

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

SUPPLEMENTAL AGENDA

DATE: Tuesday 3 April 2012

AGENDA - PART I

3. MINUTES (Pages 1 - 6)

That the minutes of the meeting held on 15 March 2012 be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

7. REFERENCES FROM COUNCIL/CABINET

(a) Scrutiny Review - Debt Recovery Process - Response: (Pages 7 - 8)

(b) Reablement Progress Response to Recommendations from Standing Scrutiny Review Group: (Pages 9 - 10)

9. 'SHAPING A HEALTHIER FUTURE FOR NORTH WEST LONDON' – PREPARING FOR A JOINT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE (Pages 11 - 20)

Report of the Divisional Director of Partnership Development and Performance

AGENDA - PART II

Nil

Note: In accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, the following agenda items have been admitted late to the agenda by virtue of the special circumstances and urgency detailed below:-

Agenda item

Special Circumstances/Grounds for Urgency

3. Minutes of the Meeting held on 15 March 2012

Members are requested to consider the minutes, as a matter of urgency, as they were not available when the main agenda was printed and circulated due to obtaining the necessary clearances.

7a. Scrutiny Review – Debt Recovery Process - Response

Members are requested to consider the reference, as a matter of urgency, as it was not available when the main agenda was printed and circulated due to obtaining the necessary clearances and the proximity of Cabinet to the dispatch of the main agenda.

7b. Reablement Progress Response to Recommendations from Standing Scrutiny Review Group

Members are requested to consider the reference, as a matter of urgency, as it was not available when the main agenda was printed and circulated due to obtaining the necessary clearances and the proximity of Cabinet to the dispatch of the main agenda.

9. Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Members are requested to consider the report, as a matter of urgency, as it was not available when the main agenda was printed and circulated due to obtaining the necessary clearances and in order to enable a recommendation to be made to Council on 24 May 2012.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MINUTES

15 MARCH 2012

Chairman:	* Councillor Jerry Miles	
Councillors:	† Sue Anderson Kam Chana * Ann Gate * Barry Macleod-Cullinane	* Chris Mote (1) * Sachin Shah * Victoria Silver * Stephen Wright
Voting Co-opted:	(Voluntary Aided) * Mrs J Rammelt Reverend P Reece	(Parent Governors) † Mrs A Khan
In attendance: (Councillors)	Graham Henson	Minute 247

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

241. Attendance by Reserve Members

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

Ordinary Member

Councillor Paul Osborn

Reserve Member

Councillor Chris Mote

242. Declarations of Interest

RESOLVED: To note that the following interests were declared:

Agenda Item 8 – Primary School Expansion Programme

Councillor Chris Mote declared a personal interest as his wife was a teacher. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane declared a personal interest as his sister was a teacher and he had also assisted in the London Councils' lobbying in relation to School Funding. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Councillor Stephen Wright declared a personal interest as his wife was a teacher and he was a serving school governor. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Councillor Sachin Shah declared a personal interest as a serving school governor. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Councillor Ann Gate declared a personal interest as she was married to the Portfolio Holder for Schools and Colleges who had responsibility for this area. She would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

243. Minutes

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 28 February 2012, be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

244. 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 respectively.

245. References from Council/Cabinet

There were none.

RESOLVED ITEMS

246. Primary School Expansion Programme

The Committee received a comprehensive presentation from officers outlining the current position with respect to the Council's strategy and planning on school place planning issues and detailed information in relation to the

outcomes of the statutory consultations undertaken to date, applications for reception places in September 2012 and capital funding for schools.

Officers emphasised that the council's statutory responsibility concerning the provision of school place planning remained insitu and that they were working collaboratively with primary schools to respond to the ever increasing demand on school places. Officers noted that Harrow's previous history in establishing its school place planning objectives had been successful and that the authority had always met its duty to ensure sufficient places. Officers were confident in the strategies and methodology going forward and that this would again result in an accurately planned and balanced approach to the process.

Officers were focussing their efforts on the area of primary school allocation as the statistical feedback identified this as the area of greatest pressure arising from a significant increase in population demographic which wished to take up such places. Officers were currently planning for an additional 10-15 reception classes by the year 2015, then anticipated a plateauing of demand and that this would decrease thereafter. Officers further advised that the Schools Forum had agreed the funding formula to respond to the recent changes in legislation. The funding was expected to be provided via government grants through three different streams of activity.

With respect to the permanent expansion of schools, officers advised that a statutory consultation had been launched during the autumn 2011 and subject to the decision of Cabinet it was anticipated that the relevant statutory notices would be published in respect of seven schools. Officers noted that a further two potential permanent expansions were expected and that the emergence of Free Schools was also expected to have an impact on the changing landscape of school placement planning.

The issue of Special School placements was also a priority as again it was recognised that this was a fast growing area of need. Officers were currently considering the levels of provision and anticipated bringing forward strategies to future meetings of the Cabinet.

High Schools were currently well managed in terms of school place planning but, again officers noted that a growth curve in this area of need was expected within a few years.

With respect to the paperwork before Members, officers advised that the role projections were due to be updated. They also spoke briefly on the meetings held to date with the Department for Education concerning the Council's Grants settlement which officers considered, in terms of the formula utilised, to have severely disadvantaged Harrow and its children.

Members thanked officers for their presentation and raised several questions which officers responded to as follows:

- Noted that the report circulated with the supplemental agenda was a slightly older version than that which had gone to another Panel by comparison to the report submitted to this Committee;

- With regard to the Funding Bid submitted by Harrow this was felt to have been right and proper in terms of content. However, the outcome in terms of the funding formula used had disadvantaged Harrow. Officers were in regular liaison with the DfE concerning the methodology and had been part of a small group of authorities invited to a series of seminars to inform the next stage Funding Bid considerations.
- The potential effect on the Council with regard to a poor Funding Bid settlement was anticipated to be a 5-year cost of £26 million. This assumed a grant of £13.6 million and capital programme funding of £10 million.
- The Council had not considered purchasing places at this time through linking with independent partnerships processes.
- The Council's Place Planning Strategy aimed to respond to the rising Special Education Needs (SEN) issue and it was anticipated that in the future a free school/s should be part of that solution.
- Officers had been advised by the DfE that the places for reception level classes were high enough to justify the Free School proposal and advertising. These remained a below expected numbers level in respect of high school requirements and it was not anticipated this would be achieved for the upcoming school year. However, officers recognised that a potential issue might emerge where parents had been offered more than one school place.
- It was emphasised that no loss of amenity areas would be experienced through the permanent expansion of schools. However, it was advised that schools had not been built for the numbers of pupils that now needed to be absorbed and that each school would face individual and different challenges to meet its responsibilities.
- Officers confirmed that the need for strong travel plans as part of any permanent expansions was part of the plan for each affected school. Cross departmental working was already underway as part of this and it was anticipated would result in a multi-faceted solution.
- Officers considered the greatest risk factor to be in relation to the provision of high quality school places. There were other risks which included that the Council could not determine its numbers in terms of requirement. Voluntary Protocols were in place with Academies with regard to this but there was no agreement in place with the Free School.
- With respect to the issue of the longer term risk concerning information sharing, officers felt the Council was in a good position currently and their expectation was that this would only be negatively driven if a collaborative arrangement was not achieved with the Free School provision.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted and the above comments submitted to the Cabinet as part of its considerations.

247. Corporate Equality Objectives

The Committee welcomed the Portfolio Holder for Performance, Corporate Services and Customer Services to its meeting. An Officer then gave a brief presentation of the report outlining the inherent elements of the Single Equality Scheme and that this would be brought to a close at the completion of the report stage. He then set out the Council's Equal Opportunity Policy and proposals concerning Corporate Equality Objectives which were a requirement under the Public Sector Equality Duty, arising from the Equalities Act 2010. It was advised that the timeline for the approval of the objectives was very constrained as all Councils had a statutory responsibility to publish these by the 8 April 2012.

Speaking on the proposed draft Equality Objectives, the officer advised that these had been subject to a consultation process utilising the Council's Residents Panel. Of the 1,152 members of the Panel, 652 returns had been received and all proposed objectives had met a majority support threshold. It was anticipated that the full details of the response outcomes would be included in the Cabinet report to consider the adoption of the Equality Objectives.

In response to questions it was advised that:

- The Council was legally obliged to put in place Equality Objectives and that Harrow had worked to ensure its objectives were synchronous with the overall corporate objectives to better promote the mainstreaming of equalities.
- It was agreed that the Council's longer term aim should be that equalities was a fundamental aspect of the Council but, also recognised that the authority had some issues to resolve and that the proposed objectives would invigorate a sharper focus on this area.
- The reflection of the Objectives with regard to the councillor and senior officer leadership of the authority remained a challenge. However, the Council was proactive in its efforts to promote applications from under-represented groups whilst also remaining legally obliged to appoint the best candidate for a role.
- Concerning the SES Action Plan, officers agreed that the outcomes read as statements and that this was the reason for discontinuing this approach. The Council now wished to move to a position of much more tightly controlled and measureable Equality Objectives. Officers were in discussion with departments concerning the setting of percentage measure targets to ensure that clear objectives and outcomes were put in place.

- The Residents' Panel was a Group of residents who had volunteered to respond to written communications approximately 3-4 times per year. There was no incentivisation provided as part of this membership.
- With regard to the view that the report should be resubmitted to the Committee in a more complete format containing all responses information, it was advised that due to the legal timeline placed on the publication of Equality Objectives this was not achievable. However, the targets being put in place were anticipated to be for a one year period and there would be opportunity to continue to feed into the objectives / performance management going forward.
- A pattern within the responses had indicated less support for "protected groups" with regard to budget cuts impacts.
- Officers agreed to revisit the comment concerning working in partnership with Trade Unions as its intention was to reflect that when the Council was developing a policy it would work to ensure Unions and staff were aware of the proposal and appropriately communicated with.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted and the above comments submitted to the Cabinet as part of its considerations.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 9.03 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR JERRY MILES
Chairman

LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – 3 APRIL 2012

REFERENCE FROM CABINET – 8 MARCH 2012

Scrutiny Review - Debt Recovery Process - Response

Cabinet received a report of the Interim Corporate Director Resources setting out a preliminary response to the recommendations of the Scrutiny Challenge Panel on the Debt Recovery Process.

The Leader of the Council welcomed the Chairman of the Challenge Panel and the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to the meeting and invited them to address the meeting.

The Chairman of the Challenge Panel informed Cabinet that the Panel had considered the application of the Council's debt recovery process and had examined examples of where the Council appeared to be applying its policy, in the Panel's opinion, in a manner which did not fully take account of potential distressing personal circumstances of some residents. A blanket application of the policies could, in the Panel's view, become harmful although it was recognised that it was critical for the Council to collect the money owed to it. However, the Panel considered that there needed to be some form of encouragement in the process that would also assist residents.

The Challenge Panel had been of the view that the process of applying severe sanctions had not been carefully considered, particularly where these impacted on residents in difficult financial circumstances. Capturing residents in trouble earlier in the process was essential. The Chairman of the Panel suggested that before severe sanctions were taken, the circumstances and vulnerability of the individual ought to be examined with care, as sanctions applied would result in life time changes for the individual concerned. Additionally, there were opportunities for the Council to streamline the debt collection functions, looking to reduce cost, improve collection rates of some of the smaller collection functions.

The Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee welcomed the response report, and thanked the Chairman of the Challenge Panel for leading a robust review. He added that he also felt that the Council needed to appreciate that a number of factors could result in a non-payment situation. Furthermore, a streamlining of the debt collection function would help save money and he hoped that the recommendations of the Challenge Panel would help enhance the service and processes applied.

The Leader of the Council thanked the Members for their contributions and acknowledged that debt recovery was an emotive issue. When compared with other local authorities, Harrow Council's policy on debt recovery could not be considered to over-zealous. However, he acknowledged that early intervention in the process was critical and suggested a working group be established that could oversee this process. Moreover, it was important that the

policies were applied in a reasonable, sensitive and proportionate manner. He agreed that a progress report be submitted in three months' time.

RESOLVED: That the responses recommended by officers be endorsed and that a further progress report be submitted in three months' time.

Reason for Decision: To provide an appropriate response to the Scrutiny recommendations and to improve the effectiveness of the handling of exceptional cases.

FOR INFORMATION

Background Documents:

Report submitted to Cabinet
Draft minutes of Cabinet

Contact Officer:

Daksha Ghelani, Senior Democratic Services Officer
Tel: 020 8424 1881
Email: daksha.ghelani@harrow.gov.uk

LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – 3 APRIL 2012

REFERENCE FROM CABINET – 8 MARCH 2012

Reablement Progress Response to Recommendations from Standing Scrutiny Review Group

Cabinet received a report of the Divisional Director Adult Social Care setting out the responses to the recommendations from the Standing Scrutiny Review.

The Corporate Director Community, Health and Wellbeing referred to the five recommendations from the Scrutiny Review and explained that the majority of these had been taken on board. He invited the Chairman of the Scrutiny Review Group for a discussion outside of this meeting, if needed.

RESOLVED: That the response to the recommendations from the Standing Scrutiny Review on the Reablement Service be noted.

Reason for Decision: To provide an appropriate response to the Scrutiny recommendations.

FOR INFORMATION

Background Documents:

Report submitted to Cabinet
Draft minutes of Cabinet

Contact Officer:

Daksha Ghelani, Senior Democratic Services Officer
Tel: 020 8424 1881
Email: daksha.ghelani@harrow.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

**REPORT FOR: OVERVIEW AND
SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

Date:	3 April 2012
Subject:	'Shaping a Healthier future for North West London' – Preparing for a Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Responsible Officer:	Alex Dewsnap, Divisional Director Partnership Development and Performance
Scrutiny Lead Member area:	Councillor Ann Gate Lead Member - Health and Social Care
	Councillor Vina Mithani Lead Member - Health and Social Care
Exempt:	No
Enclosures:	Shaping a Healthier Future – Case for Change

Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

This report outlines issues for consideration by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to recommend to Council that Harrow will participate in a Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee. The Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee will be formed to consider NHS North West London's programme to improve care for North West London and the consultation process.

Recommendations:

Councillors are recommended to:

- I. Consider the summary of the '*Shaping a Healthier Future*' programme

- II. Consider the relative merits of Harrow taking part in the JOSC
- III. Ask that full Council agree Harrow's involvement in the establishment of the JOSC and delegate authority to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to appoint the Harrow representative(s) to the JOSC and to determine membership and issues related to the JOSC.

Section 2 – Report

Background

Shaping a healthier future is a programme that has been set up by NHS North West London (NWL) to respond to the challenge of trying to provide high quality healthcare for North West London. The NHS NWL cluster is amongst the largest in England with a budget of £3.4 billion and covers 8 London boroughs including Harrow, Hillingdon, Brent, Ealing, Kensington and Chelsea, Westminster, Hammersmith and Fulham and Hounslow. The programme has also been developed with the 8 Primary Care Trusts (PCTs)/Clinical Commissioning Groups serving a population of 1.9 million people. Amongst the 8 boroughs there are 14 hospital sites and 423 GP practices.

The Shaping a healthier future programme has been set up by clinicians following recognition that changes need to be made to the way services are delivered because of pressure on the services. Some of the key challenges and changes include:

- the ageing population
- current lifestyle is creating an epidemic of obesity, diabetes, cancer, heart disease and stroke
- the numbers of patients living with chronic disease are increasing
- science and technology offer new ways of tackling old problems
- internet, mobile communications and telehealth are opening up new channels for delivering care and providing health information, increasingly supporting patients to care for themselves

The programme is also being developed in order to address the growing challenges which lie in the way primary care and out-of-hospital care has been organised in the past which will not meet future needs. In some parts of north west London, patients cannot get a basic appointment with their GP or access services easily. Amongst six of the eight boroughs in north west London patient satisfaction has also been recorded as being in the bottom 10% nationally (*NHS NWL, The Case for Change, February 2012*). The programme also aims to bring more proportionality to health care spending and increase spending and investment in community and local services.

With all this NHS costs are on the rise whilst there is less funding available. Some changes have been made over the past few years including:

- changes in community, primary and hospital care increasing localisation of services

- co-ordination and integration of care across the boundaries of providers has been improved reducing non-elective admissions for diabetic and elderly patient groups
- some specialist services have been centralised into single networked centres, improving clinical outcomes

However, there is also recognition that far more still has to be done.

North west London has also got a vast amount of hospital space per head per population in comparison to other part of the country, the aim will be to have senior, specialised teams available 7 days a week, 24 hours a day with health services delivered locally when they can.

Out of Hospital Care

The work being carried out on out-of-hospital care presently is a big part of the '*Shaping a healthier future plan*' CCG's. The work is being lead by CCG's in north west London, PCT borough directors, director from each local authority and provider out of hospital care leads.

The programme is focused on developing high-quality cost-effective care outside of hospitals in order to support the changes in other parts of the health economy.

Quality standards have been developed to support the changes in out-of- hospital care which include:

1. Individual empowerment and care - provision of information to aid people when making decision about their care
2. Access, convenience and responsiveness - ensure that out-of-hospital care operates as a seven day a week service with community and health care services responding to local needs
3. Care planning and multi-disciplinary care delivery - co-ordinated and seamless integrated service using evidence pathways and care planning to support individuals.
4. Information and communication - following individual consent, health and social care records will be shared between care providers to identify changing needs so that care plans can be reviewed and updated. By 2015, it is hoped all patients will have access to their health records.

Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committees (JOSC)

Under the 2001 Health and Social Care Act, 2002 Regulations and 2003 Directions and Guidance) requires that where a local NHS body consults more than one Overview and Scrutiny Committee on a proposal it has under consideration for a substantial development of the health service or a substantial variation in the provision of service, the Overview and Scrutiny Committees of the local authority shall appoint a JOSC for

the purpose of consultation. Only the JOSC has the statutory power to request information relating to the issue being consulted upon.

The JOSC will:

- make comments on the proposal consulted on by NHS NWL
- Require NHS NWL to provide information about the proposals
- require NHS NWL to attend and answer questions in relation to the proposals

Informal JOSC meeting

The first informal meeting of the JOSC will be held on 4 April 2012 and will only include Councillors and Officers in the first part of the meeting where membership options, the terms of reference, timescales and meetings dates and administration of the JOSC will be considered.

Membership Options

At the first informal JOSC meeting Members will be invited to consider the advantages and disadvantages of the options outlined below:

Option 1: one nominated scrutiny member & one substitute member from each council participating in the JOSC.

Advantages

- (a) It is envisaged that the nominated representative in each borough will attend all meetings thereby ensuring a consistent and broad level of understanding from all participating members which can be drawn on in agreeing recommendations and the final report.
- (b) Where the nominated representative is unable to attend, the attendance of a substitute representative will ensure that all participating councils remain fully involved and have a voice in the work of the JOSC.

Disadvantages

- (a) The majority of the workload (which could involve significant time commitments) will fall to one member including the need to attend all meetings of the joint committee and acting as the link back to the local scrutiny panel. This could prove difficult depending on other time commitments.
- (b) Substitute members standing in for the nominated representative may find it more difficult to put evidence into a complete context if attending isolated meetings.

Option 2: two nominated scrutiny members from each council participating in the JOSC.

Advantages

- (a) It is envisaged that the nominated representatives in each borough will attend all meetings thereby ensuring a consistent and broad level of understanding from all participating members which can be drawn on in agreeing recommendations and the final report.

- (b) Where one of the nominated representatives is unable to attend the other representative would be able to represent the participating council and have a full understanding of all issues highlighted in evidence to date.
- (c) Members in each local authority may find it helpful to discuss proposals with another local councillor sitting on the JOSC, especially where that proposal impacts on their authority in a distinct way.
- (d) This option will allow a wider pool of member experience and knowledge to inform the work of the JOSC.

Disadvantages

- (a) It may be more difficult to find meeting times/dates that are suitable for all members.
- (b) There may be a lack of interest/capacity in boroughs to committing this level of member resource.

Proposed terms of reference

The proposed draft terms of reference will be redrafted and circulated in time for sign off at the first formal meeting of the JOSC. Proposed terms of reference are as follow:

1. Consider the '*Shaping a Healthier Future*' consultation arrangements - including the formulation of options for change, and whether the formal consultation process is inclusive and comprehensive.
2. Consider and respond to proposals set out in the '*Shaping a Healthier Future*' (**) consultation with reference to any related impact assessments or other documents issued by or on behalf of NHS North West London in connection with the consultation;
3. Consider whether the '*Shaping a Healthier Future*' proposals affecting acute and out of hospital care are in the interests of the health of local people and will deliver better healthcare for the people in North West London and people travelling across the GLA boundary, having due regard to cross-border issues;

(**) or whatever the exact title of the awaited consultation document turns out to be.

Harrow nomination to the JOSC

Having agreed to take part in the JOSC in principle, it should be noted that the committee cannot agree a formal nomination from the council until the next full Council meeting, which will be on 24 May 2012 until it is agreed that harrow participate and due to possible changes in membership of committees. The options which are chosen by the current members of the informal JOSC (option 1 or 2 detailed above) will also have implications on membership.

Members agree that representative(s) waiting to be formally appointed to the JOSC are able to participate in any meetings during the pre-consultation phase, in the same way as those that have been appointed.

The current chair and Vice-Chair of the Health and Social Care Scrutiny Sub-Committee who are also the Adult Health and Social Care lead members will be in attendance at the informal meeting on 4 April.

In view of any changes that may arise, it is also recommended that Council give the Overview and Scrutiny Committee the power to decide on any key decisions in terms of the membership and issues related to the JOSOC.

Timescales, meeting dates and current status

NHS NWL are currently in pre-consultation phase on their proposals and this began in January 2012 and will run till May 2012. The main focus of the pre-consultation phase to date has been two public consultation events held in February and March 2012 involving patients, local authorities, patient groups, GP's, other clinicians and the public. According to current timescales, the formal consultation period is expected to run from the beginning of June to September 2012.

At the first two informal briefing sessions delivered for scrutiny members by NHS North West London, members raised concern about the timing of the consultation which coincides with the summer holiday period, the Olympics and the Diamond Jubilee. *Members should note that NHS North West London has stated that the JOSOC is able to comment on the suitability of the length of the consultation period.*

In addition to the meetings needed to take evidence from suggested witnesses, members will need to have at least a further two meetings to carry out the following tasks:

- Agree terms of reference, rules of procedure, elect chair(s). This can be done at the start of the first meeting during the formal consultation period, which will also be taking evidence.
- Agree the committee's consultation response
- (After the consultation ends) Review NHS North West London's response to the JOSOC's consultation response.

Members will receive an updated timetable once meetings dates for the JOSOC are agreed.

Local engagement activity that takes place with individual boroughs has not been included. Members may find it helpful to keep each other notified of any engagement carried out at a local borough level, so the JOSOC retains an overview of engagement activity across all 8 boroughs.

Jan – May Pre-consultation engagement activity with JOSOC

16th Jan Informal briefing on case for change

29th Feb Informal briefing on clinical standards, service models and

	process and timeline for Joint Committee engagement & formation.
4 th Apr	Members give views and give informal agreement to some of the practical arrangements of the JOSOC.
	Members give views on the draft short list of options to go in the consultation document and the benefits framework.
19 April	Information item to Health and Social Care Scrutiny Sub-Committee
w/c 30 th Apr	Members give views on short list of options, draft consultation plan and out of hospital strategies.
w/c 14 th May	Members give views on consultation options, draft consultation document and plan.
24 May	Full Council
Jun* – Aug	JOSOC takes evidence from identified witnesses
June (date tbc)	First meeting of the JHOSOC in formal consultation period to agree chair(s), rules of procedure, terms of reference & take evidence
	Dates of further witness sessions tbc
Sep*	JOSOC agree final response and submit to NHS NWL.
1 st -14 th Sep	Officers draft report
15 th – 30 th Sep	Members give comments on draft and finalise their response. Date(s) of meeting tbc
Oct	JOSOC receive formal response to recommendations from NHS NWL Date of meeting tbc

Resourcing Needs

It is envisaged that the following tasks will need to be undertaken in order to support the JOSOC:

- preparing and sending out the agendas for meetings;
- arranging witnesses for the JOSOC meetings;
- organising venues for the JOSOC meetings;
- providing procedural advice to the JOSOC;
- drafting correspondence on behalf of the JOSOC;
- communicating with NHS NWL
- organising press and PR activity on behalf of the JOSOC;

- minuting the meetings;
- drafting the final report and recommendations for the JOSC;
- support to the Chairman.

Members should be aware that there is no financial funding available to the JOSC. Regardless of whether support arrangements are met through Option A or Option B as outlined below, it is proposed that the participating authorities take it in turn to host meetings in their respective boroughs. There will therefore be a need to rely on the good will of participating boroughs for minute taking, nameplates and additional copies

Option A

At the time of writing, scrutiny chairs across the 8 boroughs were in the process of writing to NHS North West London to request financial assistance to allow them to procure administrative and policy support to assist the work of the JOSC. In particular, this support would be responsible for producing the final report (and recommendations) of the JOSC.

It is important to note that support would not come from an NHS employee, but would be procured from an independent source so as to ensure that the independence of the JOSC is not compromised.

Where this request is met, it is suggested that the person(s) providing the support should be able to demonstrate:

- Their experience of working with scrutiny members in a Joint Committee structure considering complex, potentially contentious and high profile issues such as health provision.
- A good understanding of health commissioning and provider arrangements across the NW London sector.
- That they are well respected and known by officers and members working in the London scrutiny committee.

Option B

Where a request for support as outlined in Option A is not met, all support to this JOSC will need to be drawn from the participating authorities and the workload shared between existing scrutiny resource within these authorities.

The Centre for Public Scrutiny will remain available to the Committee to provide advice and answer general queries on an informal basis.

Financial Implications

There are no financial implications associated with this report.

Performance Issues

There are no specific performance issues associated with this report.

Environmental Impact

There are no specific environmental implications associated with this report.

Risk Management Implications

There are no specific risk management implications associated with this report.

Corporate Priorities

The council has a priority to 'support and protect people who are most in need' and to develop a 'united and involved communities: a Council that listens and leads'. The content of this report is relevant to both these priorities and the need to safeguard the interests of residents.

Section 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Not required for this report.

Section 4 - Contact Details and Background Papers

Contact: Fola Irikefe, Scrutiny Officer, 0208 420 9389

Background Papers: Presentation by NHS North West London – Shaping a Healthier Future – this can be viewed on the Council's website.

This page is intentionally left blank