

SOUTHAMPTON PARTNERSHIP DELIVERY BOARD – ACTION NOTES

Meeting date: 6th August 2007

Present: Ros Cassy, Chair. (RC) Cllr Alec Samuels, Southampton City Council (CllrAS) Angela Alderman, Government Office South East. (AA) Brad Roynon, Southampton City Council. (BR) Brian Skinner, Southampton City Primary Care Trust (BS) Jacky Stevens, Business Link (JS) Jo Ash, Southampton Voluntary Services. (JA) Martin Pryor, Jobcentre Plus. (MP) Paul Stickler, Hampshire Constabulary. (PS)		Apologies: Evelyn Byrne, Hampshire & IoW Learning and Skills Council. (EB)
		In attendance: Joy Wilmot-Palmer, Southampton City Council. (JWP) Henry Pavey, Southampton City Council. (HP)
No:	ITEM	ACTION
1	WELCOME AND NOTES OF THE 5th JULY 2007 MEETING The notes of the 05/07 DB were agreed as an accurate record.	
2	MATTERS ARISING DB Terms of Reference: Noting that no amendments having been received to the final draft ToRs circulated by email these have now been adopted as the final ToRs. SSCF Grant Reduction: Needs to be confirmed whether the reduction is actually £43,000 or it is £15,000 with an additional £28,000 Respect grant added to the SSCF? Noted that both Hampshire and Portsmouth had written to the Home Office regarding their reduction and had received the same standard letter in reply that Southampton had. The DB agreed that, whilst it is highly unlikely to change anything, it would be worth writing to the Home Office again (once the situation is fully clarified) outlining the implications of the shortfall, ie the staffing impact and also trust in the LAA process. SEEDA Sub-Regional Review: Since the DB's consideration of SEEDA's Sub-Regional Review at its 05/07 meeting, it was noted that the SEEDA Board met on 19/07 and received a report outlining a way	JWP to advise DB of actual shortfall once determined. RC to action letter.

	<p>forward. The outcome for Southampton is that there will not be a specific AIF Programme for the city from 1st April 2008 and that any devolved funding is likely to be on a sub regional basis (PUSH). SEEDA's paper suggests this will require a business-led partnership for PUSH, the implications of which will need to be worked through. It was agreed to invite Kathy Slack to the DB's 10/09 meeting so that SEEDA's plans can be discussed</p> <p>Multi-Area Agreement: Noted that JWP had met with the Heads of Policy from Hampshire and Portsmouth with a follow-up meeting to be held in September along with representatives from GOSE and SEEDA. Noted that an MAA for the Economic Development and Enterprise block (with some extension) enables the broader strategic objectives from the PUSH Business Plan to be bought forward and that the PUSH Joint Committee could sign-off an MAA. Need to consider how LAA targets already agreed by Southampton and the local perspective can feed into the PUSH sub-regional dimension.</p>	<p>RC/HP to invite Kathy Slack.</p> <p>JWP/EEB</p>
<p>3</p>	<p>LAA QUARTER 1 MONITORING</p> <p>JWP presented a report recommending that the DB:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Note the progress with the implementation of the CorVu system • Note the 1st quarter performance results for Southampton's Local Area Agreement and the 12 Stretch Targets included within it. • Consider the exception based format of this report and identifies any amendments that it would like to see introduced for subsequent monitoring periods. • Request partners to critically review the reporting timescales for all non reported indicators at the end of the first quarter to ensure that appropriate monitoring information is available prior to the year end. • Refer all indicators which are currently reported to be significantly off target (coloured red in this report) to the appropriate sector partnership for review to ensure that appropriate remedial action is put in train as necessary by the end of the financial year. <p>After discussion of the report and the Quarter 1 detailed information, which was tabled, the following actions were agreed:</p> <p>1) DB members are to inform JWP by mid-September if there are any outstanding teething problems</p>	

	<p>with the implementation of the CorVu System or performance input and analysis. Priority is to get the system right.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2) Need to know which targets are to be reported quarterly, annually, etc. In addition, need a profiling of all the targets over the life of the LAA. 3) The Quarterly Monitoring reports must be sent to the LAA Delivery Partnership Chairs for consideration by their partnerships in advance of DB consideration. 4) The LAA Delivery Partnership Chairs' must have the DB meetings in their diaries where quarterly monitoring is being considered. The Chairs will be expected to attend and report to the DB the quarterly progress against their targets. 5) A timetable of key dates up to the end of LAA is needed identifying performance data submission; report generation and dispatch to DB and Chairs; Chairs consideration of the data prior to the DB meeting; the DB meeting itself; and subsequent follow-up actions. 6) DB needs to develop an exception reporting process which challenges the LAA Delivery Partnership Chairs regarding 'why has the variance occurred' and 'what are you/your partnership doing about it' and 'how can the DB help you to get your target(s) back on track'? <p>The DB expressed its thanks to all those involved in the CorVu implementation and the Quarter 1 monitoring.</p>	<p>All DB members to action.</p> <p>JWP/HP to action 2 to 6.</p>
4	<p>ECONOMY & ENTERPRISE BOARD 3-YEAR WORK PROGRAMME</p> <p>Lorraine Brown and Tim Levenson, SCC introduced a report outlining a draft 3-year work programme for the EEB noting that a number of actions, including the EDE Block LAA, are still being worked through. The DB considered the draft work plan and noted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) That good progress has been made to date, given the EEB's infancy, but that it now needs to ratchet up its business especially around the LAA. Noted that the EEB is the only LAA Delivery Partnership that will not be on a statutory footing from 1st April 2008. 2) Confirmation of who actually attends the EEB (the senior level of buy-in) as this needs to be an extremely important and influential group. 3) The EEB needs to keep the DB informed of how things are going. 4) The Vision and the CoSS need to be written into the EEB's Terms of Reference. 5) A revised draft work programme needs to be bought to a future DB (date tbc). 	<p>LB/TL to action 1 to 4.</p> <p>HP to identify DB meeting date.</p>

<p>5</p>	<p>SP UPDATE</p> <p>HP requested the DB to note the progress/current position of the SP's Achieving Better Outcomes for Southampton programme with regards to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategy Board draft Terms of Reference and update • CoSS publication and launch • SP 2026 Conference update • Southampton City Image & Brand Book implementation • SP Website refresh <p>After consideration, specific actions noted were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Any comments on the draft Terms of Reference for the SP Strategy Board to HP by 10/09. 2) Clarification is needed around whether JA's approach to identify the 5 community and voluntary sector representatives for the Strategy Board actually includes the Neighbourhood Partnerships? JA noted that the NPs are a SCC construct and are therefore different from other neighbourhood groupings. JA/RC to consider and clarify this position. 3) Need to complete the SP Fit for Purpose Review and move the DB on from process to delivery and a focus on major issues facing the city 	<p>DB members to action. JA/RC to clarify position regarding NPs.</p> <p>RC/JWP/HP</p>
<p>6</p>	<p>SP OPERATING BUDGET & RESOURCES</p> <p>HP presented a report to the DB updating on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget and staffing research on the south east LSPs • The current position on the 2007/08 SP budget • Current staffing capacity • Staffing and/or funding shortfalls <p>BS and BR both commented on the need to ensure that the SP was sufficiently resourced given its substantial work programme and also the associated costs of having very senior people meeting and making decisions without the appropriate supporting structure. With this in mind, the DB acknowledged the requirement for administrative and some communications capacity for the SP supporting</p>	

	<p>infrastructure which needs to be clearly defined. Reliance on an annual business student placement (for whom funding is not secured in the longer term) is not sufficient and core tasks need to be covered by staff who have more secure funding.</p> <p>HP to work with JWP and RC to scope the required tasks from now on. The PCT £15,000 funding held over can be used to ensure work is taken forward between meetings. Work will be done to identify whether there is any spare capacity within the existing staff resources including the AIF Programme Team.</p>	<p>HP/JWP/RC to develop appropriate job description and person specification.</p>
	<p>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</p> <p>November DB: The 05/11 meeting to be pushed back a week due to conflicting diary demands.</p>	
<p>Next Meeting: Monday 10th September, 1400 to 1630hours, Committee Room 2, Civic Centre.</p>		