

**MINUTES OF THE STANDING LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE (HSP)
MONDAY, 6 JUNE 2011**

Present: Councillor Claire Kober (Chair), Councillor John Bevan, Councillor David Browne, Councillor Gideon Bull*, Councillor Nilgun Canver, Kevin Crompton, Councillor Isidoros Diakides, Paul Head, Michael Jones, Councillor Gail Engert, Sona Mahtani, Councillor Lorna Reith, Michele Stokes, Councillor Lyn Weber, Andrew Williams.

* *Present for part of the meeting*

In Attendance: Louisa Aubeeluck, Xanthe Barker, Alex Grear, Cathy Herman, Claire Kowalska, Eve Pelekanos, Dr Helen Pelendrides, Helena Pugh, Benjamin Rake, Rachel Rowney, Phil Swan, Stuart Young.

MINUTE NO.	SUBJECT/DECISION	ACTION BY
HSP246.	APOLOGIES Apologies for absence were received from: Councillor Joanna Christophides Councillor Dilek Dogus John Egbo Councillor Joseph Ejiofor Maureen Galvin Peter Lewis	
HSP247.	URGENT BUSINESS There were no items of Urgent Business.	
HSP248.	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST There were no declarations of interest made.	
HSP249.	MINUTES RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 21 October 2010 be confirmed as a correct record.	
HSP250.	THE FUTURE OF PARTNERSHIP WORKING IN HARINGEY The Chair advised that Shared Intelligence had been commissioned by the Council to undertake a review of partnership arrangements in Haringey. It seemed appropriate at this juncture to review how the partnership operated as there had been a significant number of changes over the preceding twelve months including the abolition of the Local Area Agreement (LAA) and the loss of Performance Reward Grant (PRG).	

**MINUTES OF THE STANDING LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE (HSP)
MONDAY, 6 JUNE 2011**

The Chair noted that the review would look to capture and retain successful elements of partnership working in the Borough and examine how these aspects could be incorporated within a new structure.

An overview was given by Phil Swan of Shared Intelligence of the work undertaken to date and how the session would be used to gauge views of the HSP SLC.

Group Work

The Board was asked to break into three groups focusing on:

- Helping local residents take up opportunities for employment
- Safeguarding vulnerable children and adults
- Tackling climate change and managing environmental resources more effectively

Each group was asked to organise themselves into:

- Core partners
- Partners who should be involved
- Interested partners

The groups were also asked to identify any missing core partners who were:

- not present; or
- in one of the other two groups

Following this the groups were asked to consider whether:

- An overarching HSP SLC group/Theme Boards were required
- Task and finish groups could be used to undertake certain pieces of work
- Ad hoc meetings could be used rather than programmed quarterly HSP SLC meetings
- Other bodies outside the structure of the HSP could be used

Set out at Appendix 1 is a summary of each group's discussion with regard to the above.

Feedback on Work to Date and Discussion

The Board was advised that Shared Intelligence had met with the Chairs of the Theme Boards and individuals involved with the partnership and the following themes had emerged from this:

- Collaboration was more important than ever in the light of diminishing budgets across the Public Sector. This would also help prevent silos developing.
- That a core groups of partners, including the following, was essential:

**MINUTES OF THE STANDING LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE (HSP)
MONDAY, 6 JUNE 2011**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Authority • Health • Police • Job Centre Plus • Voluntary and Community Sector <p>As a caveat to this it was noted that individuals representing these organisations may be asked to attend an unmanageably large amount of meetings and that the use of this core group's time would need to be carefully considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There had been agreement that some level of infrastructure would be required to support the partnership. ➤ The current arrangements for partnership working were too elaborate. ➤ There was too much 'rubber stamping'. ➤ A preference for the establishment of a core group, with task and finish groups focusing on specific issues was expressed. This would enable the partnership to achieve focused outcomes. ➤ There had been resistance to seeing Theme Boards abolished. ➤ There was a question around the roles that Councillors and officers played in partnership working. ➤ Although the role of the VCS was recognised as being important there was a lack of confidence in the current arrangements and it was considered that they did not always provide the right representatives. ➤ The need for local input had been highlighted and there was the potential to develop links between the partnership and the new Area Committees. ➤ Greater clarity around roles to set out where responsibility for lay for statutory functions and duties was needed. <p>Following this session the Board was asked to form two to three recommendations for Shared Intelligence to consider when compiling their final report to the HSP Executive on 16 June (set out in Appendix 1).</p> <p>The Chair thanked people for their attendance and advised that Shared Intelligence would share their initial findings with the HSP Executive on 16 June.</p>	
<p>HSP251.</p>	<p>NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS</p> <p>There were no new items of Urgent Business.</p>	
<p>HSP252.</p>	<p>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</p> <p>There were no items of AOB.</p>	
<p>HSP253.</p>	<p>DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS</p> <p>The dates of future meetings, as set out below, were noted:</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE STANDING LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE (HSP)
MONDAY, 6 JUNE 2011**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ 6pm, 31 October 2011➤ 6pm, 16 January 2012➤ 6pm, 17 April 2012	All to note
--	--	-------------

The meeting closed at 7.30pm.

MINUTES OF THE STANDING LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE (HSP) MONDAY, 6 JUNE 2011

The following organisations should be included within any core group formed to tackle this issue:

- Business/employers
- Contractors
- Social enterprises
- Job Centre Plus
- Work programme prime/sub-contractors
- Organisations who support people getting into work

At a sub-regional level it might be useful if central Government, the Unions and captains of industry were included round the table.

There was agreement that it would be important to understand who had responsibility for specific functions and what resources they held across the board.

It was noted that there were aspects that hindered the partnerships ability to act including a lack of engagement with private sector organisations. There was agreement that the Government had a role to play in enabling Local Authorities to work in partnership more effectively.

There was agreement that an 'end point' should be identified and worked to rather than starting with the structure e.g. designing a support package to get people into work and stay there.

The group agreed that further areas for consideration included:

- What do we have to offer to Small and Medium Enterprises (SME)?
- Can we assess the local area accurately?
- Where are the potential growth areas; how can we prepare our communities beyond the recession?

In terms of the structures the following points were raised:

- Task and Finish groups would be useful in providing a focused approach and targeted campaigns may also be useful. It was noted that ideas tended to dry up with standing committees and that a 'short and sharp' focused groups may be more effective.
- Identifying problems in a proactive manner rather than reacting to a problem would be more constructive
- There was a need to work with local groups, traders associations; however, they needed and would not necessarily have the capacity to act independently.

Other thoughts and views:

- Can we assist people to obtain jobs outside of the Borough e.g. Stansted, the City? Can we set up arrangements with city firms – apprenticeships, internships etc?
- North London Strategic Alliance (NLSA) – is this delivering? Is it too big? Could we focus more on the wider Upper Lea Valley?
- We need to ensure that the Department of Work and Pensions (DWP) work programme serves the local community
- Is there something to be gained from being in an Enterprise Zone?
- Who is the voice of local business?
- A central body (perhaps annual conference) could be used to set the overall aims.
- Need a clear sense of common purpose and to identify a clear direction.

MINUTES OF THE STANDING LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE (HSP) MONDAY, 6 JUNE 2011

- Running of business throughout the year to be done by a leaner core group namely the HSP Executive. This could also take on more of a commissioning role for specific issues – off-shoots to target and act on specific issues/challenges; smaller executive groups to get on with the job, possibly ad hoc/task and finish.
- Greater focus was required on evidence based analysis of the work undertaken by the partnership.
- Principle partners with access to resources involved at a higher level.
- Some discussion of the definition of resources and recognition that resources are not just financial. Other groups with limited resources still had something to offer and knowledge should be recognised as a resource.
- The current Theme Board structure should be streamlined as too many of the same people attended every meeting. Greater efficiency was required and Boards where attendance was poor should be re thought.
- There should be recognition that with fewer staff there isn't the capacity for officers to support the large number of Theme Boards in place.
- What would be the mechanism for the frontline to be heard?
- Area Committees could add an interesting dynamic i.e. by requesting action from bottom up and feeding up to organisations with the resources to act.
- Big organisations may not be able to engage directly with every Area Committee but they could respond in some form.
- What is the implication of joint Borough working?
- What is the impact of Government agendas e.g. the work programme; can it work, can we make it work?

Recommendations:

- Meetings should be streamlined to avoid the same people going to all the different meetings and to improve efficiency.
- There should be a lean core group focusing on delivery and commissioning task and finish groups.
- A clear focus and direction should be set – perhaps set by an annual meeting.
- A link between the Area Committees and the partnership should be created in order to get local information.

Group 2 - Safeguarding vulnerable children and adults

The following organisations should be included within any core group formed to tackle this issue:

- Local Authority – both the political leadership and officers from both the Children's and Young People's Service and Adult Social Care
- Health - the sector would need to be broken down into the specific elements such as Mental Health and Hospitals and consideration would need to be given as to how they should feed into the partnership structure.
- Police

It was suggested that carers and service users should also be included in any wider group of partners.

There was discussion around the role and function of the Local Safeguarding Children's Board (LSCB), the Adult Safeguarding Board (soon to become a statutory requirement), the Children's Trust (and wider LSP) and the new Health and Wellbeing Board (sHWB). There was agreement that the lines of accountability and the functions each body would undertake remained unclear at present.

MINUTES OF THE STANDING LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE (HSP) MONDAY, 6 JUNE 2011

In addition to the statutory responsibilities of certain bodies; individuals such as the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People and the Borough Commander also had statutory responsibilities and these needed to be aligned and understood. It was noted that the statutory duties of any one organisation would not be wholly discharged via any of these bodies.

It was noted that the sHWB had been established on the basis that it was primarily a commissioning body with a small and focused membership. If other bodies were abolished thought would need to be given to how partners previously represented within these would feed into the sHWB. It was suggested that it may need to establish sub groups to capture this.

There was discussion around the strategic and operational aspects of partnership working and there was agreement that in order for it to be effective there needed to be routes for 'upward and downward' conversations. Whilst it was important that partners from outside the 'core group' were involved and participated at the appropriate point there was agreement that decisions had to be made at a strategic level around the partnerships priorities before actions / areas of work could be agreed.

Views on structure:

- Noted that the most successful HSP meetings had focused on a single issue where a partnership response was needed to resolve a particular issue and that this approach could be replicated in task and finish groups.
- Task and finish groups could pull in people from a wider field rather than being limited to the membership of fixed Theme Boards.
- Any new structure would need to reflect the partnerships priorities in order for it to be effective in delivering outcomes. Following the abolition of the LAA the partnerships priorities had not been discussed or reformed to reflect the 'new reality'.
- There was agreement that accountability and the setting of strategic priorities was important to the partnership and that an over arching body should provide this.

Other thoughts and views:

- In terms of safeguarding partnership working had a key role to play in improving understanding and communication between organisations.
- There was agreement that creating a cultural shift that encouraged organisations to be more open and to share information should be at the core of partnership working.
- It would be helpful if a package of shared priorities for staff working on the frontline could be agreed. This would build on the joint training sessions that had already been established.
- The option for establishing a Public Service Board to agree strategic priorities should be considered.

Recommendations:

- Clear priorities for the partnership and lines of accountability should be established.
- The leadership of the core organisations identified should be able to meet in a forum where they can have an open discussion about the resources available in the Borough as a whole and how these might be used to maximise the benefit to residents.
- The partnership should be used to help embed a culture where information is shared more easily and to improve understanding and communication between organisations.

Group 3 - Tackling climate change and managing environmental resources more effectively

MINUTES OF THE STANDING LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE (HSP) MONDAY, 6 JUNE 2011

It was noted that nearly all the external partners present were sitting around the safeguarding table and that none of the external partners had chosen to sit on the environmentally themed group.

The following organisations should be included within any core group formed to tackle this issue:

- Voluntary and Community Sector
- Specialist network enthusiasts (debate as to whether they were core though)
- Veolia (waste contractor)? Interesting discussion as to the role of commissioning in partnerships. Do they have a place in strategic partnerships as to the service they provide?
- Council
- Natural England (but again are they core, or they focussed and specific)
- Health Facilities? Health Service? What function do they provide with regard to the environment?
- TFL
- Haringey Cycling campaign
- En10ergy (Social Enterprise)
- Local businesses

There was agreement that there was a core group but that this included the same key organisations identified by the other two groups. Consequently there was agreement that environmental issues became a low priority for that core group and that this area was left with specialist and interested groups that have little or no influence.

Other thoughts and views:

- We need ambassadors representing areas and themes
- Does Overview and Scrutiny have a role?
- Need to tighten the link between Area Committees and partnerships? However partners cannot be attending all of the Committee meetings.
- Need to ensure there maintains a circle of feedback, accountability and resolution.
- We need help from other partnerships to manage the relationships, but it is not clear how this could be implemented.
- We need a strategic hub to monitor the important issues and this ought to be supported by intelligence and information throughout - this is essential.
- A key question should be "What is our role as a Council in environmental management?" Until we are clear, we cannot attempt to lead on the development of partnership working.
- There should be more emphasis on task and finish groups.
- We need a mechanism for getting a more inclusive contribution to ensure statutory duties are covered
- A mapping exercise to determine which partners are still active and actually attend each Theme Board meeting should be an essential piece of evidence underpinning the review by Shared Intelligence. There should be a broader discussion as to whether we should let successful partnerships blossom without the need for restricted structures is required and whether Theme Boards with poor attendance should continue.

Views on current structure:

- Top heavy and that it did not involve or engage partners effectively
- Disjoin with HSP Standing Leadership Conference/Executive and Theme Boards

MINUTES OF THE STANDING LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE (HSP) MONDAY, 6 JUNE 2011

- HSP Exec 'out of touch' and Theme Boards and a lack understanding of the group's role and purpose.
- At present we are sharing information rather than delivering joint projects or exploiting potential opportunities.
- There is too much rubber stamping of the decision making process and too few tangible outcomes.
- Would the establishment of task and finish groups duplicate the role of Overview and Scrutiny and could Overview and Scrutiny drawn in partners and take on this role?

Recommendations:

- Only meet if we need to work together or we can action a desired outcome.
- It is important to have an LSP that is flexible and reactive. The terms of reference for any over arching body and each Theme Board should reflect this, or they should be allowed to flourish without the restrictive framework in place.
- We need flexible Boards that have focussed outcomes and that do not meet just for the sake of meeting.
- We must ensure there is a bureaucracy light way to feed information through to the local areas and complete the 'loop of understanding'.
- We need a high level Board to manage finances and how we align our mainstream funding resources.