011, only two days before a scheduled meeting of Cabinet. It was suggested that the decision should have been taken by Cabinet as this would have been more transparent and constitutionally sound, and the reason for not submitting a report to Cabinet was queried. Officers undertook to look into this and to incorporate a response into the report to be submitted to the June Committee meeting as agreed under the previous agenda item. In addition, Members questioned why an independent adviser had been appointed to review the appeals, after the Grants Advisory Panel had agreed that they be reviewed by reserve members of the Panel. The Portfolio Holder for Community and Cultural Services stated that she felt that this would be a quicker and more transparent process.

Members were also concerned about the timeliness of committee reports, and about documents being made available late, both to Members and the public. It was suggested that there should be a separate Cabinet meeting to agree the grants to voluntary organisations. The Corporate Director of Community and Environment stated that Members had been advised in July 2010 that the consultation on the grants process would have implications for the delivery of the main grants programme for 2011/12, and that papers had been made available as soon as they were ready, but officers had had to weigh up various factors and try to pull together a tight timeline. It was hoped in 2012 to bring the report on the grants applications to the February Cabinet meeting

with a view to completing the whole process, including appeals, before the end of the financial year. A Member noted that there was no mention of the Grants Advisory Panel in the timeline and felt that it was important that the Panel be fully involved in the process, as it was able to look at issues in greater depth.

The outcome of the consultation on the possible commissioning and delivery of a revised small grants programme was queried, and it was advised that over 80% of respondents had supported this. The Council was therefore developing proposals for revised funding arrangements for 2012/13 and would be holding stakeholder meetings on this shortly. A Member highlighted that London Councils had recently lost a Judicial Review case relating to this and questioned what steps were being taken to avoid this in Harrow. The Portfolio Holder for Community and Cultural Services stated that she had had several meetings with officers on the matter. Officers advised that they were taking legal advice and also working with the procurement team on developing the specifications.

RESOLVED: To note the improvements made to the grants administration process as a result of lessons learnt in previous years and recommendations made by Internal Audit.

131. Exclusion of Press and Public

RESOLVED: That the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business for the reason set out below:

<u>Item</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Reason</u>
17.	Internal Audit Report – Grants to Voluntary Organisations	The report contained information under paragraph 3 in that it contained information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person, including the authority holding that information.

132. Internal Audit Report - Grants to Voluntary Organisations

The Committee considered a confidential report of the Assistant Chief Executive, which set out a review by the Council's Internal Audit Service of the adequacy, application and effectiveness of the arrangements in place for grant administration.

Members had a detailed discussion of the findings of the review, which had been requested by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and agreed by Internal Audit for inclusion in the 2010/11 Internal Audit Plan as an emerging risk. A number of questions were asked of officers and the Community and Cultural Services Portfolio Holder, to which answers were provided. Members thanked the Internal Audit Service for an excellent report.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

133. Re-admittance of Press and Public

RESOLVED: That the press and public be re-admitted to the meeting for the remainder of the business.

134. Scrutiny Work Programme Update

Members received a report of the Divisional Director of Partnership Development and Performance, which provided an update on the progress of the delivery of the scrutiny work programme, and set out the projects proposed for inclusion in the work programme by the Scrutiny Leadership Group for approval.

At the meeting, it was advised that there was also a recommendation from the Scrutiny Leads for Corporate Effectiveness and Finance for a review of the debt recovery process and, if agreed, this might require some re-phasing of the work programme. A Member suggested that the Committee should do a piece of work on the Safer Neighbourhood Teams, given the changes that were being implemented, but it was advised that this was something that the Scrutiny Lead Members were already looking at. The next phase of the work programme was agreed, with the addition of the work on the debt recovery process.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) progress of the delivery of the work programme be noted;
- (2) it be agreed that the next phase of the scrutiny work programme comprise:
 - i. standing review of the budget,
 - ii. second phase of the Better Deal for Residents Standing Review,
 - iii. second phase of the Performance Management Review,
 - iv. snow clearance,
 - v. engaging with young people,
 - vi. debt recovery process;
- (3) allowance be made for the inclusion of the following projects where this was deemed appropriate following further investigation:
 - i. disabled access,
 - ii. health and housing
- (4) the scopes for the projects included under (2) above be presented to the next ordinary meeting of the Committee (14 June 2011) where necessary.

135. Scrutiny Lead Members Report

Members considered a report of the Divisional Director of Partnership Development and Performance, which set out a report of the Sustainable Development and Enterprise Lead Members of a meeting on housing-related matters.

A Member queried why the average annual service charge for Harrow Council leaseholders was one tenth of the London average. The Performance Lead Member advised that there were many different charges and that a lot of work needed to be done on this, but officers were looking into it.

RESOLVED: That the report from the Scrutiny Lead Members be noted and the action proposed therein agreed.

136. Report of the Chair of the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Sub-Committee

The Committee received a report of the Divisional Director of Partnership Development and Performance which summarised the issues to be taken forward by the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Sub-Committee following its meeting on 6 April 2011. Additionally, in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, the minutes of the Sub-Committee meeting on 6 April 2011 were admitted late to the agenda in order that they could be considered in conjunction with the report, the minutes of the previous meeting on 18 January 2011 having been circulated in error on the main agenda.

RESOLVED: That the report of the Chair of the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Sub-Committee be noted.

137. Attendance by Executive Members at Scrutiny Meetings

In accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, a proposed resolution relating to attendance by Executive Members at scrutiny meetings was admitted to the agenda as a late item, in light of the non-attendance of an Executive Member at recent scrutiny review meetings. The Committee agreed to consider this item as a matter of urgency as the Implications of HAVS (Harrow Association of Voluntary Service) Scrutiny Review, which was looking at the Council's arrangements for grants to the voluntary sector, needed to be concluded as soon as possible.

Members expressed regret that this action was being taken but felt that it was necessary to ensure that the Committee Procedure Rules were followed and Members attended scrutiny meetings when requested.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) under Rules 49 and 43 of the Committee Procedure Rules, the current Portfolio Holder for Community and Cultural Services be required to attend and answer questions at the Implications of HAVS Review Group, chaired by Councillor Nana Asante, and the Monitoring Officer

be instructed, in accordance with Rule 43.4, to write to the Portfolio Holder informing her of this decision and to arrange a date for this meeting, ensuring that the Portfolio Holder is given at least 10 clear working days notice of the meeting;

- (2) the review group report back to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting on 14 June 2011 with the final report;
- (3) a reference be made to Cabinet reminding Members of their duties under Rule 43 which states:

“43.2 In fulfilling the scrutiny role, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Scrutiny Sub-Committee may require the Leader of the Council and any other member of the Executive to attend before the Committee to explain:

43.2.1 any particular decisions or series of decisions;

43.2.2 the extent to which the actions taken implement Council policy; and/or

43.2.3 their performance.”

- (4) in the spirit of the delivery of effective challenge and reflecting custom and practice hitherto, Cabinet also be reminded of its individual and collective responsibilities under section 49 of the Committee Procedure Rules which states:

“49.1 In conducting reviews, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Scrutiny Sub-Committee may also ask people to attend to give evidence at their meetings as outlined in Rules 43-45 above.”

The Committee wished it to be recorded that the voting was as follows:-

Councillors Sue Anderson, Nana Asante, Kam Chana, Ann Gate, Barry Macleod-Cullinane, Jerry Miles, Paul Osborn, Sachin Shah and Stephen Wright voted for the above decision;

Councillor Bill Phillips voted against it.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.34 pm, closed at 9.20 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR JERRY MILES
Chairman

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE (SPECIAL) MINUTES

12 MAY 2011

Chairman: * Councillor Jerry Miles

Councillors:

* Sue Anderson	* Paul Osborn
* Kam Chana	* Sachin Shah
* Ann Gate	* Victoria Silver
* Barry Macleod-Cullinane	* Stephen Wright

Voting Co-opted:

(Voluntary Aided)	(Parent Governors)
Mrs J Rammelt Reverend P Reece	2 Vacancies

* Denotes Member present

RESOLVED ITEMS

138. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations.

139. Appointment of Vice-Chairman

RESOLVED: To appoint Councillor Paul Osborn as Vice-Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for the 2011/12 Municipal Year.

140. Establishment of Sub-Committees for 2011/12

The Committee considered a report setting out the proposed memberships and Chairmen of the Sub-Committees for 2011/12 which, in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, was admitted late to the agenda in order to enable the Sub-Committees to be established.

RESOLVED: That the Sub-Committees of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee be established for the Municipal Year 2011/12 with the memberships and Chairmen as detailed in Appendix I to these minutes.

141. Appointment of Lead Members 2011/12

The Committee considered proposals relating to Lead Members for Scrutiny for 2011/12 which, in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, were admitted late to the agenda in order to enable Lead Members to be agreed.

RESOLVED: That the Scrutiny Lead Members be agreed, as detailed in Appendix II to these minutes.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.47 pm, closed at 7.50 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR JERRY MILES
Chairman

SCRUTINY SUB COMMITTEES - 2011/12**(Membership in order of political group nominations)****Labour****Conservative****(1) PERFORMANCE AND FINANCE SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE (5)****(3)****(2)****I.
Members****Sue Anderson (CH)
Jerry Miles
Varsha Parmar****Tony Ferrari
Barry Macleod-Cullinane *****II.
Reserve
Members****1. Nana Asante
2. Krishna Suresh
3. Krishna James****1. Chris Mote
2. Susan Hall****(2) HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE (5)****(3)****(2)****I.
Members****Ann Gate (CH)
Jerry Miles
Sachin Shah****Mrs Vina Mithani *
Simon Williams****II.
Reserve
Members****1. Ben Wealthy
2. David Gawn
3. Krishna James****1. Barry Macleod-Cullinane
2. Mrs Lurline Champagne OBE****CH****= Chair*********= Denotes Group Members for consultation on Administrative Matters**

(3) CALL-IN SUB-COMMITTEE (5)

Labour

Conservative

(3)

(2)

I. Members

Sue Anderson
Jerry Miles (CH)
Sachin Shah

Susan Hall
Paul Osborn *

II. Reserve Members

1. Nana Asante
2. Ann Gate
3. Ajay Maru

1. Barry Macleod-Cullinane
2. Tony Ferrari
3. Kam Chana

(4) CALL-IN SUB-COMMITTEE (Education) (9)

(7)

(2)

I. Members

Sue Anderson
Nana Asante
Ann Gate
Ajay Maru
Jerry Miles (CH)
Sachin Shah
Victoria Silver

Husain Akhtar
Christine Bednell

II. Reserve Members

1. Zarina Khalid
2. Raj Ray
3. Krishna Suresh
4. Ben Wealthy
5. Krishna James
6. Nizam Ismail
7. Kairul Kareema Marikar

1. Chris Mote
2. Janet Mote
3. Lynda Seymour
† 4. Ramji Chauhan
† 5. Mrs Camilla Bath

Voting Co-opted Members:

- (1) Two representatives of Voluntary Aided Sector
- Mrs J Rammelt/Reverend P Reece
- (2) Two representatives of Parent Governors
- Vacancy (Primary) / Vacancy (Secondary)

CH

= Chair

*

= Denotes Group Members for consultation on Administrative Matters

†

[Note: The appointed number of Reserves for each Group is in excess of the Committee Procedure Rule 3.2 provision, by virtue of Resolution 17: Overview and Scrutiny Committee (18.7.06).]

SCRUTINY LEAD MEMBERS 2011/12

Policy Lead Member	Councillor
Health and Social Care	Councillor Ann Gate
Children and Young People	Councillor Christine Bednell
Corporate Effectiveness and Finance	Councillor Jerry Miles
Safer and Stronger Communities	Councillor Chris Mote
Sustainability Development and Enterprise	Councillor Stephen Wright

Performance Lead Member	Councillor
Health and Social Care	Councillor Mrs Vina Mithani
Children and Young People	Councillor Krishna James
Corporate Effectiveness and Finance	Councillor Tony Ferrari
Safer and Stronger Communities	Councillor Nana Asante
Sustainable Development and Enterprise	Councillor Sue Anderson

This page is intentionally left blank

**REPORT FOR: OVERVIEW AND
SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

Date of Meeting:	14 th June 2011
Subject:	Update on recommendations from 'Delivering a strengthened voluntary sector'
Responsible Officer:	Brendon Hills Corporate Director Community and Environment
Scrutiny Lead Member area:	Councillor Chris Mote, Policy Lead – Safer and Stronger Communities Councillor Nana Asante, Performance Lead – Safer and Stronger Communities
Exempt:	No
Enclosures:	Appendix 1: Update on recommendations from 'Delivering a strengthened voluntary sector'

Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

This report provides an update on actions taken against the recommendations of the scrutiny review 'Delivering a strengthened voluntary sector'.

Recommendations:

The Overview and Scrutiny committee is requested:

1. To note the updates and further actions against recommendations as described in Appendix 1.
2. To receive a further report in the autumn on the delivery of the Third Sector Strategy and updated action plan.

Section 2 – Report

2.1 Introductory paragraph

2.1.1 The Overview and Scrutiny committee undertook a review called 'Delivering a strengthened voluntary sector' during 2008. The final report made 22 recommendations, 21 of which were accepted by Cabinet in March 2009. This report provides an update on progress and further action against these recommendations.

2.2 Background

2.2.1 The responsibility for the delivery of actions against recommendations cuts across Council directorates. The positive and ongoing progress against recommendations demonstrates that relevant service areas have actively pursued these. The delivery of many actions has been undertaken through close partnership working and engagement of the voluntary sector in Harrow.

2.3 Current situation

2.3.1 The table attached at Appendix 1 provides a summary of the actions taken to address the recommendations and highlights further action that will be undertaken with timescales for delivery.

2.3.2 The priority areas of activity going forward are;

- (a) Development of a Third Sector Investment Plan for 2012/13 onwards
- (b) Consultation on and commissioning of new VCS infrastructure support services
- (c) Finalisation of Compact Board governance arrangements and Compact funding code
- (d) Review of the Third Sector Strategy and action plan

2.4 Why a change is needed

2.4.1 Reductions in public sector funding present a challenge for both the Council and the VCS. The impact of this for some VCS organisations has been significantly reduced levels of funding. The challenge for Harrow Council is managing the allocation of limited resources across a number of competing demands. To inform the strategic view of support to the voluntary sector officers are undertaking an analysis of Council funding and other provision across all Directorates to the sector.

2.4.2 A strategic Third Sector Investment Plan for 2012/13 onwards is being developed with internal and external stakeholders which will be presented to the Grants Advisory Panel and Cabinet in July. The plan takes in to account the results of consultation with the VCS in January 2011 and recent stakeholder workshops. The plan will ensure that support is delivered in a way that makes best use of available

resources, allocates these resources in a fair and transparent manner and aligns their use with the delivery of Council's priorities.

- 2.4.3 A further challenge facing the voluntary sector is the imminent closure of HAVS (Harrow Association of Voluntary Service). In recognition of this the Council has been working with voluntary sector representatives to set up arrangements for the delivery of interim support services including funding advice, capacity building support, volunteer recruitment and continued access to the premises at 64 Pinner Road. The Harrow Strategic Partnership (HSP) voluntary sector representatives and the Council are finalising interim management arrangements for a period of six months to manage the delivery of these basic services whilst a consultation is undertaken by and with the voluntary sector to determine what support services are required in the long-term.
- 2.4.4 To manage the relationship between the sectors the development and role of the Compact Board to provide robust governance and promote the Compact across partners will be progressed through the Voluntary Sector Forum. The Funding compact code is being consulted on with the VCS and other stakeholders and will be finalised by October 2011.
- 2.4.5 In light of the changing environment for the Third Sector the strategy will be reviewed and the action plan updated to reflect new work streams and priorities. This will be reported to Members in the Autumn 2011.

2.5 Implications of the Recommendation

2.5.1 Equalities impact

Proposals described in this report will be subject to equalities impact assessments as part of the Council's continuing duties under the Equality Act 2010. The relevant protected characteristics are:

- Age
- Disability
- Gender reassignment
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race,
- Religion or belief
- Sex
- Sexual orientation

2.6 Financial Implications

- 2.6.1 Cabinet agreed at its meeting of the 17th May 2011 to ring-fence £20,781 from the grants budget which will be matched by a £47,219 carry forward from 2010/11 to support the delivery of interim support services for the VCS and the consultation activity that will inform the development of a service specification for the long-term service. The carry forward is subject to cabinet approval.

2.6.2 All proposals contained within the Third Sector Investment Plan will be managed within the Council's current budget.

2.7 Performance Issues

2.7.1 Activities and services provided by the voluntary sector have the potential to contribute to a number of Council priorities. The future development of the Third Sector Investment plan will aim to ensure that all Council funding is more closely aligned to Council priorities. This will be measured through specification and monitoring of outcomes based on funding priorities.

2.8 Environmental Impact

2.8.1 The development of a Third Sector Investment plan will take into account opportunities for specifying fair trade goods and other environmental considerations for the procurement of services.

2.9 Risk Management Implications

2.9.1 The provision of Council funding to the VCS whether through grants or commissioning has associated risks in particular with regard to ensuring the proper use of public funds. The Council is working to improve its approach to monitoring organisations in receipt of funding. In 2010/11 the Adults and Housing and Community and Environment directorates undertook joint monitoring of funded organisations. The monitoring process for this year's grants programme and future years will be further strengthened in the light of this experience.

2.10 Corporate Priorities

The services provided by the voluntary and community sector have the potential to contribute to the following corporate priorities:

- Keeping neighbourhoods clean, green and safe.
- United and involved communities: A Council that listens and leads.
- Supporting and protecting people who are most in need.

Section 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Name: Kanta Hirani.....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the* Chief Financial Officer
Date: ...3 rd June 2011.....		
Name: Jessica Farmer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	On behalf of the* Monitoring Officer
Date: ...3 rd June 2011.....		

Section 4 - Contact Details and Background Papers

Contact: Kashmir Takhar, Head of Service – Community Development,
020 8420 9331

Background Papers:

Appendix 1: Update on actions to address recommendations from the
Overview and Scrutiny review

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 1
Update on actions to address recommendations from the Overview and Scrutiny Review

No.	Recommendation	Person responsible	Update	Further action	Date
1	To have a Council-financed funding support officer within the voluntary and community sector to support groups in a variety of ways e.g. grant applications, adapting to any changes in the grants process, developing funding strategies, meeting monitoring requirements, procurement processes, community assets. To work closely with the Council's external funding officer.	Corporate Director of Finance and Corporate Director for Community and Environment	The Council provided 50% match funding for a Funding Officer role from September 2009 - March 2011. The officer was based at HAVS and provided support with identifying funding sources, assisting with funding applications, delivering training workshops etc. To replace this service the Council is working with VCS representatives to put in place interim support services for the voluntary sector that will include funding advice. Funding advice is also available from the Council's External Funding Manager which includes VCS access to an external funding network and external funding newsletter.	(1) Delivery of interim VCS support services (2) Following VCS consultation the development and delivery of long-term support services	(1) 30th June 2011 (2) December 2011
2	To have a relationship manager at the Council to act as the main channel of liaison with groups in the voluntary and community sector.	Corporate Director for Community and Environment	The Divisional Director for Community and Culture is the Council's relationship manager and is the main channel of liaison with groups in the voluntary and community sector.	Ongoing	Ongoing
3	To develop a third sector strategy for Harrow that seeks to help define the local relationship with the VCS and invests in VCS development in line with partnership priorities. The third sector strategy should also seek to address the recognised gaps in the models developed and proposed by the scrutiny review - Community Trust model (for example gaps in commissioning and premises) and further work on the model of commissioning in the Strategic Relationships model.	Corporate Director for Community and Environment	The Third Sector Strategy was developed and adopted by Cabinet in April 2010. A Third Sector Strategy cross-corporate working group has been established to monitor progress and wider impacts on the VCS. This group is supporting the development of a Third Sector Investment plan. The aim is to establish clear commissioning priorities and outcomes from this investment.	Development of Third Sector Investment plan presented to Cabinet	Jul-11
4	To ask VCS representatives on the HSP to feed back more systematically to sector colleagues through regular emails or as updates in existing newsletters.	Assistant Chief Executive	The notes of Harrow Chief Executives meetings are made available to the VCS representatives on the Council website within 5 days of each meeting. Briefing notes of HSP Board meetings are available to HSP representatives and are on the Council website within 5 days of each meeting. The VCS representatives provide feedback to sector colleagues through the Voluntary Sector Forum and email communication.	Ongoing	Ongoing
5	To recognise the real opportunity to develop volunteering in Harrow where supply of volunteers outstrips demand – investing more resource to build the capacity of Harrow Volunteers Centre to provide infrastructure and support to small voluntary groups in recruiting and training volunteers and co-ordinating skills for day to day management of groups.	Corporate Director for Community and Environment	Arrangements are being put in place for the provision of interim support services for the VCS that will include support with volunteer recruitment. It is recognised that there is a real opportunity for VCS organisations to make more use of volunteers in Harrow and a lack of support available to small voluntary groups on how to make best use of volunteers. This will be taken in to account when a service specification for infrastructure support is devised.	Following VCS consultation the development and delivery of long-term support services	Dec-11
6	To advertise the Volunteers Centre on the Harrow Council website.	Corporate Director for Community and Environment	Provision of services to support volunteer recruitment will be provided as part of the interim arrangements being put in place. It is likely that this will also be an aspect of the specification that is developed for the provision of infrastructure support services.	(1) Delivery of interim VCS support services (2) Following VCS consultation the development and delivery of long-term support services	(1) 30th June 2011 (2) December 2011

No.	Recommendation	Person responsible	Update	Further action	Date
7	To develop robust governance arrangements for the Compact, to include refreshing the document every two years, promoting the Compact and its way of working, formalising conflict resolution (providing a framework for stage 1 complaints). To be the responsibility of a new Compact Board of representatives to feed up to the HSP, and therefore not reliant on individuals.	Assistant Chief Executive	A proposal has been developed to review the governance arrangements for the Compact this includes a proposal to develop a new compact board and peer review arrangements. An outline structure has been agreed by the Voluntary and Community Sector Forum and detailed terms of reference are under development.	Development of terms of reference and agreement by Voluntary Sector Forum	Oct-11
8	To produce a reader-friendly summary of the new compact document and distribute this to councillors, officers and colleagues in the voluntary and community sector.	Assistant Chief Executive	The compact refresh has been completed except for the funding code which has been drafted and is now the subject of consultation with the voluntary and community sector and service departments. When this is complete, a reader-friendly summary will be made available.	(1) Finalise and agree draft with VCS and internal stakeholders. (2) Develop reader friendly summary.	October 2011
9	To roll out training on the Compact and what it means to partnership working. To be included in members' training, management/officer training and training within the VCS and other partner organisations within the HSP, to raise awareness and understanding. (Please note that part (a) of the recommendation was agreed by Cabinet through the interim report).	Assistant Chief Executive	Some training for members of the Grants Panel has been undertaken. Further training to focus on the new funding and procurement code when agreed will take place.	Training on new funding and procurement code to be rolled out to officers, VCS and other stakeholders.	November 2011 - January 2012
10	To rationalise the grant-giving process – to clearly define processes, appeals mechanisms and adherence to these in order to improve consistency and transparency.	Corporate Director for Community and Environment	Since the Overview and Scrutiny report was published two consultations have been undertaken with the VCS to develop the grant-giving process in line with recommendations. The first consultation in 2009 resulted in a number of changes being implemented to the grants administration process. A second consultation was undertaken in January 2011 on further potential changes to the grants system that will inform the development of the 2012/13 funding round.	Development of Third Sector Investment Plan for 2012/13 onwards	Jul-11
11	To move towards three-year funding commitments through grants so as to encourage stability and more scope for planning ahead within the sector.	Corporate Director of Finance and Corporate Director for Community and Environment	The recent consultation with the VCS indicated strong support for moving towards the commissioning of some services from the VCS. Proposals for the 2012/13 funding round are currently being developed in consultation with the VCS and other stakeholders. It is envisaged that this could lead to longer-term funding agreements, however this requires further development with Finance and Procurement departments.	Development of Third Sector Investment Plan for 2012/13 onwards	Jul-11
12	To consider a longer-term approach (5-10 year funding) for SLAs awarded to VCS infrastructure organisations.	Corporate Director of Finance and Corporate Director for Community and Environment	The development of a replacement service for the provision of infrastructure support will be undertaken in consultation with the VCS. This consultation will inform the development of a service specification which will be secured through a commissioning process. The development of a commissioning approach will consider the need for longer-term funding agreements.	(1) Delivery of interim VCS support services (2) Following VCS consultation the development and delivery of long-term support services	(1) October 2011 (2) December 2011
13	To agree that the 2009-10 grants round should be conducted in full compliance with the existing criteria and process and in a transparent way.	Corporate Director for Community and Environment	Cabinet agreed at their meeting in December 2008 that the 2009-10 grants round should be conducted in full compliance with the existing criteria. The 2009-10 grants round concluded in March 2009.	Training on new funding and procurement code to be rolled out to officers, VCS and other stakeholders.	November 2011 - January 2012
14	For the Grants Advisory Panel to engage with the VCS to consider the criteria for the 2010/11 grants round and take account of the concerns raised through this scrutiny review about the current system. To bring these proposals to a scrutiny challenge panel in preparation for the 2010/11 grants application process	Corporate Director for Community and Environment	A grants consultation exercise was conducted with the VCS during May 2009. Proposals for revisions to the criteria and application process were discussed with a scrutiny challenge panel and the Grants Advisory Panel in June 2009. This resulted in the introduction of revised criteria and amendments to the grants process. The same process was used for the administration of grants for 2011/12. Lessons learned from both years will inform the revised process for 2012/13.	Development of Third Sector Investment Plan for 2012/13 onwards	Jul-11

No.	Recommendation	Person responsible	Update	Further action	Date
15	To ensure that all procurement exercises and available premises are advertised in a regular email/newsletter and that the VCS are on that distribution list. To also raise awareness with the VCS that the Council's Web pages for procurement include much help and advice on accessing procurement routes.	Corporate Director of Finance and Corporate Director for Community and Environment	Tenders and available premises are advertised on the Council's website. The Council has provided workshops to the VCS on commissioning helping to raise their awareness of the support available via the Council's web pages on procurement. A questionnaire has been sent to VCS organisations to assess their training and support needs to access procurement opportunities. A further workshop will be held with the VCS to ascertain their training and support needs and identify how this is best provided.	VCS stakeholder workshop to develop commissioning process and assess training and support needs.	Jun-11
16	To optimise the VCS access to procurement exercises through a fair assessment of the procurement requirements necessary for each tendering exercise.	Corporate Director of Finance.	The Council's procurement strategy supports the principle of local procurement. The "Shop Local" initiative was launched to facilitate low value purchases directly from local and third sector markets. To assist VCS access to procurement exercises, procurement have reviewed tendering procedures and simplified the Pre Qualification Questionnaire and tender documents to enable sole traders, partnerships and third sector providers to bid for public contracts. Community and Environment are working with the Sustainable Procurement officer to assess VCS training needs to assist them in accessing procurement opportunities, following this a programme of support and training will be developed.	Assessment of third sector training needs and development of capacity building action plan.	Jul-11
17	To ask the HSP partners to compile a register of their community premises/rooms and develop a protocol for their use by the VCS. To encourage a fairer and more transparent system of community lettings.	Corporate Director Place Shaping and Corporate Director for Community and Environment	A strategic review of key sites occupied by public sector partners is being undertaken by the Place shaping directorate, this will include identification of opportunities for third sector usage. A directory of venues available for hire is being developed to support users of community lettings.	(1) Cabinet report on development of Council property assets (2) Development of directory of venues for hire	(1) December 2011 (2) October 2011
19	To ask the relevant council directorate(s) (concerned with lettings especially of schools) to assess the current issues around community lettings (of schools and council buildings such as the Teachers' Centre and community centres) and offer possible solutions to these. To articulate this assessment and present possible solutions to a scrutiny committee and concurrently feed into scrutiny's review of extended schools.	Corporate Director for Community and Environment	An assessment of issues around community lettings was undertaken in 2009 and reported to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Since this time a further consultation has been undertaken in January 2011 which sought views on how community lettings could be provided in the future. The consultation results indicated strong support (75%) for the proposal that organisations should be able to book directly with schools rather than the Council operating as an intermediary. The results of this consultation will inform proposals for the future delivery of this service as part of the Third Sector Investment plan.	Development of Third Sector Investment Plan including strategic approach to providing premises support to the VCS.	Jul-11
19	To task the HSP with creating an environment where creative people can thrive and make best use of community assets. To seek people with a passion for developing social entrepreneurship and social capital.	Assistant Chief Executive Corporate and Corporate Director for Community and Environment	The Harrow Strategic Partnership is considering a draft priority for tackling worklessness which would include creating opportunities for the development of social entrepreneurship. This is one of the funding priorities for allocation of LAA reward grant to support developments in this area. The Third Sector Investment plan will also take in to account training and capacity building needs for the VCS.	(1) Finalisation of HSP priorities and allocation of reward grant (2) Development of Third Sector Investment Plan for 2012/13 onwards	Jul-11
20	To establish a Community Trust for the council's grants administration processes and carry out further work on how this can best be achieved - the feasibility of a community trust model for grant-giving in Harrow should be fully explored, scoped and costed, using the scrutiny proposal as a basis. To include developing a better understanding of realistic timescales with regard to implementation and the ability to serve future needs of the borough, for example with regard to the Comprehensive Area Assessment.	Corporate Director for Community and Environment	During the development phase of the Third Sector Strategy some preliminary work was undertaken in to the feasibility of moving to a Community Trust for the Council's grants administration process. The results of this concluded that the development of a Trust from scratch would be resource intensive and examples in other local authority areas, where grants had been outsourced showed that they had later been brought back in to Council control. The recent consultation undertaken in January 2011 sought the views of the VCS on which organisation could administer a small grants programme in the future, the responses were 62% in favour of this responsibility remaining with the Council compared to 18% opting for a Community Trust.	ACTION CLOSED	

No.	Recommendation	Person responsible	Update	Further action	Date
21	To conduct a feasibility of the Strategic Relationships Model for commissioning, using the scrutiny proposal as a basis. To include developing a better understanding of realistic timescales with regard to implementation, cultural/organisational shifts required, costs and the ability to serve future needs of the borough.	Corporate Director for Community and Environment	A revised funding process for 2012/13 is being developed which will include commissioning of services and a small grants programme. The proposals will be developed as part of the Third Sector Investment plan.	Development of Third Sector investment plan including timetable for the introduction of a commissioning process	Jul-11

**REPORT FOR: OVERVIEW AND
SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
AND SCRUTINY SUB-
COMMITTEES**

Date:	14 th June 2011
Subject:	Standing Scrutiny Review of the Better Deal for Residents Programme – Interim Report, Project Management
Responsible Officer:	Alex Dewsnap, Divisional Director, Partnership Development and Performance
Scrutiny Lead Member area:	Cllr Jerry Miles, Corporate Effectiveness Policy Lead Member Cllr Tony Ferrari, Corporate Effectiveness Performance Lead Member
Exempt:	No
Enclosures:	Interim report from the Standing Scrutiny Review of the Better Deal for Residents Programme

Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

This report accompanies the report from the Standing Scrutiny Review of the Better Deal for Residents Programme

Recommendations:

Councillors are recommended to:

- I. Agree the report from the Standing Scrutiny Review
- II. Refer the report to Cabinet in July for consideration

Section 2 – Report

Introductory paragraph

In January this year, the Overview and Scrutiny committee agreed the scope for the Standing Scrutiny Review of the Better Deal for Residents which specified that the project would:

1. “consider the content of the Better Deal for Residents programme in terms of ambition, relevance, appropriateness
2. ensure effective project management processes are in place for the programme
3. consider the impact of the programme on:
 - the Council – is it achieving the outcomes envisaged – linked to the effectiveness of project management processes
 - residents
 - what impact are the changes having and how are these being mitigated – Better Together/Big Society,
 - how far do residents understand/appreciate the need for significant change are their opinions being taken into account, are they being actively engaged/convinced in the delivery of change
 - partners – are we working more efficiently with partners to deliver change, what is the impact on their services
 - managers – how well are they being supported in delivering change whilst at the same time being subject to that change

This is the interim report from the review and cover the group’s findings in terms of the robustness of the Council’s project management processes.

Financial Implications

There are no financial implications associated with this report.

Performance Issues

There are no performance issues associated with this report.

Environmental Impact

There is no environmental impact associated with this report.

Risk Management Implications

There are no risks associated with this report.

Equalities implications

Was an Equality Impact Assessment carried out? Yes () No ()

This report is considering the robustness of the Council’s project/programme management process and any changes in the process are subject to the agreement of Cabinet. If changes are agreed then the service may be required to undertake an EqIA

Corporate Priorities

Monitoring the Better Deal for Residents Programme will ensure that scrutiny is contributing to all of the corporate priorities:

- Keeping neighbourhoods clean, green and safe
- United and involved communities: a Council that listens and leads
- Supporting and protecting people who are most in need
- Supporting our Town Centre, our local shopping centres and businesses

Section 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Not required for this report.

Section 4 - Contact Details and Background

Papers

Contact:

Lynne Margetts, Service Manager Scrutiny, 020 8420 93887

Background Papers:

None

This page is intentionally left blank

June 2011

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Better Deal for Residents Programme
Standing Scrutiny Review
Interim Report – Programme Management

Members of the Challenge Panel

Councillor Stephen Wright (Chairman)

Councillor Nana Asante

Councillor Kamaljit Chana

Councillor Ann Gate

Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane

Councillor Paul Osborn

Councillor Bill Phillips

Councillor Krishna Suresh

Community Co-optees:

Seamus English

Elizabeth Hugo

Rita Jourdan

Linda Robinson

Final Version

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAIRMAN'S INTRODUCTION & ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	1
SUMMARY.....	2
BACKGROUND.....	4
OBSERVATIONS.....	5
RECOMMENDATIONS.....	12
APPENDIX – BDFR SCOPE.....	14

CHAIRMAN'S INTRODUCTION & ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This is the first report from the Better Deal for Residents Standing Scrutiny Review. This review has been established to consider the implementation of the Council's 'Better Deal for Residents' programme and the impact of this programme on residents, staff and partners. It is perhaps the most ambitious transformation programme that the council has ever undertaken and as such warrants significant scrutiny. For this reason, the Overview and Scrutiny committee has decided to establish a long-term project which can continue to monitor the impact of the programme throughout its life.

The review group was established in September 2010 and we are pleased to be joined by a number of local residents who have brought an intensification of our focus on the impact of the programme on the people for whom the 'better deal' is targeted. As its first task, the group has decided to consider the robustness of the Council's project/programme monitoring process. This report represents the conclusions of this initial investigation.

We are grateful to all officers who have helped us with the investigation. In particular, we would like to thank:

- Bridget Bergin, Service Manager, Partnership Development
- Maggie Challoner, Service Manager, Residents' Services
- Carol Cutler, Director Customer Service and Business Transformation
- Catherine Doran, Corporate Director, Children's Services
- Brendon Hills, Corporate Director, Community and Environment
- Ben Jones, Senior Project Manager, Customer Services & Business Transformation
- Mala Kripalani, Service Manager, Programme Management Office
- Marianne Locke, Divisional Director, Culture and Community Services
- Jim Marsh, Programme Manager
- Lora McGann, Project Manager
- Paul Najsarek, Corporate Director, Adults and Housing
- Paul D Newman, LEAN Practitioner
- Jonathan Price, Policy Development Manager, Adults and Housing
- Andrew Trehern, Corporate Director, Place Shaping
- Ghan Varsani - Programme Director Capita - Harrow Business Unit

Also, on behalf of the BDfR Standing Scrutiny Review Group, we would like to give very special thanks to Lynne Margetts, Service Manager, Scrutiny for the dedicated and tireless way she has assisted in the planning, setting up and documenting of meetings and in the preparation of this and other reports. She has given excellent advice and support to myself and the group and she will be sadly missed.

With the completion of this phase, we now embark on the next phase of the project during which we will consider the impact of the programme, how far it is achieving its purpose and the extent to which it is engaging with residents.

Cllr Stephen Wright
Chairman of the Better Deal for Residents Standing Scrutiny Review

SUMMARY

The council needs to find significant savings over the next three years and to achieve those savings the council has embarked on a programme to fundamentally transform the organisation and its structures and to broker a new relationship with residents. The Better Deal for Residents programme is the means by which the council hopes to make these major service reconfigurations. Such a significant change programme requires a high level of scrutiny to ensure that the change proposals and their impact are in the best interests of residents, partners and service users and are clearly understood. It is for this reason, that a Standing Review has been established with residents at the heart of the BDfR programme.

Appendix 1 sets out the terms of reference, scope and objectives of the BDfR Programme Standing Review. It is intended that the Standing Review will add real value by considering the impact of the programme, the extent to which resident opinion has informed the project, and the extent to which residents' behaviour can be influenced. However, the Standing Review group needed to satisfy itself that the project management process in place was sufficiently robust to ensure that projects deliver the fundamental change that can ensure the viability of the organisation and our services for the future. Therefore this phase of the project has focussed solely on the competence and implementation of the council's project management processes.

The Review Group has received presentations from representatives of the Customer Service and Business Transformation unit on the council's management of Capita projects and on the Programme Management Office, an unit set up two years ago to support and coordinate BDfR projects within the Directorates. We also examined the Project Management Document templates created by the PMO to introduce standards and conformity to project documentation. We have made a number of recommendations on these templates within the body of this document.

To get a better understanding of BDfR projects we also received presentations from operations managers who were managing current transformation projects within the BDfR programme. The Group also needed to get further background on project management, controls and standards within the Directorates and representatives from the group (Cllrs. Wright and Phillips) held meetings with the Director of Customer Services and Business Transformation and four Corporate Directors. These meetings were fully documented and circulated to the Review Group.

These meetings suggested there were issues with the overall vision and objectives of the BDfR programme, its governance and political oversight, and cultural issues relating to project management within the organisation and the apparent poor utilisation of the PMO. The PMO is a corporate resource with qualified project managers that can assist Directorates identify and plan their change projects using PRINCE2, LEAN and other transformation methods. Even so, we were told by some Directorates management that they wanted to develop their own 'in house' project management skills and resources.

We also found significant differences between the way projects are managed within the BDfR programme and other projects that fall outside the BDfR Programme managed within Directorates. The PMO has the capability to ensure projects are implemented using the same standards and common language across the whole council. However, the meetings and a review of project documentation reveals there is variation in the way the project management processes have been adopted.

We also found issues with project governance. Whilst we are happy with the officer structures in place we feel there is a deficit in democratic accountability. The group was advised that full business cases are agreed at Cabinet but this appears to be the only opportunity for political oversight of the programme. We recommend the engagement of cabinet and portfolio holders is enhanced and would suggest the setting up of an Advisory Panel in order to provide cross party member advice to Cabinet.

We are also aware that there is no formal or 'constitutional' opportunity for the BDfR programme to be considered and challenged by the scrutiny function. This is the most ambitious transformation programme undertaken by the council and lies at the core of the council's work programme. We therefore believe that 'challenge' to the programme by scrutiny would assist the council in ensuring residents' interests are central to proposals and that the right decisions are being taken.

Finally, a requirement for further improvement in the corporate culture for customer satisfaction and resident involvement has been identified. Greater clarity on the council's ambition for customer satisfaction levels is required in identifiable and measurable terms so that improvements can be monitored and recorded.

In all, there are sixteen recommendations made by the Review Group.

BACKGROUND

What is the Better Deal for Residents (BDfR)

The council needs to find significant savings over the next three years. Whereas in the past, it might have been feasible to reduce spending on a service-by-service basis, the extent of the savings required means that many services will no longer be viable if cuts are delivered in this way.

(http://www.harrow.gov.uk/news/article/280/people_power_key_to_transforming_services_says_new_leader). As a result the council has embarked on a programme to fundamentally transform the organisation and its structures and to broker a new relationship with residents. The BDfR programme is the means by which the council hopes to make these changes. The programme comprises a range of projects designed to deliver major service reconfiguration. Such a significant change programme warrants a high level of scrutiny to ensure that proposals made are those in the best interests of residents and that the impact of change on residents, partners and service users is clearly understood. It is for this reason, that a standing review has been established.

Why consider project management

The review group is aware that the council has a dedicated programme office in place whose key responsibility is to monitor the high risks projects and identify the key issues and interdependencies of the BDfR and ensure the successful delivery of the programme. As such, it would not be appropriate for the review group to also monitor the delivery of the programme. Instead, the review can add real value by considering the impact of the programme, the extent to which resident opinion has informed the project and the extent to which residents' behaviour can be influenced. However, the group wished to satisfy itself that the project management process in place is sufficiently robust to ensure that projects are meeting these key objectives and delivering the fundamental change that can ensure the viability of the organisation and our services for the future. Thus, this first phase of the project has focussed solely on the competence and implementation of the council's project management process. The full scope for the project is included as Appendix One.

What the group did

The group considered two fundamental questions

- Is the council's project management process fit for purpose and how does it compare with what is considered industry standard?
- How well is this process embedded in the organisation?

In order to answer these questions the group undertook the following:

- To ensure everyone on the review group had a similar understanding of transformation and project management, the review chairman described the key aspects of process transformation and managing transformation projects.
- The group received presentations from representatives of the Programme Management Office and from project managers from a sample of current projects,
- Group representatives, Cllr Wright and Cllr Phillips, met with Carol Cutler, Director of Customer Services and Business Transformation and Corporate Directors – Catherine Doran, Children's Services, Brendon Hills, Community and Environment, Paul Najsarek, Adults and Housing and Andrew Trehern, Place Shaping, to discuss project management within their Directorates.

The pages which follow outline the group's initial findings.

OBSERVATIONS

Our deliberations during this initial phase lead us to the following observations:

- **Nature of BDfR**

There appears to be a lack of clarity on the overall vision, ambition and objectives of the BDfR programme. It appears to be a random collection of projects badged as BDfR and as such, the group is concerned to understand how a project becomes designated as a BDfR project. We feel that there should be some clarity regarding the overall composition of the programme and how it is constituted if it is to be properly managed.

We understand that many projects do not fall within the BDfR programme and thus, will not be managed /coordinated via the PMO. The need for a professional and consistent approach to project management across the organisation is essential and we would emphasise the need for a single, corporate project management process regardless of the status as a BDfR project.

We are also concerned that what constitutes a 'Better Deal for Residents' from the council's perspective, may not constitute a Better Deal from the perspective of residents. For example, we were advised of circumstances which might deliver a saving for the authority but in which the benefit to residents, perhaps in terms of a saving passed on for investment elsewhere or as a reduction in Council Tax, is not immediately obvious. During the course of our deliberations, we have noted that the key driver of the programme is the need to deliver savings. Whilst we have no issue with this, we think it would be helpful if the programme were designed with a very clear focus on how residents themselves might like to see savings delivered, the council can identify the 'end' but residents should be able to influence/determine the 'means'. With this in mind we would welcome more transparent, co-ordinated and more strategic engagement with residents at the commencement of future projects in order to negotiate a clear and agreed approach which can ensure residents' future commitment to change. This would also link in with the council's initiative "Lets Talk" in terms of consultation with residents over priorities.

- **Culture within the Organisation**

It is evident in some Directorates that there is a lack of recognition of project management as a professional skill. Often, operations managers are asked to manage Directorate transformation projects. However, when time and resource conflicts arise this can lead to contention between the delivery of the operational service and maintaining the project timetable and in these circumstances, best practice project processes, controls and quality of documentation can often be set aside.

We were also advised of the belief that it is necessary for projects to be led by the 'most powerful' rather than the 'most skilful' which again suggests a low regard for the skills of a professional project manager. In these circumstances it will often be the case that operational managers who provide project management will not have received the appropriate level of training.

The PMO is a corporate resource with qualified project managers that can assist Directorates identify and plan their change projects using PRINCE2, LEAN and other transformation methods. The PMO has developed a set of project management guidelines embedded in the Project Management Toolkit. Part of its role is to ensure that

a standard project management process is adopted across the council. Even so, our evidence indicates the practice is variable across the Directorates. For those non-BDfR projects managed within the Directorates the project documentation examined indicates the completion of formal project documentation as recommended within the Toolkit is not universal. This effectively undermines the process and its credibility. The review group feels it is unfortunate, though predictable, that the corporate Project Management Toolkit maintained by the PMO is not mandatory.

Often the review group heard the PMO's role described as 'administrative' or 'secretarial'. In our view this indicates a failure to recognise and make best use of the significant investment in project management skills developed within the council to support the BDfR delivery.

This cultural deficit is further illustrated in the organisation's approach to the delivery of LEAN projects. Having invested significant resources in the training of Directorate staff to become Green Belt ¹ practitioners, in practice, the practitioners can rarely be released from their contractual / operational duties in such a way as to make the delivery of projects practical. The organisation has thus failed to create a sustainable environment within which the LEAN methodology might deliver important improvements to our services and significant savings for the organisation.

The review group believe the PMO is the element which can bind together the energy being generated via BDfR and ensure that the council as a whole is able to benefit from the change being delivered, with opportunities and risks respectively shared and controlled. We were pleased to hear from some officers interviewed that the PMO had successfully supported a change in the culture for parts of the service enabling a more positive approach to project management methodology.

We asked if enhanced authority for the PMO would be beneficial to the organisation in terms of ensuring a professional focus for project management. We were advised that this could only be secured if this is '*what the organisation wants*'. Increased authority for the PMO must be coupled with increased appreciation of the value of project management skills. Within this culture it has not been possible for the skills and competencies of the PMO to be properly utilised. We feel the PMO has significantly more to offer.

As a corporate resource we believe the PMO skills set should be continually developed to provide wider capability and advice. For example, we suggest the PMO examines transformation methods such as 'Sprint' that has been developed specifically for local government change programmes. Additionally, tools to manage "Knowledge" based projects such as Microsoft Exchange integrated with SharePoint for "Collaborative" working and "Agile" project methods for use in high risk projects where there is a high degree of human interaction (e.g. staff and/or public) should also assessed for adoption.

¹ Green Belt – Denotes mid level training that enables practitioners to use a blend of Lean and Six Sigma steps to develop process improvement solutions.

- **Corporate Project Management Process**

We have reviewed the project management process operated via the project management toolkit by the PMO and have identified an effective process in place subject to the proposals outlined below. However, we have concerns with regard its implementation across the council.

We also believe there is an effective process through which Capita projects are delivered and monitored. These projects require:

- Strategic business case – (SBC)
- Outline business case – (OBC)
- Full business case – (FBC)
- Project initiation document – (PID)

There also appears to be a rigorous and effective process in place holding Capita to account although we are concerned about the apparent lack of Member involvement. As a commercial organisation, managed through tight financial controls and fixed price contracts, Capita are acutely aware of the importance of effective project management as failure for them equates to loss of profit. No variations to contract, no progress through gateways can happen without the specific sanction of the Director Customer Service and Business Transformation subject to satisfactory completion of each of the stages outlined above. This enforces minimal deviation from project milestones. However, we have also been appraised of some drawbacks of working with Capita such as the lack of an intuitive approach to the council's function / purpose and the commercial imperative.

Additionally, we are concerned as to how consistently this process is implemented for non-capita projects. We have noted above our concerns with regard to the culture of the organisation and we will set out our recommendations on how to improve documentation later in this report. Here, we discuss our concerns with regard to consistent application of the process.

Corporate Directors have told us they are keen to develop their own project management skills within their Directorates. Whilst we recognise the usefulness and sustainability of a 'grow your own' culture, it is important that officers, who take on project management responsibilities, are properly trained and follow standard project management processes. However, from our discussions at all levels in the organisation and from documentation reviewed, it is evident that there is variation in the way the project management processes have been adopted. The importance of implementing a council-wide process is not to stifle creativity but to ensure that processes are implemented using the same standards and common language across the whole council. Instead, we have been advised of 'modifications' to the corporate process by a number of officers. Whilst one size might not fit all, and indeed the process must be proportionate to the risk carried by individual projects, nonetheless, the core components of the project management process utilised across the organisation must be consistent and transparent. For example, we could not identify any consistent approach to deciding on the level of risk associated with individual projects. To ensure the consistency of project management operating in the organisation, we believe the processes utilised by the PMO should be adopted for all projects that sit outside the BdFR.

It is our view that:

- There should be a single, professionally-led project management process,
- This process should be applied proportionately,
- There must be clear guidance on what constitutes large/high risk projects, and this should be overseen by the PMO,
- Any deviation from the corporate process must be confirmed by the Corporate Strategy Board.

- **Comments on the PMO process**

We believe an effective corporate Programme Management Office is essential if the council is to deliver the level of change envisaged in the BDfR. Service areas must be properly supported to deliver the change programme using a single process, a single language and defined standards. We also believe the project management process must add value to the organisation and not make unnecessary demands on service areas attempting to maintain day-to-day service operations whilst at the same time transforming services. The processes and services offered by PMO should be recognised by the organisation and we would urge discussions to broker a new contract through which the skills of the PMO are adopted more widely. We are happy to report that the PMO has responded positively to suggested improvements in its processes.

If Directorates are to utilise the PMO and its processes, then we feel the PMO must demonstrate its 'value add' to the project management process for the Directorates. Specifically, we are aware that in all circumstances, the cost of utilising Capita to deliver a project is fully accounted for in the business case. We feel that similar accounting arrangements (for the costs of the PMO) should be in place to strengthen the PMO's case.

The PMO has developed standard documentation within its Project Management Toolkit for use in defining new projects which recommends the production of, for non-Capita BDfR projects, a business case and project initiation document. Documentation for both Capita and non-Capita projects is generally robust but there are a number of additional sections we would like to see within the documentation:

- **Baseline** – to identify key baseline information for the current service/s. Objectives for the transformation project can only be set and measured against the current baseline. For example:
 - Definition and scope of service/s to be investigated,
 - The annual cost of delivering the service/s, any revenue income, other relevant financial information,
 - Time to deliver the services, i.e. the end to end process (e.g. from initial customer contact to service delivery),
 - Resources employed – full-time/temporary/contract staff, technology, equipment, etc.

A baseline is required to set meaningful objectives (i.e. quantitative targets) and as a measure against which to evaluate project success or failure. We note that a central component of the LEAN process is the identification of detailed baseline information at the start of a project. Although some officers have suggested the collection of baseline information might be too time-consuming, we would argue this is basic information that should be readily to hand and is required for successful project management and the achievement of the desired outcomes.

- **Transformation Objectives** – Using the baseline information, clear, measurable objectives should be identified within the PID and business case before the project commences and against which the project milestones and outcomes should be measured. For example, it is not sufficient to say at the end of the project 'this is what we have achieved'. Project success should be assessed based on achieving challenging targets set at the start of the project.
- **Impact on Residents/Partners** – The PID/business case should clearly identify the impact BDfR projects will have on residents, partners or staff. Impact can be both positive and/or negative in terms of the change in services provided. The potential impact must be clearly identified early in the document so that senior management can take a view on the appropriateness of project implementation. We note the project documentation includes the need to address equality impacts but this assessment appears too narrow in definition and often peripheral to the project process. We would suggest that as a minimum, residents' views on the viability and usefulness of a project should be considered at project inception – we consider that the council's ambition to be a 'listening and leading' authority make this focus essential for all projects.

We are advised that whilst a 'lessons learnt' process is in place for Capita-led projects, a similar process is not in place for other projects. We were also advised that the 'lessons learnt' for Capita projects are not widely shared. We consider such sharing of project outcomes would be useful in supporting the development of the council's project management capability.

We are concerned that ongoing monitoring of the project following implementation is not uniform across the organisation. This is an essential phase of the project to ensure the benefits initially achieved are being maintained some months later. The absence of such monitoring and reporting may result in the service delivery sliding back to previous methods and the benefits of transformation lost. We discuss the governance arrangements in more detail below.

- **Governance**

The review group was advised of the governance structure outlined below:

- **CSB Programme Board** provides overall direction and control over the programme and final accountability for implementation. It is comprised of all members of CSB. The PMO is responsible for:
 - Monitoring projects
 - Flagging up issues
 - Disseminating decisions from the board throughout the organisation
 - Determining the agenda of the board
- **Design Board** – considers cross cutting issues, the PMO helps to identify inter-dependencies, flag up issues, determine agenda,
- **Better Together Board** – considers activities to improve engagement with residents, the PMO provides support to the board,
- **Strategic Procurement Board** – recently established to support the delivery of outcomes from the programme through the procurement process. Although this will be supported by the PMO, there hasn't been a great deal of input as yet,

- **Place Shaping and Property Board** – considers the strategic property issues that are emerging from the programme. The PMO help determine agenda, flag up issues and interdependencies and run specific planning sessions.

Below these high level boards that have representation from all Directorates, there are Directorate-led boards based on Departmental Management Teams. These boards:

- Lead and direct all elements of BDfR projects through a Directorate work plan,
 - Ensure that each project has the required project management resource,
 - Ensure that all projects are properly managed and controlled,
 - Ensure that all projects are sufficiently financed,
 - Identify and manage project risks and issues,
 - Submit proposals to the programme board for maintaining progress or request redirection.
- Whilst we are happy with the officer structures in place we feel there is a deficit in democratic accountability. The group was advised that full business cases are agreed at Cabinet but this appears to be the only opportunity for political oversight of the programme. We suggest the involvement of cabinet and portfolio holders be enhanced and would further suggest an Advisory Panel be set up under the chairmanship of the Leader of the Council in order to provide cross party member advice to Cabinet. There needs to be clear Member involvement at inception, during the implementation, and then sign-off and review of the project process and, for robustness, Member involvement ought to be formalised through Cabinet and/or other meetings including Portfolio Holder Decision meetings. This formalisation of Member oversight also enables public and other councillors to formally question and challenge project management in an open and transparent way, improving accountability and reducing the democratic deficit.
 - We are also aware that, to date, there has been little consideration of the BDfR programme by the Scrutiny function. This is the most ambitious transformation programme undertaken by the council. Moreover, it lies at the core of the council's work programme. We therefore believe that greater 'challenge' to the programme by Scrutiny would assist the council in ensuring residents' interests are central to proposals and that the right decisions are being taken.

- **Culture and Resident Perspective**

The Review Group believe there has been a definite improvement in the culture and performance of the council regarding customer satisfaction and resident involvement but there is still considerable room for improvement. The culture of the organisation needs to change further to be more focussed on resident / customer satisfaction, for example, where staff should be willing to take personal responsibility for issues which are raised with them by residents.

This type of cultural change starts at the top. Senior managers and councillors should make the council's ambition on customer satisfaction and the need for a change in culture absolutely clear. Some 'first principles' need to be established outlining what the organisation is trying to achieve and a baseline against which performance improvements can be identified and measured. The council must be able to measure improvement and ongoing monitoring of performance and customer opinion is required.

This will include Access Harrow and all other types of resident contact with the council including One Stop Shop, email and post.

Councils must make clear their ambition and provide training to improve customer service as in many cases, residents have no alternative providers.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Better Deal for Residents programme standing review makes the following recommendations:

1. There is wide recognition in the Scrutiny Review group that the council needs to be transformed to a resident centred organisation. In particular, that a culture of residents satisfaction should be at the heart of all council activities including the Better Deal for Residents programme. Their views and experiences must drive the programme. As such the council should develop a mechanism for engaging with residents at the outset of a project and their views must be clearly evidenced in all project management documentation.
2. There should be a single project management process operated across the organisation. This process should be applied proportionately with advice from the PMO. Any deviation from this process must be sanctioned by the Corporate Strategy Board.
3. The council's method for managing projects (Prince 2) and the Project Management Toolkit should be mandatory for all but the smallest quality improvement projects and in particular, for those projects which will impact residents or other partners,
4. Existing project management and other transformation skills within the PMO are under-utilised. The PMO needs to re-assess the scope of its product and service offerings and 'market' its skills and capabilities through continuous dialogue and communication with directors and operations management. Ongoing support should help to boost team confidence and greater communication at director level will ensure the development of improved relationships.
5. The cost of running the PMO should be more transparent in order to demonstrate the 'value added' to its service delivery processes,
6. As a corporate resource, the PMO should continually develop its skills knowledge and expertise in transformation methods and knowledge management tools.
7. The PMO should develop formal training programmes covering sub elements of Prince 2 methodology including methods, standards, quality management, Toolkit documentation, risks/mitigations, LEAN and other new methods.
8. Changes to the Project Management Toolkit documentation are required:
 - Baseline information covering the current service/s, performance, costs, resources, etc, to be included;
 - The impact on residents and other partners from the Better Deal for Residents projects must be considered early in the project definition. Whilst the council must improve its own practices, it must do so from the perspective of the impact on residents and be built into the project management templates;
 - A clear statement of objectives that act as targets for transformation;
 - Guidance on post implementation monitoring to ensure new processes are embedded.
9. An Advisory Board should be set up under the chairmanship of the Leader to provide political oversight of the BDfR and provide cross party Member advice to Cabinet.

10. Additional points of political oversight, reporting and challenge should be built into the inception, implementation, sign-off and review of projects.
11. Non-BDfR projects should have corporate scrutiny and be managed through the corporate process. Many Directorate projects have little or no visibility and therefore escape proper executive scrutiny. The council needs to decide how it should manage Directorate projects that are non-BDfR or Capita-led to ensure consistency of standards, delivery and outcomes,
12. The criteria to identify Better Deal for Residents projects should be clearly defined and agreed.
13. The direction whereby Directorates seek to develop their own project management skills should be resisted. This will result in a duplication of skills, added costs and potential for diversity in project management standards and controls (the 'silo' effect),
14. Whilst the current remit of the PMO does not include management of individual projects, their project management skills should be more effectively deployed to provide Directorates with assistance with the following (we acknowledge that many of these activities are already undertaken by PMO staff):
 - Project identification, definition, scoping and objectives;
 - Sizing, complexity, risk (i.e. is it a Capita, Directorate or department project);
 - Categorisation of BDfR projects;
 - Confirm project mandate – Member / Officer authorisation path;
 - Plan project and resourcing (activities, leadership, skills, knowledge requirements);
 - Agree appropriate documentation (BC/PID) proportionate to the size and complexity of the project. For BDfR projects ensure impact on residents and other partner groups are fully identified and articulated;
 - Provide support and guidance for the delivery of a single standard project management process, (ensure appropriate PRINCE2 project management standards are required and maintained for all projects except those defined as small, low risk, quality improvement changes. (Clarification on the definition of projects by size, risk and impact is necessary);
 - Influence and support the cultural shift of the organisation;
 - Deliver Project Management and skills training, i.e. PRINCE2 methodology;
 - Coordinate cross-Directorate projects within the programme to ensure they are delivered in full cognisance of each other with risks and opportunities fully visible;
 - Monitor the progress of individual projects against stated milestones and objectives;
 - Manage the effective delivery of the overall programme;
 - Support the project boards to deliver effective governance;
 - In some circumstances, provide direct project management support.
15. Recommend that greater 'challenge' to the programme by Scrutiny would assist the council in ensuring residents' interests are central to proposals and that the right decisions are being taken.
16. Further improvement in the corporate culture for customer satisfaction and resident involvement has been identified. Greater clarity on the council's ambition for customer satisfaction is required in identifiable and measurable terms so that any improvement can be monitored and proven.

APPENDIX – BDFR SCOPE

BETTER DEAL FOR RESIDENTS PROGRAMME STANDING REVIEW - SCOPE

VERSION NUMBER – 5

VERSION HISTORY

Initial draft

Version 2 – considered at review group meeting on 18th November

Version 3 – amended after further discussions with the Chairman 23rd November

Version 4 – final version agreed by the review group on 16th December

1	SUBJECT	Better Deal for Residents Programme
2	COMMITTEE	Overview and Scrutiny Committee
3	REVIEW GROUP	<p>Councillors Cllr Nana Asante Cllr Chana Cllr Ann Gate Cllr Macleod-Cullinane Cllr Osborn Cllr Phillips Cllr Krishna Suresh Cllr Wright (Chairman)</p> <p>Co-optees Rita Jourdan Hema Mistry Elizabeth Hugo Linda Robinson Abigail Matsika Seamus English</p>
4	AIMS/ OBJECTIVES/ OUTCOMES	<p>1. To consider the content of the Better Deal for Residents programme in terms of ambition, relevance, appropriateness</p> <p>2. To ensure effective project management processes are in place for the programme</p> <p>3. To consider the impact of the programme on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Council – is it achieving the outcomes envisaged – linked to the effectiveness of project management processes; • residents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ what impact are the changes having and how are these being mitigated – Better Together/Big

		<p>Society;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ how far do residents understand/appreciate the need for significant change, are their opinions being taken into account, are they being actively engaged/convinced in the delivery of change; ● partners – are we working more efficiently with partners to deliver change, what is the impact on their services; ● managers – how well are they being supported in delivering change whilst at the same time being subject to that change.
5	MEASURES OF SUCCESS OF REVIEW	<p>Review is able to ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Programme delivers real change in service delivery; ● Programme delivers anticipated savings; ● Programme delivers change in residents'/service users' attitude to service delivery and responsibilities.
6	SCOPE	The content of the Better Deal for Residents Programme
7	SERVICE PRIORITIES (Corporate/Dept)	
8	REVIEW SPONSOR	Tom Whiting, Assistant Chief Executive
9	ACCOUNTABLE MANAGER	From relevant service area
10	SUPPORT OFFICER	Service Manager Scrutiny
11	ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT	From within Scrutiny Team
12	EXTERNAL INPUT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Residents ● Partner organisations ● Service users
13	METHODOLOGY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Consideration of the detail of the programme ● Investigation of the effectiveness of the performance management of the programme to ensure best practice <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ examination of a number of cases studies with relevant project directors ○ consideration of the overall PMO performance

		<p>management process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular updates on progress – to include achievement of anticipated savings • Parallel investigation of the impact of the programme on residents and partners (including voluntary sector) • Investigation of particular areas under the 3rd priority 'Building on the community spirit of residents to be more involved in the future of the Borough'
14	EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS	It is anticipated that the Better Deal for Residents programme will deliver significant change in the way the council organises itself to deliver services to local people. Harrow is an extremely diverse borough and the organisation cannot make assumptions about service needs of the population. As such changes to services and changing the expectations and behaviours of our residents will need to reflect the differing needs and experiences of the population. The council must be able to assure itself that adverse equalities implications for staff or on residents are identified and where possible, mitigated. The review will monitor this.
15	ASSUMPTIONS/ CONSTRAINTS	
16	SECTION 17 IMPLICATIONS	This could be a component of the project in so far as the Better Together stream is implemented.
17	TIMESCALE	Ongoing
18	RESOURCE COMMITMENTS	The project will be delivered from within the existing scrutiny budget
19	REPORT AUTHOR	Lynne Margetts
20	REPORTING ARRANGEMENTS	<p>Quarterly reports on progress to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee</p> <p>Interim report to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in June 2011</p> <p>Outline of final formal reporting process:</p> <p>To Service Director [] TBC</p> <p>To Portfolio Holder [] TBC</p> <p>To CMT [] TBC</p> <p>To Cabinet [] TBC</p>
21	FOLLOW UP ARRANGEMENTS (proposals)	TBC