

HARROW COUNCIL

REVIEW OF THE FIRST TWELVE MONTHS' OPERATION OF THE COUNCIL'S PARTNERSHIP WITH ACCORD MP - DRAFT SCOPE

1	SUBJECT	London Borough of Harrow's Partnership with Accord MP (AMP) (first year performance and future developments)
2	COMMITTEE	Performance and Finance (commissioned by Overview and Scrutiny)
3	REVIEW GROUP	Cllr Mark Versallion (Chairman) Cllr Brian Gate Cllr Barry Macleod-Cullinane Cllr Robert Benson Cllr Jeremy Zeid Cllr Thaya Idaikkadar Cllr David Gawn
4	AIMS/ OBJECTIVES/ OUTCOMES	To establish the lessons learned from the first year of operation of the council's partnership with Accord MP (AMP) to deliver improvements to public realm infrastructure.
5	MEASURES OF SUCCESS OF REVIEW	A small number of recommendations to support the setting of targets and the monitoring of performance, and the operation of the partnership more generally, for the use of the executive's own governance arrangements.
6	SCOPE	To examine: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• How services were delivered, and performance, before the start of the partnership.• What has changed, in performance terms, in the last twelve months.• Future plans and changes to governance.
7	SERVICE PRIORITIES (Corporate/Dept)	11 – Improve the way we work and deliver real value for money
8	REVIEW SPONSOR	Andrew Trehern, Corporate Director, Community and Environment Services
9	ACCOUNTABLE MANAGER	Lynne McAdam, Scrutiny Service Manager
10	SUPPORT OFFICER	Ed Hammond, Scrutiny Officer
11	ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT	Layla Davidson, Research and Project Support Officer
12	OTHER INPUT	Andrew Trehern Eddie Collier Dave Masters Dennis Thompson Anu Singh

		<p>Vic Jenkins</p> <p>Cllr Susan Hall, Portfolio Holder Cllr Philip O'Dell, former Portfolio Holder</p> <p>Alan Rimmer, AMP Alex Costenedes, AMP</p> <p>Input from the ongoing Internal Audit of council partnerships (including Accord MP)</p>
13	METHODOLOGY	<p>1. How services were delivered, and performance, before the beginning of the Accord MP partnership.</p> <p>Analysis of historic performance data, particularly 2005/06 information, through analysis of BVPI scorecard.</p> <p>Delivered through desktop review meeting (early November).</p> <p>2. What has changed, in performance terms, in the last twelve months?</p> <p>Analysis of three case studies.</p> <p>Case Study A: Emergency response Case Study B: Uxbridge Road Reconstruction and Resurfacing Case Study C: Vehicle crossings</p> <p>Delivered through desktop review of issues at a meeting in early November, and through site visits, facilitated by partnership officers, and through canvassing the views of nearby residents and businesses where appropriate.</p> <p>Also delivered through a desktop comparison of wider information (including BVPIs) at a review meeting in mid-November, followed by an evidence-gathering meeting with council officers and officers from Accord MP, in late November or early December, to discuss evidence gathered thus far, relating to performance, resident satisfaction and information pertaining both to best practice and the case studies. The review will make one or two central recommendations to back up its findings.</p> <p>3. Future plans and changes to governance</p> <p>The combined governance structure, linking together the AMP and Kier Group partnership arrangements, is being developed. This element of the review will be delivered through desktop analysis (at the mid-November meeting) and discussion at the evidence-gathering meeting with officers. Conclusions could be drawn from the Internal Audit investigation as well as on the basis of November's round table meeting.</p>

14	EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS	There are no equality implications specifically concerned with the review.
15	ASSUMPTIONS/ CONSTRAINTS	Involvement of officers in Community and Environment Services will be dependent upon departmental resources (staff time in particular). The scope takes account of this constraint and evidence gathering will be designed to minimise undue workload on partnership officers working both for the council and for AMP.
16	SECTION 17 IMPLICATIONS	There are no specific section 17 implications, although delivery of a clean and well-designed public realm may help to reduce levels of crime and fear of crime. This issue is not being examined by the review, except insofar as it relates directly to performance targets and related information.
17	TIMESCALE	<p>Case studies: over the course of October and early November.</p> <p>Meeting 1 (desktop review discussing both pre- and post-AMP BVPIs and other information, feedback from case studies and preparations for the evidence-gathering meeting) - mid November</p> <p>Meeting 2 (evidence gathering round table with officers to discuss all the above) – late November.</p> <p>Meeting 3 (report drafting meeting) – mid-December</p> <p>Draft of report to members and officers for comment over Christmas. Any further changes in report to be dealt with electronically. Sign-off at P&F in January.</p>
18	RESOURCE COMMITMENTS	<p>No resource commitments in excess of scrutiny officer time. Commitment will be required by Council and AMP officers – particular in relation to the evidence-gathering meeting.</p> <p>Case studies will be facilitated by partnership staff.</p>
19	REPORT AUTHOR	Ed Hammond with Chairman and members of review group.
20	SCRUTINY PRINCIPLES	Considered and adhered to. The review will contribute towards corporate priorities and provide a template for future studies of contracts and similar issues.
21	REPORTING ARRANGEMENTS	<p>Outline of formal reporting process:</p> <p>To Portfolio Holder [] When.....</p> <p>To CMT [] When.....</p> <p>To Cabinet [] When.....</p>
22	MONITORING ARRANGEMENTS	<p>Broad issues to be picked up as part of the wider reviews of procurement and partnership.</p> <p>Specific issues can be picked up as part of the monthly BVPI monitoring process at P&F chairman’s meetings.</p>

OUTLINE PROJECT PLAN

Activity	Member Input <i>Who is involved?</i> <i>Estimated time commitment</i>	Officer Resource <i>Who is involved?</i> <i>Estimated time commitment</i>		When	Lead Person
Pre-scope session					
Finalise scope & obtain O&S/Sub-Committee endorsement					
Research/Preparation Period/Desk top data gathering					
Meetings/Witnesses/ Visits (specify)					
Collation & evaluation of data/evidence					
Review Group determines thrust of report					
Draft report					
Review Group agrees early draft of report					
Early draft report to accountable manager for confirmation of factual accuracy					
Review Group's informal discussions of report with Head of Service/Director (or NHS body if appropriate)					
Review Group sign off report & refer to O&S/Sub-Committee for information/approval					

Review Group's presentation of report to CMT/DMT (if appropriate)					
Final report to accountable manager					
Final report of Group to O&S/Sub-Committee for approval (if necessary)					
Consider if there is a need to publicise report findings					
Final report published & referred to Executive for consideration					
Evaluation of review process					
Follow up/Monitoring of outcomes					
TOTALS					

Contact : Ed Hammond, Scrutiny Officer, Scrutiny Unit, Harrow Council

Background Papers