

# 2020 Vision for Joint Working Programme Board

**Time: 10 – 1:00 Friday 25 July 2014**

**Location: Montpelier Room, Cheltenham Borough Council**

## Attendees

Councillor Steve Jordan	Councillor Jon Walklett
Councillor Patrick Molyneux	Councillor John Burgess
Andrew North	David Neudegg
Ralph Young	Peter Hibberd
Jane Griffiths	Amanda Attfield

## Apologies

Councillor Mark Booty and Brian Robinson

### 1. Chairing the meeting

1.1 Councillor Steve Jordan reminded the group that the original proposal was to rotate the meetings between the four councils and for the chair to correspondingly rotate. Given that it would appear the meetings will be held in Cheltenham because of its central location, it called into question about how meetings should be chaired. Councillor Patrick Molyneux said that he was comfortable with Cllr SJ chairing the meeting, unless others had an objection.

### 2. Notes from previous meeting

2.1 The notes had been circulated with the agenda. The following matters arising were noted:

- Programme definition – has been updated as agreed and will be reviewed in October
- Pensions – teleconference held with officials from DCLG. It was evident that they want to keep employees in the LGPS, which is counter- intuitive to the message we have received from cabinet ministers. The meeting was not productive. DN advised that he had raised the matter at the LGA conference, and that other councils have similar issues. AON Hewitt are preparing some bullet points for the requests we should make of government and it was agreed that it would be useful to write directly to DCLG with our concerns about the current LGPS issues, and to raise through the shared CEX network.

**Action: letter to be drafted**

# 2020 Vision for Joint Working Programme Board

- Public protection – a report will be brought to the August meeting.

**Action: August meeting agenda**

## 3. ICT update

3. The programme board had approved funding for work to commence to support a new network across the four councils. The GOSS network needed to be upgraded and the transformation funding will enable more robust networks across the partnership to be put in place. In addition they will be implementing video conferencing.

3.2 In response to a question PH confirmed that the ICT team were also looking at the programme and costs of implementing a four way share for ICT and for the wider 2020 Vision. AN asked if the networks and infrastructure would be scalable. PH agreed that Phil Martin will need to come to a future board to outline the programme and he would ensure that this issue was covered in the brief. There was a discussion as to the overall 2020 Vision and a scalable model of delivery and it was important that the ICT infrastructure was able to support this, although recognizing that there may be practical issues if other partners were on different platforms and systems. PH will feed back to PM.

## 4. TCA bid update

4. DN advised that there had not be many bids for the phase 1, shared management/CEX proposals and we had yet to hear back on our bid or expression of interest for phase 2. The LGA were keen for those councils who had submitted bids to work closely to share knowledge, experiences and learning and to exchange ideas. The LGA will be setting up a joint meeting.

## 5. Member involvement – to consider potential for a cross party member advisory group and also for notes of meetings to be circulated to all members

5.1 The Labour group in FODDC have issued a press statement saying that they are not convinced of the need to establish a separate company. In a recent scrutiny meeting members asked of more members could be involved in the board on a cross party basis. Cllr PM recognised that the programme board would become unwieldy.

5.2 Officers suggested that another option would be to create a cross party advisory group which could act as a sounding board on the key issues. It was also agreed that minutes of the programme board could be made available for internal use. AN advised that CBC does have cross party membership on some groups eg joint core strategy and that this works well and so would support the idea of an advisory group. It was agreed that terms of reference for the proposed group would be brought back to the next meeting and that notes from the programme board could be made available to members.

**Action: TOR for advisory group to be presented to next meeting. Notes of programme board meetings to be made available to members**

## 6. Budget update

6. The programme board members were aware that both tenders for the interim management were likely to be above the budget which had been set originally. It was agreed that given the importance

# 2020 Vision for Joint Working Programme Board

of the work the programme board would authorise expenditure up to £50k.

7. Any other business
  - Future meeting dates – agreed that these would be recirculated as there seemed to be an issue of them being in everyone’s diary.
  - LGA session on 2020 Vision – this seemed to have gone well and been well received.
  - WODC – it is anticipated that WODC will nominate a second member to attend the meetings.
8. **Presentations by the potential HR providers, ability to ask questions and to make decision on suitable provider**
  - 8.1 AA outlined the process that had been followed. Five providers had been approached to tender and we had received three responses. A shortlisting process had taken place with AA, PH, RY and JG and the members had received their assessment with the highest two being asked to present to the councillor representatives on the board.
  - 8.2 In response to a question as to whether the one supplier was impartial given that they had undertaken work on GOSS and also with one of the partner councils, AA believed that a robust process had been followed and procurement rules followed. AA believed either company could undertake the work and it was for members to have confidence in them and which is why it should be their decision.
  - 8.3 Councillor PM asked why the officers were being asked to leave the meeting, and it was agreed that although officers will be assisting members and helping to facilitate the journey it was important given that it impacted on all officers for this to be a member decision.
  - 8.4 It was noted that one provider has identified significantly more days and it will be for the panel to understand the approach and to determine whether it meets the brief.
  - 8.5 At this stage all officers expect AA left the meeting. Following 20 minute presentations and 20 minutes Q&A from each of the providers and assessment by the panel against the criteria and brief, the panel agreed that Activist should be appointed.

**Action: AA to complete necessary contract**

**Next Meeting - Friday 29 August**