

AUDIT COMMITTEE – 26 APRIL 2013

Title of paper:	Partnership Governance Information	
Director(s)/ Corporate Director(s):	Director of Policy, Partnerships and Communication	Wards affected: All
Report author(s) and contact details:	Liz Jones, Acting Head of Policy, liz.jones@nottinghamcity.gov.uk 0115 876 3367	
Other colleagues who have provided input:	Alice Johnson, Policy Officer	
Relevant Council Plan Strategic Priority: (you must mark X in the relevant boxes below)		
World Class Nottingham	X	
Work in Nottingham		
Safer Nottingham		
Neighbourhood Nottingham		
Family Nottingham		
Healthy Nottingham		
Leading Nottingham		
Summary of issues (including benefits to citizens/service users):		
<p>In November 2012 the Audit Committee requested more information on the partnerships which are considered by the Council to be significant and the health checks which are undertaken on these significant partnerships. This report provides additional information and requests views from the Audit Committee on whether to amend the information to be collected in the 2013 health checks.</p>		
Recommendation(s):		
1	That Audit Committee approve two changes to the health check template put forward by the Vice Chair and suggest any additional amendments	
2	That Audit Committee note the additional information provided in regards to the latest health checks, completed summer 2012	

1. BACKGROUND (INCLUDING OUTCOMES OF CONSULTATION)

BACKGROUND: THE PARTNERSHIP GOVERNANCE FRAMEWORK

- 1.1 The Partnership Governance Framework is designed to ensure that the Council's involvement in partnerships does not expose the Council to an unacceptable level of risk. The framework is about reviewing the Council's processes in terms of its involvement in the partnership (as opposed to reviewing the arrangements of the Partnership directly).
- 1.2 Through the framework, significant partnerships are identified where one more of the following criteria apply.

- **Strategic Importance** - the partnership is critical to the delivery of the Council's key objectives or statutory obligations. The success of the partnership is therefore fundamental to the Council's priorities and functions; or,
- **Reputational Importance** - the Council's reputation could be damaged by failure of the partnership to deliver; or,
- **Financial Importance** – currently or potentially managing/directing resources that include a substantial financial contribution from the Council or for which the Council is the Accountable Body.

1.2 The partnerships which meet this criteria are listed in the Register of Significant Partnerships, which is updated annually, and an annual self-assessment of the 'health' of the partnership's governance (the 'health check') is undertaken.

1.3 The health check aims to gather all the relevant information to identify any potential risks with a view to developing remedial actions, without being burdensome. It does not substitute the need for the partnership to review its own governance and performance arrangements regularly.

1.4 The health check is completed by the NCC lead officer (representing NCC within the partnership) and signed off by the partnership Chair. The health check template, which is set out in Appendix B, covers the following areas:

1. Aims and objectives
2. Membership and structure
3. Decision making and accountability
4. Performance management
5. Evaluation and review
6. Equalities
7. Finance
8. Partnership Risk Management

1.5 Each partnership gives itself a score for each of the areas above and a summary is presented to Audit Committee, as in November 2012 when the results of the 2012 health checks were presented¹.

1.6 There is also a section for partnerships to include the most significant risks which the Council needs to be aware of in terms of our involvement with this partnership, which is shared with the Corporate Risk Specialist.

1.7 Following recent discussions with the Audit Committee Vice Chair, two additional points have been added to the health check template for consideration by the Audit Committee. These are highlighted in grey on Appendix B, and consist of the following points:

Addition to the Membership and structure section:

- The NCC lead officer is actively engaged

Addition to the Finance section:

- Where applicable, for the most recent financial year the partnership has had "unqualified audit opinion" (i.e. it has passed audit without any qualifications) and any recommendations raised by auditors have been actioned

¹ Audit Committee Report: 'Partnership Governance Framework – Register and Health Checks'; and, 'Revised Partnership Governance Framework' (30th November 2012)

- 1.8 **Audit Committee are asked to approve these changes and suggest any additional amendments to the health check template (Appendix B).**

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON THE PARTNERSHIPS AND THE HEALTH CHECKS

- 1.9 Appendix A provides a summary of the Register of Significant Partnerships which also sets out which partnerships:

- i) Are statutory;
- ii) Have financial resources; and,
- iii) Have the City Council as the Accountable Body.

- 1.10 Appendix C provides the documents for the Register of Significant Partnerships and health checks for each significant partnership. Both of these were completed in Summer 2012.

- 1.11 **Audit Committee are asked to note the additional information provided in regards to the latest health checks, completed summer 2012 (Appendix C).**

2. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 The role of overseeing the Partnership Governance Framework has recently moved from Executive Board to the Audit Committee, as it fits more naturally with the Audit Committee terms of reference.

- 2.2 This report gives the Audit Committee the opportunity to consider the information requested in the health checks and suggest any additional amendments. Following this, the annual completion of health checks will happen during the summer.

3. OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED IN MAKING RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 None

4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS (INCLUDING VALUE FOR MONEY/VAT)

- 4.1 As noted, Appendix A sets out which partnerships have the City Council as the Accountable Body.

5. RISK MANAGEMENT ISSUES (INCLUDING LEGAL IMPLICATIONS AND CRIME AND DISORDER ACT IMPLICATIONS)

- 5.1 None

6. EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Has the equality impact been assessed?

Not needed (report does not contain proposals or financial decisions)

YES

No

Yes – Equality Impact Assessment attached



7. LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS OTHER THAN PUBLISHED WORKS OR THOSE DISCLOSING CONFIDENTIAL OR EXEMPT INFORMATION

7.1 None

8. PUBLISHED DOCUMENTS REFERRED TO IN COMPILING THIS REPORT

8.1 Audit Committee Reports: 'Partnership Governance Framework – Register and Health Checks' and 'Revised Partnership Governance Framework'. These reports also include the Partnership Governance Framework 2012 and the Register of Significant Partnerships 2012. Both are available at:
<http://gossweb.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/nccextranet/index.aspx?articleid=11775>

Appendix A

Nottingham City Council Register of Significant Partnerships Updated December 2012

For further information contact Liz Jones, Interim Head of Service, Corporate Policy, liz.jones@nottinghamcity.gov.uk or Alice Johnson, Policy Officer, alice.johnson@nottinghamcity.gov.uk.

	Title	Councillor & Corporate Director Lead	Lead Officer	Further information		
				Statutory?	Direct NCC financial contribution ?	NCC as Accountable body?
1	One Nottingham	Councillor David Mellen, Portfolio Holder for Children's Services Ian Curryer, Chief Executive	Nigel Cooke, One Nottingham	No	Yes	Yes
2	Crime and Drugs Partnership	Councillor Alex Norris, Portfolio Holder for Area Working, Cleansing and Community Safety John Kelly, Corporate Director, Communities	Peter Moyes, Director, Crime and Drugs Partnership	Yes	Yes	Yes
3	Children's Partnership Board	Councillor David Mellen, Portfolio Holder for Children's Services Candida Brudenell, Acting Corporate Director, Children's and Families	Katy Ball, Acting Director, Quality and Commissioning	No	No	No
4	Working Nottingham Partnership	Councillor Nick McDonald, Portfolio Holder for Jobs, Skills and Business David Bishop, Corporate Director, Development	Nicki Jenkins, Head of Economic Development	No	No	No
5	Green Nottingham Partnership	Councillor Alan Clark, Portfolio Holder for Energy and Sustainability John Kelly, Corporate Director, Communities	Andy Vaughan, Director of Neighbourhood Services	No	No but NCC provides secretariat support through the Sustainability and Climate Change Section	No
6	Greater Nottingham Transport Partnership	Councillor Jane Urquhart, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transportation David Bishop, Corporate Director for Development	Sue Flack, Director of Planning and Transport	No	No	No but there is a service level agreement in place

	Title	Councillor & Corporate Director Lead	Lead Officer	Further information		
				Statutory?	Direct NCC financial contribution ?	NCC as Accountable body?
7	Nottinghamshire Employment & Skills Board	Councillor Jon Collins, Leader David Bishop, Corporate Director, Development	Nicki Jenkins, Head of Economic Development	No	No	No
8	Greater Nottingham Growth Point Partnership	Councillor Alan Clark, Portfolio Holder for Energy and Sustainability; Councillor Jane Urquhart, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transportation David Bishop, Corporate Director, Development	Sue Flack, Director of Planning and Transport	No	No	No, but NCC is a responsible body (Leicester are the Accountable Body)
9	Strategic Cultural Partnership	John Kelly, Interim Corporate Director, Communities	Hugh White, Director, Sports, Culture and Parks	No	No	No
10	Nottingham Regeneration Ltd	Councillor Alan Clark, Portfolio Holder for Energy and Sustainability David Bishop, Corporate Director, Development	Andrew Gregory, Head of Development Management	No	Yes	No
11	Experience Nottinghamshire	Councillor Dave Trimble, Portfolio Holder for Leisure, Culture and Tourism David Bishop, Corporate Director, Development	John Yarham, Director, Economic Innovation and Employment	No	Yes	No
12	Castle Cavendish Foundation (formerly Nottingham Development Company)	John Kelly, Corporate Director, Communities	John Marsh, Locality Manager	No	No	No
13	Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Joint Leadership Board	Councillor Jon Collins, Leader Ian Curryer, Chief Executive	Claire Richmond, Director of Policy, Partnerships and Communication	No	No But the Secretariat for the Joint Leadership Board is provided in kind by the County Council and the City Council.	No
14	Core City Board	Councillor Jon Collins, Leader Ian Curryer, Chief Executive	Claire Richmond, Director of Policy, Partnerships and Communication	No	No but the Secretariat for the Core City Board is provided in kind by the	No

	Title	Councillor & Corporate Director Lead	Lead Officer	Further information		
				Statutory?	Direct NCC financial contribution ?	NCC as Accountable body?
					City Council with support from the County Council.	
15	Derbyshire and Derby, Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Local Enterprise Partnership	Councillor Jon Collins, Leader David Bishop, Corporate Director, Development	Dave Tatum, Economic Development Partnership Manager	No	No	Only in regards to the Growing Places Fund and City Skills Fund which are spent through the LEP
16	Strategic Housing Partnership	Councillor David Liversidge, Portfolio Holder for Adults, Housing and Community Sector David Bishop, Corporate Director, Development	Graham de Max, Partnership Manager, Housing Strategy	No	No but secretariat function provided	No
17	Shadow Health and Wellbeing Board	Councillor Nicola Heaton, Executive Assistant for Health Candida Brudenell, Acting Corporate Director, Children's and Families	Colin Monckton, Acting Director Quality and Commissioning	Yes (from April 2013)	No	No

Appendix B

PARTNERSHIP GOVERNANCE HEALTH CHECK GUIDANCE

The health check is a guide for an annual assessment of a partnership's governance and capacity. The aim is to make an overall assessment of the effectiveness of the partnership; identify whether there is any strategic, reputational or financial risk to the Council through its membership of the partnership; and lead to proposals for changes/improvements.

Some of the detailed definitions and examples may not be directly applicable. There may be some additional definitions of good governance that the nominated lead officer will need to apply given the specific circumstances or arrangements for a partnership. Evidence to support the findings of the health check will be held by the nominated lead officer.

This health check does not substitute for the partnership itself reviewing its governance and performance. The Council's nominated lead officer and chief officer have a responsibility to support and advise the partnership to carry out its own review and take any action required to improve its governance.

The health check has 4 categories:

Score	Category	Description
1	Excellent	There is an excellent system of governance designed to achieve the partnership's and the council's objectives; any potential strategic, reputational or financial risks for the council are noted and well managed; performance is on track.
2	Good	There is a basically sound system of governance, but some weaknesses that may threaten some of the partnership's and the council's objectives; any concerns regarding management of potential strategic, reputational or financial risks to the council are minor; performance is mainly on track
3	Some key areas for improvement	There are some significant weaknesses that could threaten some of the partnership's and the council's objectives; there are some significant concerns about potential strategic, reputational or financial risks to the council and their management; performance is not on track in some areas
4	Many key weaknesses	Governance and controls are generally weak leaving the partnership's system open to significant error or abuse; the partnership's and council's objectives are unlikely to be met; there are many significant concerns about strategic, reputational or financial risks to the council and their management; performance is not on track in most areas

NOTTINGHAM CITY COUNCIL
SIGNIFICANT PARTNERSHIPS GOVERNANCE HEALTH CHECK

In consultation with your partnership, please complete the tables below. Once the details have been agreed by the partnership please return them to alice.johnson@nottinghamcity.gov.uk. If you require any assistance please contact Alice Johnson, Policy Officer, Nottingham City Council, on 0115 87 63372.

Name of Partnership:
NCC Lead Councillor:
NCC Corporate Director:
NCC Lead Officer:
Partnership Chief Executive/Manager (if appropriate):

We have identified 8 areas of good governance. In each area we have provided a number of clear statements to illustrate what 'excellent' looks like for that area of governance. Using the criteria where 1 is 'excellent' and 4 is 'many key weaknesses' (page 1), please record a score (1-4) for each area of good governance for your significant partnership, making relevant notes on how the score could be improved.

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
1. Aims and objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership has clear aims and SMART objectives clearly set out and understandable • Strong alignment between the partnership's and The Nottingham Plan and 2030 vision • In pursuing the 2030 vision, the partnership has a set of values against which decision making and actions can be judged (e.g. code of conduct) • The partnership achieves more than the sum of its parts. It delivers the benefits identified in the business case 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

<p>2. Membership and structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The structure is clear, is set out in Terms of Reference, a Memorandum of Agreement or other governing documents and is regularly reviewed. • Roles, responsibilities and contributions are defined for all partners and set out in the governing documents, including whistle-blowing, responding to compliments and complaints, risk assessment, personnel and financial management and financial and performance reporting. • Key partners provide effective leadership. Their leadership roles and responsibilities are understood and fulfilled. • The membership provides the necessary knowledge, skills and experience to do the job. Partners ensure that the right people are in the right place at the right time. • The partners are committed at the highest level to deliver the partnership's objectives. There are constructive working relationships between all partners, the right people attend the meetings, and these are supported by lead officers within partner agencies. • Changes to membership and exit strategies are considered and the governing documents say what will happen if/when a partner wishes to leave. • The NCC lead officer is actively engaged 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
---	--	---

<p>3. Decision making and accountability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision making is clear and transparent. Authority and delegations are set out in governing documents including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Who can make what decisions ○ Delegated responsibilities • The partnership has a clear procedure for dealing with conflicts of interest • Those making decisions are provided with information that is fit for the purpose – relevant, timely and give clear explanations of technical issues and their implications • Decisions are properly recorded and notified promptly to those who are affected by them. • The partnership has a communication plan to inform service users, members and the public about the partnership, its decisions, its achievements and successes, who is accountable and responsible for what. It provides routes for people to comment/contribute to the partnership’s work. • The partnership has clear lines of accountability and arrangements for reporting performance • Arrangements are in place for the partnership to report in a timely way on its work and achievements to Council officers and Councillors. Decisions and activities are scrutinized at the appropriate level. • There are clear routes for members and partners to raise concerns. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<p>4. Performance management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership reviews its progress and 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

<p>delivery against clear outcomes, outputs and milestones and takes prompt corrective action if necessary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivery contracts and agreements are monitored and poor performance is tackled. 		
<p>5. Evaluation and review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership regularly reviews its policies, strategies, membership and use of resources against its objectives and targets. • The partnership reviews its progress and delivery against clear outcomes, outputs and milestones and takes prompt corrective action if necessary. • Delivery contracts and agreements are monitored and poor performance is tackled. • Arrangements for responding to complaints and dealing with unforeseen problems needing a prompt response are in place and clearly stated. • There are clearly stated procedures to deal with disputes within the partnership and these are followed when necessary. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<p>6. Equalities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership assesses its policies and programmes for their impact on equalities. • The partnership considers impact on inequality and deprivation as part of its performance management. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<p>7. Finance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership has access to resources to 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

<p>support delivery of its aims and objectives. It has a financial and /or procurement plan that identifies how it proposes to use these funding to achieve its objectives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The role of the partnership in relation to finance and the extent of its powers to make financial decisions and approvals are stated and understood. • The partnership has effective arrangements for financial monitoring and reporting. • The partnership uses its resources well and demonstrates how it uses them to add value. It ensures that it uses resources to complement and enhance the work of individual partners. • Where applicable, for the most recent financial year the partnership has had “unqualified audit opinion” (i.e. it has passed audit without any qualifications) and any recommendations raised by auditors have been actioned 		
<p>8. Partnership Risk Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key people are aware of areas of potential risk in partnerships and the need to allocate resources to manage risk. • The partnership has an agreed mechanism for identifying, assessing and managing risks. • Appropriate tools have been developed and resources are in place to manage risk. • Partnership risks are well managed across organisational boundaries. • There is clear evidence of improved partnership delivery through risk management. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

Overall Headline Risk

Please fill in the table below the most significant risks which the Council needs to be aware of in terms of our involvement with this partnership. These can include strategic, financial and reputational risks. An example risk has been included to guide you.

Some partnerships may not face any risks, whereas others may face many. For those which face many risks, please note only the three most significant risks.

Please write a brief description of the risk, give each risk a rating for likelihood and impact using the criteria below, and bullet point the mitigating actions which will help mitigate the risk.

Risk Description	Impact Rating	Likelihood Rating	Total Risk Rating (Impact x Likelihood)	Mitigating actions
				•
				•
				•

Likelihood rating scale:

1. Remote
2. Unlikely
3. Possible
4. Likely
5. Almost Certain

Impact rating scale:

1. Negligible
2. Minor
3. Moderate
4. Major
5. Catastrophic

Appendix C: 2012 Health Checks

Registration document for One Nottingham

Completed Summer 2012

Nottingham City Council - Partnership Governance Framework Registration of Significant Partnerships	
<p>One Nottingham Loxley House Station Street Nottingham NG2 3NG</p> <p>Tel: 0115 8765000 Email: general@onenottingham.org.uk Website: www.onenottingham.org.uk</p>	<p><u>Status</u></p> <p>Unincorporated Voluntary Association The One Nottingham Board is the overarching body which provides strategic direction to the Partnership.</p>
Nigel Cooke, Head of One Nottingham	
<p><u>Aims/focus</u></p> <p>The purpose of the Partnership is to provide a single coordinating framework that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Agrees the long term strategic direction for the City of Nottingham in the Nottingham Plan 2020• Is responsible for the implementation and review of the overall direction of the Plan• Articulates and promotes the needs and aspirations of local communities• Brings together the different parts of the public sector with the private, voluntary and community sectors in a spirit of collaboration and communication• Engages partners in consultation, decision making and the delivery of the Nottingham Plan• Coordinates city-wide policies, plans and programmes across organisational boundaries to ensure they have maximum impact on the vision for Nottingham• Encourages joint working in order to deliver high quality services and better outcomes for the people of Nottingham• Promotes the engagement of communities and citizens in decisions that affect the future of the City• Facilitates effective communications across partnerships/partners• Harnesses resources to deliver the Partnership and partners' objectives	
<p><u>Role in Nottingham Plan/LDF /Council Plan</u></p> <p>Lead partnership responsibility for The Nottingham Plan. The Partnership is a non-</p>	

statutory body and therefore is not the ultimate decision-maker on the plans. All target setting, and consequent financial, commissioning or contractual commitments proposed by One Nottingham must be formalised through the City Council or through one of the other One Nottingham partners (e.g. if policing or health resources are involved).

Nottingham City Council is the lead body for partnership work in Nottingham, as it holds the formal accountability for the statutory aspects of partnership working. The sovereignty of individual partners to make decisions and set policy in their respective organisations is recognised by One Nottingham.

Resources

2011/12

NCC funding £0.137m
 People Exchange Programme
 (funded through external income)
 £0.018m
 One Nottingham Partnership Fund–
 £0.350m

Reporting

NCC – Executive Board, Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Other – Government through various departments.

Council nominees, responsible Corporate Directors and lead officers

Councillor Mellen, Portfolio Holder for Children and Families, ON Board Chair

Chief Executive, – Chair of the ON Executive Group

Lead Officer – Nigel Cooke, Head of One Nottingham and Claire Richmond, Interim Director, Policy, Partnerships and Communications

Board Members

Councillor David Mellen - Chair
 Councillor Jon Collins, Leader, Nottingham City Council
 Carole Mills-Evans, Acting Chief Executive, Nottingham City Council
 Chris Eyre, Chief Constable, Notts Police
 Ron Buchanan, Chairman, NHS Nottingham City
 James Russell, PR Director, Experian (private sector)
 Mark Bowyer, Director, Broxtowe Partnership Trust (third sector)
 Peter Hill, Archdeacon of Nottingham (faith and third sector)
 Andrew Campbell, African-Caribbean & Asian Forum (third sector)
 Mike Khouri-Bent, Corporate Director for Care Standards, Pathway Care Solutions (private sector)
 Francesca Fowler, Higher Education Representative, Nottingham Trent University

Executive Group

Carole Mills-Evans, Acting Chief Executive, Nottingham City Council - Chair

	<p>Helen Kearsley-Cree, Chief Executive, NCVS</p> <p>Derek Bray, Chief Executive, NHS Nottingham City</p> <p>Nick Murphy, Chief Executive, Nottingham City Homes</p> <p>Graham Sheppard, External Relations Manager, Jobcentre Plus</p> <p>Simon Nickless, Divisional Commander, Notts Police</p> <p>Frank Swann – Chief Fire Officer, Notts Fire and Rescue Service</p> <p>Mick McGrath, Regional Director, Big Lottery fund</p> <p>Lyn Bacon, Chief Executive, Nottingham City Care Partnership</p> <p>Sheila Wright, Deputy Chief Executive Nottinghamshire Probation Trust</p>
--	--

COMPLETED SUMMER 2012

NOTTINGHAM CITY COUNCIL
SIGNIFICANT PARTNERSHIPS GOVERNANCE HEALTH CHECK 2012

Completed Summer 2012

In consultation with your partnership, please complete the tables below. Once the details have been agreed by the partnership please return them to alice.coleman@nottinghamcity.gov.uk. If you require any assistance please contact Alice Coleman, Policy Officer, Nottingham City Council, on 0115 87 63372.

Name of Partnership: One Nottingham
NCC Lead Councillor: Cllr David Mellen
NCC Corporate Director: Carole Mills-Evans
NCC Lead Officer: Nigel Cooke
Partnership Chief Executive/Manager (if appropriate): Nigel Cooke

We have identified 8 areas of good governance. In each area we have provided a number of clear statements to illustrate what 'excellent' looks like for that area of governance. Using the criteria where 1 is 'excellent' and 4 is 'many key weaknesses' (page 1), please record a score (1-4) for each area of good governance for your significant partnership, making relevant notes on how the score could be improved.

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
1. Aims and objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The partnership has clear aims and SMART objectives clearly set out and understandable Strong alignment between the partnership's and The Nottingham Plan and 2030 vision In pursuing the 2030 vision, the partnership has a set of values against which decision making and actions can be judged (e.g. code of conduct) 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are clear stated aims which continue to be delivered through the Theme Partnerships and the partners, particularly those with statutory responsibilities on key areas. The Nottingham Plan is the One Nottingham Plan. The partnership will need to continue to demonstrate that it has broad benefits for the people of Nottingham The partnership promotes innovation and leads in high profile citywide initiatives of broader significance.

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The partnership achieves more than the sum of its parts. It delivers the benefits identified in the business case 		
<p>2. Membership and structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The structure is clear, is set out in Terms of Reference, a Memorandum of Agreement or other governing documents and is regularly reviewed. Roles, responsibilities and contributions are defined for all partners and set out in the governing documents, including whistle-blowing, responding to compliments and complaints, risk assessment, personnel and financial management and financial and performance reporting. Key partners provide effective leadership. Their leadership roles and responsibilities are understood and fulfilled. The membership provides the necessary knowledge, skills and experience to do the job. Partners ensure that the right people are in the right place at the right time. The partners are committed at the highest level to deliver the partnership's objectives. There are constructive working relationships between all partners, the right people attend the meetings, and these are supported by lead officers within partner agencies. 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Partnerships structure is clearly set out in our publicised documents and the structure is reviewed on a regular basis. The Governance documents set out the roles and responsibilities of partners and all partners have signed up to these. The key partner organisations in the city have representation at the highest levels of the partnership and show commitment in time and resources to partnership objectives and priorities. The partnership governance has been under discussion due to the changing legislation requirement of government. Over the coming months the relationships with the Health and Wellbeing partnership, CDP and Children's Partnership will require discussion.

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes to membership and exit strategies are considered and the governing documents say what will happen if/when a partner wishes to leave. 		
<p>3. Decision making and accountability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decision making is clear and transparent. Authority and delegations are set out in governing documents including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who can make what decisions Delegated responsibilities The partnership has a clear procedure for dealing with conflicts of interest Those making decisions are provided with information that is fit for the purpose – relevant, timely and give clear explanations of technical issues and their implications Decisions are properly recorded and notified promptly to those who are affected by them. The partnership has a communication plan to inform service users, members and the public about the partnership, its decisions, its achievements and successes, who is accountable and responsible for what. It provides routes for people to comment/contribute to the partnership’s work. The partnership has clear lines of accountability and arrangements for reporting performance 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ON Board has the ultimate decision making responsibility. The process for decision making is set out in the governance document. All Board members have completed a declaration of interest form. All Board decisions are minuted. One Nottingham produces a Bulletin after every Board meeting which is widely distributed and it covers all the matters and decisions. The Partnership’s performance is managed by the Executive Group and overseen by the Board. Nottingham City Council act as the accountable body for One Nottingham and all major decisions have to be approved by them. Portfolio Holders sit on all of the One Nottingham Theme Partnerships to ensure a link with the democratic process. The Partnership is chaired by Cllr Mellen.

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arrangements are in place for the partnership to report in a timely way on its work and achievements to Council officers and Councillors. Decisions and activities are scrutinized at the appropriate level. 		
<p>4. Performance management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership reviews its progress and delivery against clear outcomes, outputs and milestones and takes prompt corrective action if necessary. • Delivery contracts and agreements are monitored and poor performance is tackled. 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The One Nottingham Board receives periodic reports on the Nottingham Plan. The priorities around the Nottingham Plan have been revisited in the light of the changing circumstances • The City Council Partnership and Performance Team are responsible for monitoring the Nottingham Plan performance. • Partnership funds are utilised effectively with progress reports to the board.
<p>5. Evaluation and review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership regularly reviews its policies, strategies, membership and use of resources against its objectives and targets. • The partnership reviews its progress and delivery against clear outcomes, outputs and milestones and takes prompt corrective action if necessary. • Delivery contracts and agreements are monitored and poor performance is tackled. 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Partnership is reviewed on a regular basis. • Performance is monitored on a periodic basis and action taken to improve performance if needed. • A complaints procedure is in place. • There are procedures for dealing with disputes within the Partnership and they are in the published governance document.

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arrangements for responding to complaints and dealing with unforeseen problems needing a prompt response are in place and clearly stated. • There are clearly stated procedures to deal with disputes within the partnership and these are followed when necessary. 		
<p>6. Equalities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership assesses its policies and programmes for their impact on equalities. • The partnership considers impact on inequality and deprivation as part of its performance management. 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Much of the funding is targeted to address inequalities. The Partnership has recently introduced an Equalities and Fairness Commission.
<p>7. Finance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership has access to resources to support delivery of its aims and objectives. It has a financial and /or procurement plan that identifies how it proposes to use these funding to achieve its objectives. • The role of the partnership in relation to finance and the extent of its powers to make financial decisions and approvals are stated and understood. • The partnership has effective arrangements for financial monitoring and reporting. 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A small amount of funding is targeted by One Nottingham. • The Partnership is now moving into a new period of work by influencing and working with partners to target mainstream funding. • Partnership funding is used in conjunction with partners mainstream funding to add value and this will be the key to the future success. • The funding is managed by the One Nottingham Team and the project is managed through the Council's financial regulations.

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The partnership uses its resources well and demonstrates how it uses them to add value. It ensures that it uses resources to complement and enhance the work of individual partners. 		
<p>8. Partnership Risk Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key people are aware of areas of potential risk in partnerships and the need to allocate resources to manage risk. The partnership has an agreed mechanism for identifying, assessing and managing risks. Appropriate tools have been developed and resources are in place to manage risk. Partnership risks are well managed across organisational boundaries. There is clear evidence of improved partnership delivery through risk management. 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City Council's risk management approach has been adopted by the partnership. All projects and initiatives are assessed for risk.

COMPLETED SUMMER 2012

Overall Headline Risk

Please fill in the table below the most significant risks which the Council needs to be aware of in terms of our involvement with this partnership. These can include strategic, financial and reputational risks. An example risk has been included to guide you.

Some partnerships may not face any risks, whereas others may face many. For those which face many risks, please note only the three most significant risks.

Please write a brief description of the risk, give each risk a rating for likelihood and impact using the criteria below, and bullet point the mitigating actions which will help mitigate the risk.

Risk Description	Impact Rating	Likelihood Rating	Total Risk Rating (Impact x Likelihood)	Mitigating actions
The ongoing funding has been agreed by Nottingham City Council however in times of scarce resources the future funding will be at risk.	4	3	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The alternatives for funding will be discussed with partners and funding sources will be researched.
The partnership could be engaged in activity with potential to damage the reputation of the city.	2	3	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The partnership works very closely with NCC Marketing and Communications Team and with Partners' Communications Officers and also with elected members and senior officers.
Partners could disengage from the partnership.	2	3	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One Nottingham communicates consistently with its members. Major partners are represented in all decision making forums.

Likelihood rating scale:

1. Remote
2. Unlikely
3. Possible
4. Likely
5. Almost Certain

Impact rating scale:

1. Negligible
2. Minor
3. Moderate
4. Major
5. Catastrophic

Registration document for Nottingham Crime & Drugs Partnership (CDP)

Completed Summer 2012

Nottingham City Council - Partnership Governance Framework Registration of Significant Partnerships	
<p><u>Partnership</u></p> <p>Nottingham Crime & Drugs Partnership (CDP)</p> <p>The Shire Hall High Pavement Nottingham NG1 1HN</p> <p>Tel: 0115 8765656 Email: cdp@nottinghamcity.gov.uk Website: www.nottinghamcdp.com/</p>	<p><u>Status</u></p> <p>Statutory Partnership One Nottingham Theme Partnership</p>
Peter Moyes, Director, Nottingham Crime & Drugs Partnership	
<p><u>Aims/focus</u></p> <p>To reduce the level and impact of crime and anti social behaviour in all of the communities in Nottingham.</p> <p>To reduce reoffending and substance misuse.</p> <p>To maximise the effectiveness of Nottingham's services in reducing crime through partnership working.</p>	
<p><u>Role in Nottingham Plan/Council Plan</u></p> <p>Nottingham Plan - lead responsibility for Safer Nottingham Implementation Plan.</p> <p>Council Plan – SN 1, 2 & 3 are aligned with and set out the Council's contribution to the Nottingham Plan Safer Nottingham priority</p>	
<p><u>Resources</u></p> <p><u>2012/13</u></p> <p><u>Infrastructure</u> CSF – £257,067 Partnership Contribution - £1,183795</p>	<p><u>Reporting</u></p> <p><u>NCC</u> - Corporate Delivery Board, Overview and Scrutiny Committee, Overview and Scrutiny Health and Wellbeing Select Committee. Reports to Council as Accountable Body for funding.</p>

<p><u>Programmes</u></p> <p>PTB –£3,761.898</p> <p>DIP –£1,679,866</p> <p>Early Intervention Grant –£ 132,100</p> <p>YPS - £295,734</p> <p>Substance Misuse in Prisons -£ 796,000</p>	<p><u>Other</u> - Central government, One Nottingham, Partnership Board</p>
<p><u>Council nominees, responsible corporate directors and lead officers</u></p> <p>Councillor Alex Norris – Portfolio Holder</p> <p>John Kelly, Corporate Director, Communities</p> <p>Independent Chair of CDP Board – Peter Usherwood</p> <p>Lead officer - Peter Moyes, Director, Nottingham Crime & Drugs Partnership</p>	<p><u>Board Membership:</u></p> <p>Jon Collins - Nottingham City Council, Leader / Chair Police Authority</p> <p>John Kelly - Nottingham City Council, Corporate Director Communities</p> <p>Sue Fish – Nottinghamshire Police, Assistant Chief Constable</p> <p>Kevin Dennis, – Nottinghamshire Police Authority, Chief Executive</p> <p>David Horton, – Nottinghamshire Fire & Rescue Service, Assistant Chief Fire Officer</p> <p>Jane Geraghty – Nottinghamshire Probation Trust, Chief Executive</p> <p>Dawn Smith – Nottingham City NHS CCG, COO</p> <p>Nick Murphy –Nottingham City Homes, Chief Executive</p> <p>Peter Wright –Her Majesty’s Prison Nottingham, Governor</p> <p>Judith Walker – Nottinghamshire Crown Prosecution Service, Chief Crown Prosecutor</p> <p>Nigel Cooke – One Nottingham, Director TBC - Assistant Chief Executive, Nottinghamshire County Council</p> <p>TBC –Voluntary Sector Rep</p> <p>Leslie Ayoola – BME / Voluntary Sector Rep</p> <p>Stephen Dudderidge -University of Nottingham</p> <p><u>Executive Group Membership:</u></p> <p>Jon Collins - Nottingham City Council, Leader / Chair Police Authority</p> <p>Lianne Taylor –Nottingham City Council, Director Neighbourhoods and Communities</p> <p>Simon Nickless –Nottinghamshire Police, Ch/Supt City Div Commander</p> <p>Andrew Errington –Nottingham Community</p>

	<p>Protection, Director Tim O'Neil – Nottingham City Council, Director Family & Community Teams Vic McMillen –Nottinghamshire Fire & rescue Service, Group Manager Nigel Hill –Nottinghamshire Probation Service, Director Dawn Smith –Nottingham City NHS, Director Gill Moy –Nottingham City Homes, Director of Housing Selina Fox, HMP Nottingham Partnerships Lead –Her Majesty's Prison Nottingham TBC –Nottinghamshire Crown Prosecution Service, Senior Crown Prosecutor TBC –Nottinghamshire County Council David Manley –Nottinghamshire NHS, Clinical Director of Substance Misuse Andrew Vaughan –Nottingham City Council, Director Neighbourhood Services Melanie Futer –University of Nottingham, Manager for Off-Campus Affairs, membership David Rhodes –Nottingham City Neighbourhood Watch, Chief Executive Olwen Edwards –Nottingham Victim Support, Chief Executive /Victims' Champion Sharon Singleton – Spirita Housing /RSL rep TBC –Voluntary Sector rep</p>
--	---

COMPLETED

NOTTINGHAM CITY COUNCIL SIGNIFICANT PARTNERSHIPS GOVERNANCE HEALTH CHECK 2012

Completed Summer 2012

In consultation with your partnership, please complete the tables below. Once the details have been agreed by the partnership please return them to alice.johnson@nottinghamcity.gov.uk. If you require any assistance please contact Alice Johnson, Policy Officer, Nottingham City Council, on 0115 87 63372.

Name of Partnership: Crime and Drugs Partnership
NCC Lead Councillor: Councillor Norris
NCC Corporate Director: John Kelly, Corporate Director, Communities
NCC Lead Officer: Peter Moyes
Partnership Chief Executive/Manager (if appropriate):

We have identified 8 areas of good governance. In each area we have provided a number of clear statements to illustrate what 'excellent' looks like for that area of governance. Using the criteria where 1 is 'excellent' and 4 is 'many key weaknesses' (page 1), please record a score (1-4) for each area of good governance for your significant partnership, making relevant notes on how the score could be improved.

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<p>1. Aims and objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership has clear aims and SMART objectives clearly set out and understandable • Strong alignment between the partnership's and The Nottingham Plan and 2030 vision • In pursuing the 2030 vision, the partnership has a set of values against which decision making and actions can be judged (e.g. code of conduct) • The partnership achieves more than the sum of 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Crime & Drugs Partnership (CDP) has a strong strategic framework based around its four key aims; to reduce crime, Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB), substance misuse and reoffending. • The aims are performance managed through individual headline targets, supported by a range of key performance indicators. • The Partnership's objectives are fully integrated with the Nottingham Plan and reports progress into the Plan. • The Partnership as a Themed Partnership of One

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
its parts. It delivers the benefits identified in the business case.		Nottingham (ON) applies the One Nottingham code of conduct in the exercise of its functions.
<p>2. Membership and structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The structure is clear, it is set out in the Terms of Reference, a Memorandum of Agreement or other governing documents and is regularly reviewed. • Roles, responsibilities and contributions are defined for all partners and set out in the governing documents, including whistle-blowing, responding to compliments and complaints, risk assessment, personnel and financial management and financial and performance reporting. • Key partners provide effective leadership. Their leadership roles and responsibilities are understood and fulfilled. • The membership provides the necessary knowledge, skills and experience to do the job. Partners ensure that the right people are in the right place at the right time. • The partners are committed at the highest level to deliver the partnership's objectives. There are constructive working relationships between all partners, the right people attend the meetings, and these are supported by lead officers within partner agencies. 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Partnership's structure and functioning of its Board and Executive Committee are laid out in a Terms of Reference which was refreshed and ratified by the Board in November 2010. • The membership of the Board and Executive has since been refreshed to represent a clear division between strategy setting and financial oversight and city-wide delivery of the Board's strategy. • The <i>Police and Social Responsibility Act 2011</i> has necessitated that the role and membership of the Partnership be reconsidered in advance of the introduction of Police and Crime Commissioners. The Crime & Drugs Partnership's structure and connection with locality groups within the Partnership has been used as an exemplar of Four Tier partnership working for colleagues in Nottinghamshire's Community Safety Partnerships. • Leadership is delivered through the Board via the Executive Committee to all members. The Board in January 2012 adopted a 'Champion' approach; where nominated Board members act as a lead in a specific field of work to give cross-cutting oversight, challenge and direction. • Membership of the Board and Executive consists of statutory Responsible Authorities as well as representatives of key stakeholder groups such as the

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes to membership and exit strategies are considered and the governing documents say what will happen if/when a partner wishes to leave. 		<p>Universities, third sector, education and non-statutory health care providers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resignation from the Board for non-statutory members is by letter to the Chair and by mutual agreement.
<p>3. Decision making and accountability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decision making is clear and transparent. Authority and delegations are set out in governing documents including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who can make what decisions Delegated responsibilities The partnership has a clear procedure for dealing with conflicts of interest Those making decisions are provided with information that is fit for purpose – relevant, timely and give clear explanations of technical issues and their implications Decisions are properly recorded and notified promptly to those who are affected by them. The partnership has a communication plan to inform service users, members and the public about the partnership, its decisions, its achievements and successes, who is accountable and responsible for what. It provides routes for people to comment/contribute to the partnership’s work. The partnership has clear lines of accountability and arrangements for reporting performance 	<p>2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decision making at the Board is through a consensus model; the decision making mechanism is laid out in the Board’s terms of reference. The Chair of the Board is able with the support of the Director to make appropriate decisions between Board meetings which are communicated at the earliest following meeting. All strategic decision making is made in session by the Board. Recommendations are clearly laid out in all papers to the Board and are recorded and circulated to members through the minutes. Papers requiring decisions of the Board are supported by a clear narrative; background, current context and implications. The Board receives a rich performance and policy picture of the Partnership’s activity to inform decision making. While the Partnership Team no longer has an in-house communications team, Partnership activity is communicated clearly to partners through its key meetings, and is supported by the City Council’s Communications and Marketing Department. The Partnership maintains a website and communications to drug treatment service users through its Service Users’

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arrangements are in place for the partnership to report in a timely way on its work and achievements to Council officers and Councillors. Decisions and activities are scrutinized at the appropriate level. • There are clear routes for members and partners to raise concerns. 		<p>Forum.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Partnership reports performance and activity through the One Nottingham Themed Partnership Structure, through departmental management channels (Departmental Leadership Team, Corporate Leadership Team, Executive Panel) and is scrutinised by the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee. • Work is underway to establish a legal delegated authority decision making framework for the Board further to the need to establish commissioning decisions across agencies (esp. Drug Treatment).
<p>4. Performance management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership reviews its progress and delivery against clear outcomes, outputs and milestones and takes prompt corrective action if necessary. • Delivery contracts and agreements are monitored and poor performance is tackled. 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear processes are in place to monitor and manage performance at Locality, city-wide and at strategic levels. Performance issues are addressed in detail at the Board and at the monthly meeting of the Partnership Executive. • Commissioned services are rigorously performance managed by the Partnership Team, action plans are developed to address issues encountered – the Partnership's commissioned drug treatment services are currently delivering ahead of agreed targets through the thorough implementation of this approach.
<p>5. Evaluation and review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership regularly reviews its policies, strategies, membership and use of resources against its objectives and targets. 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies, strategies and procedures are regularly reviewed within the Partnership to ensure they are fit for purpose, are delivering against current need and are compliant with

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership reviews its progress and delivery against clear outcomes, outputs and milestones and takes prompt corrective action if necessary. • Delivery contracts and agreements are monitored and poor performance is tackled. • Arrangements for responding to complaints and dealing with unforeseen problems needing a prompt response are in place and clearly stated. • There are clearly stated procedures to deal with disputes within the Partnership and these are followed when necessary. 		<p>corporate requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivery contracts and strategies are developed and supported by clear, evidence based needs assessment, analysis and performance data. • All complaints are dealt with in accordance with Nottingham City Council's complaints procedure. Complaints concerning commissioned services are addressed through contract management arrangements, where shortfalls are identified action plans are put in place and monitored to ensure compliance. • Any disputes within the Partnership were they to arise would be settled through the formal mechanism of the Board and Executive.
<p>6. Equalities</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The Partnership assesses its policies and programmes for their impact on equalities. 3. The Partnership considers impact on inequality and deprivation as part of its performance management. 	<p>2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Partnership assesses the equality impact of its activity and forms an integral part of the development of strategies and activity. The Partnership uses its extensive data and analytical resources to support its Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) processes. • The Partnership Board has specific Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) representation which serves to cement BME equalities implications within strategic deliberations. • The Partnership Team works closely with the City Council's Equalities Team to ensure both statutory compliance as well as best practice is delivered with respect to equality and diversity.

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<p>7. Finance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Partnership has access to resources to support delivery of its aims and objectives. It has a financial and /or procurement plan that identifies how it proposes to use funding to achieve its objectives. • The role of the Partnership in relation to finance and the extent of its powers to make financial decisions and approvals are stated and understood. • The Partnership has effective arrangements for financial monitoring and reporting. • The Partnership uses its resources well and demonstrates how it uses them to add value. It ensures that it uses resources to complement and enhance the work of individual partners. 	<p>1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Partnership is funded through a range of mainstream contributions from its constituent members, including the City Council, as well as Central Government grant funding. • The Board receives a finance paper at each meeting and has a dedicated Finance Board in April of each year. • The Partnership exercises financial controls through Nottingham City Councils finance processes and through the Delegated Decision Makers process. • The Board receives financial information alongside performance data ensuring that resources are delivered in accordance with the Partnership's strategic aims. • Cooperation and coordination among partner agencies delivers added value and allows for the best use of resources to be achieved.
<p>8. Partnership Risk Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key people are aware of areas of potential risk in partnerships and the need to allocate resources to manage risk. • The Partnership has an agreed mechanism for identifying, assessing and managing risks. • Appropriate tools have been developed and resources are in place to manage risk. • Partnership risks are well managed across organisational boundaries. • There is clear evidence of improved partnership 	<p>1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risks to the city and to the delivery of the Partnership's aims and commitments are identified through the use of performance and analytical data. • The Board and Executive are made aware of arising risks and set plans in place to address emerging issues, including the commissioning of problem profiles and the establishment of sub-groups. • The Partnership contributes to the City Council's Corporate Strategic Risk Register through which risks are identified and monitored. • As a partner organisation the Crime & Drugs Partnership is able to share and assist in the management of risks across

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
delivery through risk management.		organisational boundaries and deliver activity to address need through its membership.

Overall Headline Risk

Please fill in the table below the most significant risks which the Council needs to be aware of in terms of our involvement with this partnership. These can include strategic, financial and reputational risks. An example risk has been included to guide you.

Some partnerships may not face any risks, whereas others may face many. For those which face many risks, please note only the three most significant risks.

Please write a brief description of the risk, give each risk a rating for likelihood and impact using the criteria below, and bullet point the mitigating actions which will help mitigate the risk.

Risk Description	Impact Rating	Likelihood Rating	Total Risk Rating (Impact x Likelihood)	Mitigating actions
Future Funding	3	3	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Choices • Collaboration with partners • Exploration of grant funding opportunities
Failure to work effectively with PCC	3	2	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contribution to robust Transition arrangements • Flexibility and credibility of existing partnership structures and processes – a track record of success

Likelihood rating scale:

1. Remote
2. Unlikely
3. Possible
4. Likely
5. Almost Certain

Impact rating scale:

6. Negligible
7. Minor
8. Moderate
9. Major
10. Catastrophic

COMPLETED SUMMER 2012

Registration document for Children's Partnership Board

Completed Summer 2012

Nottingham City Council - Partnership Governance Framework Registration of Significant Partnerships	
<p><u>Partnership</u></p> <p>Children's Partnership Board</p> <p>c/o Nottingham City Council Loxley House Station Street Nottingham NG2 3NG</p> <p>Tel: 0115 8764814 Email: candida.brudenell@nottinghamcity.gov.uk Website: www.nottinghamchildrenspartnership.org.uk</p>	<p><u>Status</u></p> <p>The Children's Partnership Board is no longer a statutory requirement however the Partnership have agreed to continue to be the key mechanism to support all partners to work together to deliver a joined up vision for children, young people and families.</p> <p>One Nottingham Theme Partnership.</p>
<p><u>Aims/focus</u></p> <p>To oversee the implementation of the Children and Young People's Plan (CYPP) which sets out the collaborative work programme across all partners responsible for providing services to children, young people and families. All partners are accountable for the delivery of its priorities, objectives and specified targets. The Children's Partnership directs the required integrated working, joint planning, commissioning and resource allocation to achieve this.</p>	
<p><u>The role of The Children's Partnership Board in the Nottingham Plan/ LDF /Council Plan:</u></p> <p>The Children's Partnership Board has a key responsibility to own and oversee the implementation of, and performance manage, the CYPP.</p> <p>The Nottingham Plan has lead responsibility for Family Nottingham Implementation Plan, oversight of Nottingham's EI programme, the Aspiring Nottingham Agenda and contributes to programmes and targets across all themes.</p> <p>The Children's Partnership Board has the lead partnership for Children, Families and Schools indicators and contributes to linked performance areas.</p> <p>The Council Plan reflects Nottingham City Council's role in delivering Family Nottingham priority (the Children and Young People's Plan). The Children's Partnership Board also supports delivery of other Council Plan priorities eg</p>	

Neighbourhood Nottingham, Safer Nottingham, Working Nottingham and Healthy Nottingham.	
<p><u>Resources</u></p> <p>There is no dedicated partnership budget.</p> <p><u>Programmes</u></p> <p>The role of the partnership is to direct partners' mainstream resources to deliver Children and Young People's Plan.</p>	<p><u>Reporting</u></p> <p><u>NCC</u></p> <p>Specific priorities of the CYPP have been referred to Overview and Scrutiny. Young People are part of the CYP Board and report to the Youth Cabinet. NCC's Children's Services are represented on the Board. There is an emerging relationship with the Health & Well Being Board.</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <p>Relevant Children's Partnership business is reported/remitted to One Nottingham, and NCC's Children and Families Leadership Team.</p>
<p><u>Council nominees, responsible Corporate Directors and lead officers</u></p> <p>Councillor David Mellen, Portfolio Holder for Children's Services – Chair, Children's Partnership Board</p> <p>Ian Curryer, Corporate Director, Children and Families</p> <p>Lead Officer – Candida Brudenell, Director, Quality and Commissioning</p>	<p><u>Children's Partnership Board Members</u></p> <p>Aaron Riley, Young Person Board member</p> <p>Andy Sloan, Head Teacher, Rosehill School (Special School representation)</p> <p>Angela Horsley, Nottingham Children's Hospital</p> <p>Candida Brudenell, Director, Quality and Commissioning, Children and Families</p> <p>Chris Wallbanks, Programme Manager Early Intervention & Partnerships</p> <p>Cllr David Mellen (Chair), Portfolio Holder for Children's Services</p> <p>Darrell Redmond, Nottingham Equal</p> <p>Dawn Smith, Chief Operating Officer NHS Nottingham City Clinical Commissioning Group</p> <p>Gareth Owen, Head Teacher, Hadden Park High</p>

Graham Sheppard, District Manager, Job Centre Plus

Ian Curryer, Corporate Director of Children and Families

Jaimie Mansell, Young Person Board member

Jane Todd, Chief Executive of Nottingham City Council

Jane Belinda Francis, Head Teacher, Springfield Primary School

Jean Pardoe, Chief Executive of Nottingham & Nottinghamshire Futures
Jill Robey, Head Teacher, The Nottingham Nursery and Training Centre

Jon Collins, Leader of Council

Jon Rea, Engagement and Participation Officer

Lauren Davey, Young Person Board member

Malcom Cowgill, Principle, South Nottingham College

Mike Butler, Chief Executive, Djanogly City Academy Nottingham

Paula Webber, Senior Adviser Young People's Learning Agency

Paul Burnett, Independent Chair, Local Safeguarding Children Board

Phyllis Brackenbury, Assistant Director of Children, Young People, Families and Health Improvement, Nottingham CityCare, NHS

Sheila Wright, Deputy Chief Executive, Nottinghamshire Probation Trust

Shirley Smith, Assistant Director of Joint

	<p>Commissioning, NHS Nottingham City Clinical Commissioning Group</p> <p>Stephen McLaren, Urban Angel (representing the Voluntary Sector)</p> <p>Simon Nickless, Chief Superintendent, Nottinghamshire Police, City Division</p> <p>Uzair Hashmi, Young Person Board member</p> <p>Wendy Smith, Chair of the City of Nottingham Governors' Association (CONGA)</p>
--	---

COMPLETED SUMMER 2012

NOTTINGHAM CITY COUNCIL
SIGNIFICANT PARTNERSHIPS GOVERNANCE HEALTH CHECK 2012

In consultation with your partnership, please complete the tables below. Once the details have been agreed by the partnership please return them to alice.johnson@nottinghamcity.gov.uk. If you require any assistance please contact Alice Johnson, Policy Officer, Nottingham City Council, on 0115 87 63372.

Name of Partnership: Children's Partnership Board
NCC Lead Councillor: Councillor Mellen
NCC Corporate Director: Ian Curryer, Corporate Director, Children and Families
NCC Lead Officer: Candida Brudenell
Partnership Chief Executive/Manager (if appropriate): N/A

We have identified 8 areas of good governance. In each area we have provided a number of clear statements to illustrate what 'excellent' looks like for that area of governance. Using the criteria where 1 is 'excellent' and 4 is 'many key weaknesses' (page 1), please record a score (1-4) for each area of good governance for your significant partnership, making relevant notes on how the score could be improved.

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
1. Aims and objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership has clear aims and SMART objectives clearly set out and understandable • Strong alignment between the partnership's and The Nottingham Plan and 2030 vision • In pursuing the 2030 vision, the partnership has a set of values against which decision making and actions can be judged (e.g. code of conduct) • The partnership achieves more than the sum of its parts. It delivers the benefits identified in the 	1/2	Although in place this will be revisited in the light of the emerging Health & Well Being Board to ensure clarity of where all priorities of the CYPP are overseen ✓ ✓

business case		✓
<p>2. Membership and structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The structure is clear, is set out in Terms of Reference, a Memorandum of Agreement or other governing documents and is regularly reviewed. • Roles, responsibilities and contributions are defined for all partners and set out in the governing documents, including whistle-blowing, responding to compliments and complaints, risk assessment, personnel and financial management and financial and performance reporting. • Key partners provide effective leadership. Their leadership roles and responsibilities are understood and fulfilled. • The membership provides the necessary knowledge, skills and experience to do the job. Partners ensure that the right people are in the right place at the right time. • The partners are committed at the highest level to deliver the partnership's objectives. There are constructive working relationships between all partners, the right people attend the meetings, and these are supported by lead officers within partner agencies. 	2	<p>✓</p> <p>Individual roles & responsibilities may need to be clearer Add risk management processes to Terms of Reference</p> <p>On the whole attendance of members is consistent Discussion with partners in place</p> <p>Membership will be reviewed once the remit has been revisited (alongside HWB Board) including joining and leaving the partnership.</p> <p>✓</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes to membership and exit strategies are considered and the governing documents say what will happen if/when a partner wishes to leave. 		✓
<p>3. Decision making and accountability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision making is clear and transparent. Authority and delegations are set out in governing documents including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Who can make what decisions ○ Delegated responsibilities • The partnership has a clear procedure for dealing with conflicts of interest • Those making decisions are provided with information that is fit for the purpose – relevant, timely and give clear explanations of technical issues and their implications • Decisions are properly recorded and notified promptly to those who are affected by them. • The partnership has a communication plan to inform service users, members and the public about the partnership, its decisions, its achievements and successes, who is accountable and responsible for what. It provides routes for people to comment/contribute to the partnership’s work. • The partnership has clear lines of accountability and arrangements for reporting performance • Arrangements are in place for the partnership to report in a timely way on its work and achievements to Council officers and Councillors. Decisions and activities are 	1/2	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ The voice of parents needs to be considered ✓ ✓

<p>scrutinized at the appropriate level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are clear routes for members and partners to raise concerns. 		?
<p>4. Performance management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership reviews its progress and delivery against clear outcomes, outputs and milestones and takes prompt corrective action if necessary. • Delivery contracts and agreements are monitored and poor performance is tackled. 	1/2	<p>✓</p> <p>Performance is monitored closely. Delivery contracts are monitored by organisational commissioning teams there is scope for joint contracting being discussed between some partners</p>
<p>5. Evaluation and review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership regularly reviews its policies, strategies, membership and use of resources against its objectives and targets. • The partnership reviews its progress and delivery against clear outcomes, outputs and milestones and takes prompt corrective action if necessary. • Delivery contracts and agreements are monitored and poor performance is tackled. • Arrangements for responding to complaints and dealing with unforeseen problems needing a prompt response are in place and clearly stated. • There are clearly stated procedures to deal with disputes within the partnership and these are followed when necessary. 	1/2	<p>✓</p> <p>✓</p> <p>✓</p> <p>✓</p> <p>✓</p>
<p>6. Equalities</p>	1	✓

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership assesses its policies and programmes for their impact on equalities. • The partnership considers impact on inequality and deprivation as part of its performance management. 		<p>✓</p>
<p>7. Finance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership has access to resources to support delivery of its aims and objectives. It has a financial and /or procurement plan that identifies how it proposes to use these funding to achieve its objectives. • The role of the partnership in relation to finance and the extent of its powers to make financial decisions and approvals are stated and understood. • The partnership has effective arrangements for financial monitoring and reporting. • The partnership uses its resources well and demonstrates how it uses them to add value. It ensures that it uses resources to complement and enhance the work of individual partners. 	<p>2/3</p>	<p>The governance provides confidence that resources will be directed to priorities</p> <p>✓</p> <p>✓</p>
<p>8. Partnership Risk Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key people are aware of areas of potential risk in partnerships and the need to allocate resources to manage risk. • The partnership has an agreed mechanism for identifying, assessing and managing risks. • Appropriate tools have been developed and resources are in place to manage risk. 	<p>2</p>	<p>✓</p> <p>Risks and issues are considered as part of performance monitoring or Board discussions in response to changing policy/budget drivers</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partnership risks are well managed across organisational boundaries. There is clear evidence of improved partnership delivery through risk management. 		
---	--	--

Overall Headline Risk

Please fill in the table below the most significant risks which the Council needs to be aware of in terms of our involvement with this partnership. These can include strategic, financial and reputational risks. An example risk has been included to guide you. Some partnerships may not face any risks, whereas others may face many. For those which face many risks, please note only the three most significant risks.

Please write a brief description of the risk, give each risk a rating for likelihood and impact using the criteria below, and bullet point the mitigating actions which will help mitigate the risk.

Risk Description	Impact Rating	Likelihood Rating	Total Risk Rating (Impact x Likelihood)	Mitigating actions
Inability to hold partners together in a collaborative framework for progressing CYPP priorities during the existing and future period of financial restraint, requirements of the statutory HWB Board and partner restructuring may result in lower outcomes for children, young people and families and loss of reputation for Nottingham City Council	4	2	8	Strong and consistent leadership of the Chair of the Children's Partnership Board has a significant role Evolution of Partnership in line with emerging HWB Board Continue to facilitate multi agency approach
Inefficient use of financial resources through ineffective joint commissioning and incomplete needs assessment	3	3	9	Strong and consistent leadership of the Chair of the Children's Partnership Board has a significant role Evolution of Partnership in line with emerging HWB Board

				Evolution of commissioning processes
Relationship of emerging Health & WellBeing Board and GP Consortia with Children's Partnership Board	3	2	9	Continue to facilitate a multi agency approach of partners involved in NCC/NHS commissioning processes against targets

Likelihood rating scale:

- 6. Remote
- 7. Unlikely
- 8. Possible
- 9. Likely
- 10. Almost Certain

Impact rating scale:

- 11. Negligible
- 12. Minor
- 13. Moderate
- 14. Major
- 15. Catastrophic

COMPLETED SUMMER 2014

Registration document for Working Nottingham Partnership

Completed Summer 2012

Nottingham City Council - Partnership Governance Framework Registration of Significant Partnerships	
<p><u>Partnership</u></p> <p>Working Nottingham c/o Nottingham City Council, Economic Development Loxley House Station Street Nottingham NG2 3NG</p> <p>Tel: 0115 8764452 Email Nigel.jackson@nottinghamcity.gov.uk</p>	<p><u>Status</u></p> <p>Unincorporated voluntary partnership association</p> <p>One Nottingham Theme Partnership</p>
<p><u>Aims/focus</u></p> <p>To tackle poverty and deprivation by getting more local people into jobs, raising the skills level of people in Nottingham within a context of tackling poverty and tackling financial exclusion in Nottingham and to deliver the Working Nottingham priority of the SCS.</p>	
<p><u>Role in Nottingham Plan/ Council Plan</u></p> <p>Nottingham Plan – lead partnership for Working Nottingham Implementation Plan.</p> <p>Council Plan – contributes/links to WN 1.1; WN 1.2; WN2.1; WN 3.1; WN 4.2</p> <p>Local PIs – Coordinating and encouraging key partners to contribute to: Reducing unemployment by 25% over the next 4 years, Increasing the city's employment rate to 75% & raising the proportion of adults with a level 2 qualification to 90%.</p>	
<p><u>Resources</u></p>	<p><u>Reporting</u></p> <p><u>NCC</u> Corporate Delivery Board Executive Board</p> <p><u>Other</u></p>

	One Nottingham
<p><u>Council nominees, responsible Corporate Directors and lead officers</u></p> <p>Councillor John Collins, Portfolio Holder for Employment and Skills – Vice Chair</p> <p>John Yarham, Director of Economic Innovation and Skills</p> <p>Lead officer – Nigel Jackson, Head of Employment and Skills</p>	<p><u>Members of the Board</u></p> <p>Andrew Price, Young Peoples Learning Agency, Chair</p> <p>George Pashley, Director, Organisational Development, Nottingham City Homes</p> <p>John Yarham, Director, Young People, Learning and Skills, Nottingham City Council</p> <p>Janet Charlton, Notts Training Network</p> <p>David Kirkham, Strategic Manager, Employment & Skills Board</p> <p>Jo Bradley, Executive Director, Groundwork Greater Nottingham</p> <p>Don Hayes, Chief Executive, Enable</p> <p>Anne Danvers, Senior External Relations Manager, Job Centre Plus</p> <p>Natalie Gasson, Federation of Small Businesses</p> <p>Nigel Cooke, One Nottingham</p> <p>John Dowson, Chamber of Commerce</p> <p>Andrew Hall, Nottingham City Council, Head of External Affairs</p> <p>Qumar Zaman, First Enterprise</p> <p>Tony Hamilton, Nottingham Equal</p> <p>Gareth Thomas, Skills Funding Agency</p> <p>Mal Cowgill, S.Notts College</p> <p>Amarjit Basi, NCN</p>

NOTTINGHAM CITY COUNCIL
SIGNIFICANT PARTNERSHIPS GOVERNANCE HEALTH CHECK 2012

In consultation with your partnership, please complete the tables below. Once the details have been agreed by the partnership please return them to alice.coleman@nottinghamcity.gov.uk. If you require any assistance please contact Alice Coleman, Policy Officer, Nottingham City Council, on 0115 87 63372.

Name of Partnership: Working Nottingham
NCC Lead Councillor: Nick McDonald
NCC Corporate Director: David Bishop
NCC Lead Officer: Nicki Jenkins
Partnership Chief Executive/Manager (if appropriate):

We have identified 8 areas of good governance. In each area we have provided a number of clear statements to illustrate what 'excellent' looks like for that area of governance. Using the criteria where 1 is 'excellent' and 4 is 'many key weaknesses' (page 1), please record a score (1-4) for each area of good governance for your significant partnership, making relevant notes on how the score could be improved.

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
1. Aims and objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership has clear aims and SMART objectives clearly set out and understandable • Strong alignment between the partnership's and The Nottingham Plan and 2030 vision • In pursuing the 2030 vision, the partnership has a set of values against which decision making and actions can be judged (e.g. code of conduct) • The partnership achieves more than the sum of its parts. It delivers the benefits identified in the 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnership has clear aims and targets as set out in the Nottingham Plan. The Partnership's Terms of Reference (TOR) based on delivering the Employment & Skills (E&S) elements of the Nottingham plan were refreshed last year. • The work of the Partnership is guided by a delivery plan which follows the key E&S elements of the Nottingham Plan.

business case		
<p>2. Membership and structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The structure is clear, is set out in Terms of Reference, a Memorandum of Agreement or other governing documents and is regularly reviewed. • Roles, responsibilities and contributions are defined for all partners and set out in the governing documents, including whistle-blowing, responding to compliments and complaints, risk assessment, personnel and financial management and financial and performance reporting. • Key partners provide effective leadership. Their leadership roles and responsibilities are understood and fulfilled. • The membership provides the necessary knowledge, skills and experience to do the job. Partners ensure that the right people are in the right place at the right time. • The partners are committed at the highest level to deliver the partnership's objectives. There are constructive working relationships between all partners, the right people attend the meetings, and these are supported by lead officers within partner agencies. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structure set out in TOR is clear and is reviewed annually. Roles and responsibilities are set out in TOR. Partners have taken an active role in the development of the strategy and action plan for the partnership. • Membership has the necessary level of expertise and experience to do the job and there are constructive working relationships between partners • High level commitment is demonstrated by participation in discussions and attendance, though partner proactiveness between meetings needs improvement.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes to membership and exit strategies are considered and the governing documents say what will happen if/when a partner wishes to leave. 		
<p>3. Decision making and accountability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision making is clear and transparent. Authority and delegations are set out in governing documents including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Who can make what decisions ○ Delegated responsibilities • The partnership has a clear procedure for dealing with conflicts of interest • Those making decisions are provided with information that is fit for the purpose – relevant, timely and give clear explanations of technical issues and their implications • Decisions are properly recorded and notified promptly to those who are affected by them. • The partnership has a communication plan to inform service users, members and the public about the partnership, its decisions, its achievements and successes, who is accountable and responsible for what. It provides routes for people to comment/contribute to the partnership’s work. • The partnership has clear lines of accountability and arrangements for reporting performance • Arrangements are in place for the partnership to report in a timely way on its work and achievements to Council officers and Councillors. Decisions and activities are 	<p>2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Partnership has clear lines of accountability to ON board and achievements are reported regularly. • TOR outlines decision making responsibilities and reporting mechanisms • Decisions are formally recorded in the minutes. • A Communications process operates, but a more formal plan has yet to be developed

scrutinized at the appropriate level.		
4. Performance management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership reviews its progress and delivery against clear outcomes, outputs and milestones and takes prompt corrective action if necessary. • Delivery contracts and agreements are monitored and poor performance is tackled. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Partnership reviews its progress on a regular basis and at each meeting a performance dashboard is considered. The Delivery Plan is a dynamic document and changes in response to identified need.
5. Evaluation and review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership regularly reviews its policies, strategies, membership and use of resources against its objectives and targets. • The partnership reviews its progress and delivery against clear outcomes, outputs and milestones and takes prompt corrective action if necessary. • Delivery contracts and agreements are monitored and poor performance is tackled. • Arrangements for responding to complaints and dealing with unforeseen problems needing a prompt response are in place and clearly stated. • There are clearly stated procedures to deal with disputes within the partnership and these are followed when necessary. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Partnership Delivery Plan is closely monitored at each meeting. Progress against outcomes is reviewed and additional or corrective action is agreed.
6. Equalities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership assesses its policies and 		

<p>programmes for their impact on equalities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership considers impact on inequality and deprivation as part of its performance management. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addressing deprivation and inequality is the core purpose of this group in relation to worklessness. The partnership has a strong focus on issues of inequality and deprivation in all of its activity and evaluation.
<p>7. Finance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership has access to resources to support delivery of its aims and objectives. It has a financial and /or procurement plan that identifies how it proposes to use these funding to achieve its objectives. • The role of the partnership in relation to finance and the extent of its powers to make financial decisions and approvals are stated and understood. • The partnership has effective arrangements for financial monitoring and reporting. • The partnership uses its resources well and demonstrates how it uses them to add value. It ensures that it uses resources to complement and enhance the work of individual partners. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst no funding is allocated to the Partnership, it does seek to align the Employment and Skills expenditure of the various organisations which are members to ensure that the impact of this is greater than the sum of its parts.
<p>8. Partnership Risk Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key people are aware of areas of potential risk in partnerships and the need to allocate resources to manage risk. • The partnership has an agreed mechanism for identifying, assessing and managing risks. • Appropriate tools have been developed and resources are in place to manage risk. • Partnership risks are well managed across organisational boundaries. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Partnership considers the level of risk in all the recommendations and decisions it takes. • Risk Management is an integral part of the delivery plan and project consideration.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is clear evidence of improved partnership delivery through risk management. 		
---	--	--

Overall Headline Risk

Please fill in the table below the most significant risks which the Council needs to be aware of in terms of our involvement with this partnership. These can include strategic, financial and reputational risks. An example risk has been included to guide you.

Some partnerships may not face any risks, whereas others may face many. For those which face many risks, please note only the three most significant risks.

Please write a brief description of the risk, give each risk a rating for likelihood and impact using the criteria below, and bullet point the mitigating actions which will help mitigate the risk.

Risk Description	Impact Rating	Likelihood Rating	Total Risk Rating (Impact x Likelihood)	Mitigating actions
Lack of discretionary resource undermines strategy	3	3	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focusing partnership activity on adding value to existing mainstream provision.
Failure to influence key mainstream deliverers	4	3	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring proactive engagement of partners at all levels into activities.

Likelihood rating scale:

11. Remote
12. Unlikely
13. Possible
14. Likely
15. Almost Certain

Impact rating scale:

16. Negligible
17. Minor
18. Moderate
19. Major
20. Catastrophic

Registration document for Green Nottingham Partnership

Completed Summer 2012

Nottingham City Council - Partnership Governance Framework Registration of Significant Partnerships	
<p><u>Partnership</u></p> <p>Green Nottingham Partnership</p> <p>c/o Nottingham City Council Sustainability and Climate Change Loxley House Station Street Nottingham NG2 3NG</p> <p>Tel: 0115 87 65652 Email: gail.scholes@nottinghamcity.gov.uk</p>	<p><u>Status</u></p> <p>Unincorporated voluntary partnership association</p> <p>One Nottingham Theme Partnership</p>
<p><u>Aims/focus</u></p> <p>To lead the development and delivery of a strategy for the environment, energy and climate change and provide a clear voice on long term issues of environmental sustainability. Specifically to deliver the objectives and meet the targets in the Green Nottingham cross-cutting theme of the Nottingham Plan.</p>	
<p><u>Role in Nottingham Plan/ LAA /LDF /Council Plan</u></p> <p>Nottingham Plan – lead partnership for Green Nottingham cross-cutting theme of Nottingham Plan</p> <p>Led development of Nottingham city’s Climate Change Strategy, and contributed to the Council’s adaptation action plan. Contributes to delivery of the city Energy Strategy and the Waste Strategy</p> <p>Local Development Framework and Core Strategy Lead partnership for Objective 10 (environmentally responsible development). Contributes to Objective 1 (high quality new housing); Objective 2 (timely and viable infrastructure); Objective 3 (Economic prosperity for all; Objective 4 (excellent transport systems and reducing the need to travel); Objective 7 (Regeneration); Objective 8 (health and well being); Objective 11 (protecting and developing new Green Infrastructure</p> <p>Council Plan - contributes to WCN 4.1.; NN 2.1, NN3.3, NN 4.1.</p>	

<p><u>Resources</u></p> <p>£0</p> <p>NCC provides secretariat support through the Sustainability and Climate Change Section</p>	<p><u>Reporting</u></p> <p>One Nottingham</p>
<p><u>Council nominees, responsible Corporate Directors and lead officers</u></p> <p>Councillor Alan Clark, Portfolio Holder for Energy and Sustainability</p> <p>John Kelly, Corporate Director for Communities</p> <p>Lead officer – Gail Scholes, Head, Climate Change and Sustainability.</p>	<p><u>Membership</u></p> <p>Chair - Richard Barlow, Browne Jacobson</p> <p>The following businesses attend/contribute to the Green Partnership Meetings:</p> <p>The Vine Severn Trent Nottingham City - NHS Nottingham University Nottingham Trent University Environment Agency Greater Nottingham Transport Partnership Boots Derbyshire & Nottinghamshire Chamber of Commerce Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust Groundworks– 3rd Sector Advocate Experian Nottingham Development Enterprise One Nottingham Nottingham Energy Partnership Browne Jacobson Nottingham Equal</p>

NOTTINGHAM CITY COUNCIL
SIGNIFICANT PARTNERSHIPS GOVERNANCE HEALTH CHECK 2012

In consultation with your partnership, please complete the tables below. Once the details have been agreed by the partnership please return them to alice.johnson@nottinghamcity.gov.uk. If you require any assistance please contact Alice Johnson, Policy Officer, Nottingham City Council, on 0115 87 63372.

Name of Partnership: Green Nottingham
NCC Lead Councillor: Councillor Alan Clark
NCC Corporate Director: John Kelly
NCC Lead Officer: Andy Vaughan, Director of Neighbourhood Services
Partnership Chief Executive/Manager (if appropriate): Gail Scholes, Head of Sustainability and Climate Change

We have identified 8 areas of good governance. In each area we have provided a number of clear statements to illustrate what 'excellent' looks like for that area of governance. Using the criteria where 1 is 'excellent' and 4 is 'many key weaknesses' (page 1), please record a score (1-4) for each area of good governance for your significant partnership, making relevant notes on how the score could be improved.

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
1. Aims and objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership has clear aims and SMART objectives clearly set out and understandable • Strong alignment between the partnership's and The Nottingham Plan and 2030 vision • In pursuing the 2030 vision, the partnership has a set of values against which decision making and actions can be judged (e.g. code of conduct) • The partnership achieves more than the sum of its parts. It delivers the benefits identified in the business case 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is strong alignment between the partnership and the Nottingham Plan with the Green Nottingham Partnership taking responsibility for the implementation of the environmental targets and objectives in the Sustainable Community Strategy, including targets for reducing carbon emissions, increasing low carbon energy generation and minimising environmental impact while reducing its vulnerability to a changing climate.

<p>2. Membership and structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The structure is clear, is set out in Terms of Reference, a Memorandum of Agreement or other governing documents and is regularly reviewed. • Roles, responsibilities and contributions are defined for all partners and set out in the governing documents, including whistle-blowing, responding to compliments and complaints, risk assessment, personnel and financial management and financial and performance reporting. • Key partners provide effective leadership. Their leadership roles and responsibilities are understood and fulfilled. • The membership provides the necessary knowledge, skills and experience to do the job. Partners ensure that the right people are in the right place at the right time. • The partners are committed at the highest level to deliver the partnership's objectives. There are constructive working relationships between all partners, the right people attend the meetings, and these are supported by lead officers within partner agencies. • Changes to membership and exit strategies are considered and the governing documents say what will happen if/when a partner wishes to leave. 	<p>2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The roles, responsibilities and expectations of members of the Green Nottingham Partnership are detailed in the terms of reference. However, this is in need of a refresh. • Whistle-blowing and complaints are dealt with through the processes of Nottingham City Council. • Key partners promote and support the aims and values of the Green Nottingham Partnership by leadership and example within their own organisations and within the community. Members are of an appropriate level to influence and contribute to step-change in environmental impact and climate change. Two members have just been appointed who are third sector advocates with a track record or interest in the field of environmental impact and climate change, and a further member has been appointed as faith group advocate. • Full meetings take place every quarter and time limited task and finish groups (set up to meet specific need) are made up of relevant and appropriate partners. • Both full and task and finish meetings are conducted with regard to accepted good practice. The principles of openness, fairness and parity of esteem are honoured at all times. • Themed sub-groups have been finalised and are providing an effective co-ordinated approach to Green Nottingham Partnership's aims. These groups engage with other specialist partners to address the strategic priorities as determined by the Green Nottingham Partnership.
<p>3. Decision making and accountability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision making is clear and transparent. Authority and delegations are set out in 	<p>2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnership decisions are made based on consensus and are clearly recorded in the minutes. • The Green Nottingham Partnership has a Knowledge Hub

<p>governing documents including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Who can make what decisions ○ Delegated responsibilities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership has a clear procedure for dealing with conflicts of interest • Those making decisions are provided with information that is fit for the purpose – relevant, timely and give clear explanations of technical issues and their implications • Decisions are properly recorded and notified promptly to those who are affected by them. • The partnership has a communication plan to inform service users, members and the public about the partnership, its decisions, its achievements and successes, who is accountable and responsible for what. It provides routes for people to comment/contribute to the partnership’s work. • The partnership has clear lines of accountability and arrangements for reporting performance • Arrangements are in place for the partnership to report in a timely way on its work and achievements to Council officers and Councillors. Decisions and activities are scrutinized at the appropriate level. • There are clear routes for members and partners to raise concerns. 		<p>(web-based forum) for communication between members, and produces a quarterly newsletter celebrating successes and achievements. It is currently putting together a communication plan and steps are being taken to work with One Nottingham to build capacity for the production of a plan and to identify suitable resource to implement that plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are clear lines of accountability to Nottingham City Council and arrangements for reporting performance. The Green Nottingham Partnership reports directly to the One Nottingham Executive Group and to other partnership bodies as appropriate. • No procedure for conflict of interest has yet been put in place, though such issues are in practice identified and appropriate steps put in place on a case by case basis.
<p>4. Performance management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership reviews its progress and delivery against clear outcomes, outputs and milestones and takes prompt corrective action if necessary. 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The themed sub-groups support an effective co-ordinated approach to performance management and tackling poor performance. • Performance against targets is monitored regularly and reported to the Green Nottingham Partnership at its

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivery contracts and agreements are monitored and poor performance is tackled. 		<p>meetings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Themed sub groups are to contribute to the annual report. • The Partnership's key challenge is delivery against stretching targets which requires community behaviour change. It has therefore supported the development of a city-wide climate change strategy, (launched January 2012), which seeks to engage with the community through a ward based approach and encourage the necessary changes in behaviour. • All baseline figures against which to assess performance have been assembled.
<p>5. Evaluation and review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership regularly reviews its policies, strategies, membership and use of resources against its objectives and targets. • The partnership reviews its progress and delivery against clear outcomes, outputs and milestones and takes prompt corrective action if necessary. • Delivery contracts and agreements are monitored and poor performance is tackled. • Arrangements for responding to complaints and dealing with unforeseen problems needing a prompt response are in place and clearly stated. • There are clearly stated procedures to deal with disputes within the partnership and these are followed when necessary. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership regularly reviews policies, strategies, membership and use of resources. • Performance against targets is monitored and reported to the Green Nottingham Partnership at its meetings (via annual report) • A complaints process and procedures to deal with disputes within the partnership will be included when the terms of reference are next reviewed.
<p>6. Equalities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership assesses its policies and programmes for their impact on equalities. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership considers the impact of policies and programmes on equality and deprivation when commissioning strategic environmental impact and climate

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership considers impact on inequality and deprivation as part of its performance management. 		<p>change priorities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One faith group advocate has been appointed as a member of the Green Nottingham Partnership
<p>7. Finance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership has access to resources to support delivery of its aims and objectives. It has a financial and /or procurement plan that identifies how it proposes to use these funding to achieve its objectives. • The role of the partnership in relation to finance and the extent of its powers to make financial decisions and approvals are stated and understood. • The partnership has effective arrangements for financial monitoring and reporting. • The partnership uses its resources well and demonstrates how it uses them to add value. It ensures that it uses resources to complement and enhance the work of individual partners. 	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Green Nottingham Partnership has access to limited resources to support delivery of its aims and objectives through Nottingham City Council. • Several high profile projects have been implemented through the partnership, including the installation of solar PV panels on social housing in the city. • By producing the Energy, Waste and Climate Change Strategies, the City Council has demonstrated leadership and provided the pathway for the required funding decisions. • By conducting Nottingham's own Mini Stern review of the impact of climate change upon Nottingham, the Partnership is establishing the opportunities for maximum efficiencies in spending decisions upon green technology solutions which will inevitably be required by the City to address its environmental responsibility and challenges. • Presentations on new funding opportunities are regularly scheduled for members.
<p>8. Partnership Risk Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key people are aware of areas of potential risk in partnerships and the need to allocate resources to manage risk. • The partnership has an agreed mechanism for identifying, assessing and managing risks. • Appropriate tools have been developed and resources are in place to manage risk. • Partnership risks are well managed across organisational boundaries. 	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risks are managed by the individual partner organisations and therefore the partnership is not directly associated with risks. • The Partnership will utilise risk management to the extent relevant to its operations

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is clear evidence of improved partnership delivery through risk management. 		
---	--	--

Overall Headline Risk

Please fill in the table below the most significant risks which the Council needs to be aware of in terms of our involvement with this partnership. These can include strategic, financial and reputational risks. An example risk has been included to guide you.

Some partnerships may not face any risks, whereas others may face many. For those which face many risks, please note only the three most significant risks.

Please write a brief description of the risk, give each risk a rating for likelihood and impact using the criteria below, and bullet point the mitigating actions which will help mitigate the risk.

Risk Description	Impact Rating	Likelihood Rating	Total Risk Rating (Impact x Likelihood)	Mitigating actions
The Government's spending review and cuts to the public sector will continue to have implications for the Green Nottingham Partnership in terms of resources and finance.	5	4	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The role of the Green Nottingham Partnership will be reviewed once more is known of the implications. • The terms of reference and membership of the Green Nottingham Partnership will be reviewed as appropriate.

Likelihood rating scale: 16. Remote 17. Unlikely 18. Possible 19. Likely 20. Almost Certain	Impact rating scale: 21. Negligible 22. Minor 23. Moderate 24. Major 25. Catastrophic
--	--

Registration document for Greater Nottingham Transport Partnership (GTNP)

Completed Summer 2012

Nottingham City Council - Partnership Governance Framework Registration of Significant Partnerships	
<p><u>Partnership</u></p> <p>Greater Nottingham Transport Partnership c/o Ridewise The Lenton Centre Willoughby Street Lenton Nottingham NG7 1RQ</p> <p>Tel: 07791724548 Email: helenhemstock@thebigwheel.org.uk Website: http://www.thebigwheel.org.uk</p>	<p><u>Status</u></p> <p>Unincorporated voluntary association</p>
<p>Gary Smerdon-White, Greater Nottingham Transport Partnership Interim Chair</p>	
<p><u>Aims/focus</u></p> <p>Provides forum for Greater Nottingham – wide dialogue on transport issues across administrative boundaries between local authorities, transport operators and stakeholders in other public, private and third sectors. It undertakes research, marketing, publicity, information, consultation, bidding for external funding and lobbying Government on integrated transport policy, particularly related to the Local Transport Plan (LTP).</p>	
<p><u>Role in Nottingham Plan/Council Plan/Local Development Framework</u></p> <p>Nottingham Plan – contribution to World Class Nottingham Implementation Plan on congestion; leads Neighbourhood Nottingham Programme target on increasing use of public transport. GNTN delivery will also make an impact on targets for Working Nottingham, Healthy Nottingham and Green Nottingham Implementation Plans and has a key role in improving accessibility of services and opportunities.</p> <p>Local Development Framework and Core Strategy Sustainable land use planning will depend on good infrastructure planning including roads and public transport links.</p> <p>Council Plan – contributes/relates to priorities relating to transport infrastructure, public transport, roll out of 20 mph zones across the City and establishing a network</p>	

<p>of on-road cycling corridors. Currently a combination of around 30 National/Local Indicators are monitored.</p>	
<p><u>Resources 2012/13</u></p> <p>Local Sustainable Transport Fund - £165k</p> <p>Other – Project based funding £13500 Broxtowe BC £1000 event sponsorship £10,000 tbc</p>	<p><u>Reporting</u></p> <p><u>NCC</u> Overview and Scrutiny Committee</p> <p>Joint (City and County) Planning and Transportation Advisory Committee</p> <p><u>Other</u> Joint Planning Advisory Board (to ensure effective integration of LTP and Core Strategy)</p>
<p><u>Council nominees, responsible Corporate Directors and lead officers</u></p> <p>Lead Councillor Jane Urquhart, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transport</p> <p>Supporting Councillor Alex Norris, Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhood Working</p> <p>David Bishop, Corporate Director of Development</p> <p>Lead Officer – Sue Flack, Director of Planning and Transport</p>	<p><u>Members of the Board</u></p> <p><u>Private Sector</u> Steve Beverley – Victoria and Broadmarsh Centres John Dowson – Chamber of Commerce Alex Hornby – Trent Barton Buses Nicola Tidy – Nottingham City Transport Natalie Gasson – Federation of Small Businesses Rachel Doar – Experian Ged O’Donoghue – Professor of Education and Surveying, Nottingham Trent University</p> <p><u>Local Authority Sector</u> Kevin Sharman – Transport Strategy, Nottinghamshire County Council Chris Carter –Transport Strategy Manager, Nottingham City Council Nottingham City Council Andy Gibbons – Public Transport Manager, Nottingham City Council Steve Hunt – Traffic Manager, Nottingham City Council</p> <p><u>Public Sector</u> Helen Ross, NHS Nottingham City Clive Young, NUH NHS Trust</p> <p><u>Voluntary and Community Sector</u> Helen Hemstock – Big Wheel Team,</p>

	<p>GNTP Elsbeth Mallowen – Nottinghamshire Rural Community Council</p> <p>Forum – includes broader business interests, environmental groups, transport providers, District Councils, members of the public</p>
--	--

COMPLETED SUMMER 2012

NOTTINGHAM CITY COUNCIL
SIGNIFICANT PARTNERSHIPS GOVERNANCE HEALTH CHECK 2012

Completed Summer 2012

In consultation with your partnership, please complete the tables below. Once the details have been agreed by the partnership please return them to alice.johnson@nottinghamcity.gov.uk. If you require any assistance please contact Alice Johnson, Policy Officer, Nottingham City Council, on 0115 87 63372.

Name of Partnership: Greater Nottingham Transport Partnership
NCC Lead Councillor: Cllr Jane Urquhart
NCC Corporate Director: David Bishop
NCC Lead Officer: Sue Flack
Partnership Chief Executive/Manager (if appropriate): Gary Smerdon White (Interim Chair)

We have identified 8 areas of good governance. In each area we have provided a number of clear statements to illustrate what 'excellent' looks like for that area of governance. Using the criteria where 1 is 'excellent' and 4 is 'many key weaknesses' (page 1), please record a score (1-4) for each area of good governance for your significant partnership, making relevant notes on how the score could be improved.

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
1. Aims and objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership has clear aims and SMART objectives clearly set out and understandable • Strong alignment between the partnership's and The Nottingham Plan and 2030 vision • In pursuing the 2030 vision, the partnership has a set of values against which decision making and actions can be judged (e.g. code of conduct) 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly defined aims and objectives • Oversees delivery against Nottingham Plan World Class Nottingham theme including public transport growth target • Conurbation wide vehicle for engaging with partners and stakeholders on strategic transport issues • Strong alignment with statutory Local Transport Plans and Local Sustainable Transport Fund

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The partnership achieves more than the sum of its parts. It delivers the benefits identified in the business case 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leads on common marketing strategy (Big Wheel) for local transport and communicating key messages to the wider public It is accepted that organisations may have different views and members are required to respect this. Partnership delivers added value in terms of coordinated lobbying, skill sharing and through identifying the best source and combining of resources
<p>2. Membership and structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The structure is clear, is set out in Terms of Reference, a Memorandum of Agreement or other governing documents and is regularly reviewed. Roles, responsibilities and contributions are defined for all partners and set out in the governing documents, including whistle-blowing, responding to compliments and complaints, risk assessment, personnel and financial management and financial and performance reporting. Key partners provide effective leadership. Their leadership roles and responsibilities are understood and fulfilled. The membership provides the necessary knowledge, skills and experience to do the job. Partners ensure that the right people are in the right place at the right time. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOR approved and reviewed as required Objectives and roles of partners are clearly defined Partnership chaired by a business sector representative Partnership hosted within the third sector by Ridewise not for profit company Representation from the public, private and voluntary sectors. Pro-activity of some business members has declined which is of concern but this has been recognised and the partners have asked that we recruit further members from the areas of business and health Membership benefits from a breadth of knowledge, skills and experience across the transport field Lead councillor attendance and participation Staff commissioned to provide support to partnership Scope to accommodate new members or involvement to cease as required Regular transport forums arranged to allow wider engagement with businesses and other organisations

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The partners are committed at the highest level to deliver the partnership's objectives. There are constructive working relationships between all partners, the right people attend the meetings, and these are supported by lead officers within partner agencies. Changes to membership and exit strategies are considered and the governing documents say what will happen if/when a partner wishes to leave. 		
<p>3. Decision making and accountability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decision making is clear and transparent. Authority and delegations are set out in governing documents including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who can make what decisions Delegated responsibilities The partnership has a clear procedure for dealing with conflicts of interest Those making decisions are provided with information that is fit for the purpose – relevant, timely and give clear explanations of technical issues and their implications Decisions are properly recorded and notified promptly to those who are affected by them. 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partnership established as an advisory board Function is to inform transport policy development and influence transport related funding and priorities rather than directly make decisions Partnership focuses on strategic issues (as distinct from operational) Scrutinises transport project delivery to improve quality and value for money Key role of partnership is to broker conflicts of interest through ensuring individual organisations are kept as informed as possible about transport policy developments Meetings are formally recorded with notes and papers circulated to all partnership representatives Meetings scheduled for the year ahead with papers circulated in advance of each meeting Wider engagement achieved through regular transport forums and publicity activity generated by the Big Wheel marketing team

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership has a communication plan to inform service users, members and the public about the partnership, its decisions, its achievements and successes, who is accountable and responsible for what. It provides routes for people to comment/contribute to the partnership's work. • The partnership has clear lines of accountability and arrangements for reporting performance • Arrangements are in place for the partnership to report in a timely way on its work and achievements to Council officers and Councillors. Decisions and activities are scrutinized at the appropriate level. • There are clear routes for members and partners to raise concerns. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communications strategy incorporated within annual Service Level Agreement with City Council • Communications Plan is agreed by the partnership and performance is formally reviewed quarterly
<p>4. Performance management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership reviews its progress and delivery against clear outcomes, outputs and milestones and takes prompt corrective action if necessary. • Delivery contracts and agreements are monitored and poor performance is tackled. 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnership delivery requirements are set out in annual Service Level Agreements with City and County Councils • Regular officer meetings arranged to oversee programme delivery and financial transactions • Quarterly progress reports produced and annual delivery reported to the Board • Partnership oversees delivery of Nottingham Plan public transport growth target

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<p>5. Evaluation and review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership regularly reviews its policies, strategies, membership and use of resources against its objectives and targets. • The partnership reviews its progress and delivery against clear outcomes, outputs and milestones and takes prompt corrective action if necessary. • Delivery contracts and agreements are monitored and poor performance is tackled. • Arrangements for responding to complaints and dealing with unforeseen problems needing a prompt response are in place and clearly stated. • There are clearly stated procedures to deal with disputes within the partnership and these are followed when necessary. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular reviews of strategy, policies and resources at GNTF meetings • Service Level Agreements in place with City although work with the County is less formalised. • The TOR make it clear that agreements made by the partnership are not binding and formal endorsement of the constituent bodies is required • It is the responsibility of representatives to use best endeavours to ensure that disagreements between partners do not damage the credibility of the partnership • Representatives are required to respect the views of other partners
<p>6. Equalities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership assesses its policies and programmes for their impact on equalities. • The partnership considers impact on inequality and deprivation as part of its performance management. 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Transport Plan and LSTF programme have been subject of a formal Equalities Impact Assessment process. Representatives of the partnership input into the process • A key function of the partnership is to ensure that transport policies are implemented in a fair manner and that equality implications have been fully considered

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<p>7. Finance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership has access to resources to support delivery of its aims and objectives. It has a financial and /or procurement plan that identifies how it proposes to use these funding to achieve its objectives. • The role of the partnership in relation to finance and the extent of its powers to make financial decisions and approvals are stated and understood. • The partnership has effective arrangements for financial monitoring and reporting. • The partnership uses its resources well and demonstrates how it uses them to add value. It ensures that it uses resources to complement and enhance the work of individual partners. 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership suffered from the withdrawal of regional development agency funding and reductions in Local Transport Plan which inevitably required a contraction of partnership activity. However the partnership has been flexible in its delivery plan and is responsive to resource availability. The partnership has managed what resources it has had despite cuts and successfully sought other funding to reduce the impact of cuts e.g. surpluses upon closure of GNP. • Due to a successful Nottingham Urban Area Local Sustainable Transport Fund (Department for Transport) key component bid and continued success in securing project funding the partnership has secured sufficient funding to sustain core activities and some growth of transport related business support to beyond 2015. • A further LSTF main bid has been successful and allows for an expanded programme of Big Wheel marketing and events programme to be implemented • Sponsorship opportunities are also being explored and some sponsors have supported GNTP events. • Further income has also been generated from local boroughs to support their sustainable travel programmes and projects. • The activities of the D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership and potential new Local Transport Body may result in new opportunities but as yet whether the partnership will be able to directly access funding remains unclear

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Associated with the transfer of activities to Ridewise Ltd new financial procedures and reporting mechanisms have been established. These mechanisms are integrated with those of the City Council to ensure efficient processing and auditing of transactions.
<p>8. Partnership Risk Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key people are aware of areas of potential risk in partnerships and the need to allocate resources to manage risk. The partnership has an agreed mechanism for identifying, assessing and managing risks. Appropriate tools have been developed and resources are in place to manage risk. Partnership risks are well managed across organisational boundaries. There is clear evidence of improved partnership delivery through risk management. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Representatives of the partnership are aware of key areas of risk and the partnership has the skills available to manage risks down. A longer term view of risk could perhaps be improved upon The Local Transport Plan programme and associated individual projects are subject to corporate risk management processes

Overall Headline Risk

Please fill in the table below the most significant risks which the Council needs to be aware of in terms of our involvement with this partnership. These can include strategic, financial and reputational risks. An example risk has been included to guide you.

Some partnerships may not face any risks, whereas others may face many. For those which face many risks, please note only the three most significant risks.

Please write a brief description of the risk, give each risk a rating for likelihood and impact using the criteria below, and bullet point the mitigating actions which will help mitigate the risk.

Risk Description	Impact Rating	Likelihood Rating	Total Risk Rating (Impact x Likelihood)	Mitigating actions
Strategic risk Capacity to deliver	4	3	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New network of flexible skilled staff that can be called in has been established and used • RideWise workers are now being used across all sustainable travel activity •
Reputational Introduction of Workplace Parking Levy causing tension between partnership members leading to fragmentation of the partnership damaging Nottingham's reputation	3	3	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GNTTP has been careful to maintain a neutral position on the WPL scheme and with the implementation of WPL risk is reduced – companies are working more comfortably with GNTTP • Involvement of a wide range of stakeholders in shaping the future direction of the partnership and associated activities • Capitalise on political support at local and national level for retention of the partnership and associated activity

Risk Description	Impact Rating	Likelihood Rating	Total Risk Rating (Impact x Likelihood)	Mitigating actions
<p>Financial risk</p> <p>Funding for Partnership now secure through to March 2015. Uncertainty regarding support funding beyond this timescale.</p>	4	2	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GNTP/Big Wheel activity scaled to funding availability • Actively supported Nottingham Urban Area Local Sustainable Transport Fund bids • Continuing to seek project funding and sponsorship opportunities • Importance of partnership working retained in new Local Transport Plans • Regular review of financial plan and LA takes responsibility for most of the finances of the partnership

Likelihood rating scale:

- 21. Remote
- 22. Unlikely
- 23. Possible
- 24. Likely
- 25. Almost Certain

Impact rating scale:

- 26. Negligible
- 27. Minor
- 28. Moderate
- 29. Major
- 30. Catastrophic

Registration document for Nottinghamshire Employment & Skills Board (ESB)

Completed Summer 2012

Nottingham City Council - Partnership Governance Framework Registration of Significant Partnerships	
<p><u>Partnership</u></p> <p>Nottinghamshire Employment and Skills Board c/o Enable Nottingham Voluntary Action Centre 7 Mansfield Rd Nottingham NG1 3FB</p> <p>Tel: 0115 988 8300 Email: through webpage http://www.nccesb.org.uk/contact-us/ Website: http://www.nccesb.org.uk/</p>	<p><u>Status</u></p> <p>Unincorporated voluntary association</p>
<p>David Kirkham, Employability and Skills Managers, Employment and Skills Board</p>	
<p><u>Aims/focus</u></p> <p>To improve the skills and employment opportunities of people across Nottinghamshire; helping to reduce poverty and raise aspirations.</p> <p>GNESB is the strategic partnership for Nottinghamshire for Employment and Skills, is a co-commissioning pilot with DWP and is piloting the "Fit for Work Programme.</p>	
<p><u>Role in Nottingham Plan/ Council Plan</u></p> <p>It supports work on Working Nottingham Implementation Plan targets to increase City employment rate; raise % adults with minimum Level 2 qualification; take City out of 10% deprived authority areas; take all neighbourhoods out of most deprived 5%; reduce childhood poverty.</p> <p>Key contribution to Healthy Nottingham Implementation Plan target to improve mental health and wellbeing (through access to work).</p> <p>Council Plan – WN 1.1; WN 2.1</p>	

<u>Resources</u> <u>Infrastructure</u>	<u>Reporting</u> To funders for specific projects only
<u>Council nominees, responsible Corporate Directors and lead officers</u> Responsible Corporate Director – John Yarham, Director for Economic Innovation and Skills Lead Officer – Nigel Jackson, Employment and Skills Manager	<u>Members of the Board</u> Sally Camm, Capital One (Chair) New College Nottingham Janet Charlton, Nottinghamshire Training Network Zoe Gallagher, Business Sector Nick Harrington, Laing O'Rourke Don Hayes, ENABLE David Kirkham, ESB Executive Team Cath Lee, Federation of Small Businesses Phil Lovett, ESB Executive Team Maria Lyle, BIS Local Sarah Mant, Ikano (on behalf of Sarah Murphy) Jean Pardoe, Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Futures Graham Sheppard, Jobcentre Plus Joy Simpsom, Nottinghamshire Health and Social Care Community Workforce Team Cllr Andy Stewart, Nottinghamshire County Council Gareth Thomas, Skills Funding Agency John Yarham, Nottingham City Council George Cowcher, Derbyshire & Nottinghamshire Chamber of Commerce Matt Lockley, Nottinghamshire County Council John Marsden, Alliance Boots Sarah Murphy, Ikano Karl Sirrell, Federation of Small Businesses Bob Wilmot, Business Sector

NOTTINGHAM CITY COUNCIL
SIGNIFICANT PARTNERSHIPS GOVERNANCE HEALTH CHECK 2012

Completed Summer 2012

In consultation with your partnership, please complete the tables below. Once the details have been agreed by the partnership please return them to alice.coleman@nottinghamcity.gov.uk. If you require any assistance please contact Alice Coleman, Policy Officer, Nottingham City Council, on 0115 87 63372.

Name of Partnership: Employment and Skills Board
NCC Lead Councillor: Cllr Jon Collins
NCC Corporate Director: David Bishop
NCC Lead Officer: Nicki Jenkins
Partnership Chief Executive/Manager (if appropriate): Sally Camm (Chair) David Kirkham Lead Support

We have identified 8 areas of good governance. In each area we have provided a number of clear statements to illustrate what 'excellent' looks like for that area of governance. Using the criteria where 1 is 'excellent' and 4 is 'many key weaknesses' (page 1), please record a score (1-4) for each area of good governance for your significant partnership, making relevant notes on how the score could be improved.

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
1. Aims and objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership has clear aims and SMART objectives clearly set out and understandable • Strong alignment between the partnership's and The Nottingham Plan and 2030 vision • In pursuing the 2030 vision, the partnership has a set of values against which decision making and actions can be judged (e.g. code of conduct) 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ESB has five year strategic plan, strategy summary and two year implementation planning cycle. • Nottingham City Council heavily involved in the delivery of the strategy, with strong endorsement from CE of ESB's strategic aims and objectives. • Officers have worked to ensure alignment with the Nottingham Plan and the work of the Working Nottingham Employment and Skills Partnership.

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The partnership achieves more than the sum of its parts. It delivers the benefits identified in the business case 		
<p>2. Membership and structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The structure is clear, is set out in Terms of Reference, a Memorandum of Agreement or other governing documents and is regularly reviewed. Roles, responsibilities and contributions are defined for all partners and set out in the governing documents, including whistle-blowing, responding to compliments and complaints, risk assessment, personnel and financial management and financial and performance reporting. Key partners provide effective leadership. Their leadership roles and responsibilities are understood and fulfilled. The membership provides the necessary knowledge, skills and experience to do the job. Partners ensure that the right people are in the right place at the right time. The partners are committed at the highest level to deliver the partnership's objectives. There are constructive working relationships between all partners, the right people attend the meetings, and these are supported by lead officers within partner agencies. 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear TOR, structures in place for revisiting and revising governance and responsibilities. Advisory Board in place to oversee delivery, priorities activity according to risk and report on overall performance on a bi-annular cycle. Increasingly private sector led with a good mix of representation across private, public and voluntary sectors. Director and officer level leadership defined. Membership is reviewed according to strategic plan and implementation priorities.

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes to membership and exit strategies are considered and the governing documents say what will happen if/when a partner wishes to leave. 		
<p>3. Decision making and accountability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decision making is clear and transparent. Authority and delegations are set out in governing documents including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who can make what decisions Delegated responsibilities The partnership has a clear procedure for dealing with conflicts of interest Those making decisions are provided with information that is fit for the purpose – relevant, timely and give clear explanations of technical issues and their implications Decisions are properly recorded and notified promptly to those who are affected by them. The partnership has a communication plan to inform service users, members and the public about the partnership, its decisions, its achievements and successes, who is accountable and responsible for what. It provides routes for people to comment/contribute to the partnership’s work. The partnership has clear lines of accountability and arrangements for reporting performance 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bi-annual reporting cycle in place with advisory board driving actions/ performance and managing risks. TOR clarifies roles and responsibilities and procedures for decision making and dealing with conflicts of interest. All decisions are recorded as part of the minutes which are published and are publicly available. The partnership communicates externally, through a number of media- email bulletins, website activity and regular calendar of events.

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arrangements are in place for the partnership to report in a timely way on its work and achievements to Council officers and Councillors. Decisions and activities are scrutinized at the appropriate level. 		
<p>4. Performance management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership reviews its progress and delivery against clear outcomes, outputs and milestones and takes prompt corrective action if necessary. • Delivery contracts and agreements are monitored and poor performance is tackled. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arrangements are in place for regular reporting of partnership performance. Risks are recorded and reviewed to inform priority actions. There is a measure of success template to determine progress made and re-prioritise activity.
<p>5. Evaluation and review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership regularly reviews its policies, strategies, membership and use of resources against its objectives and targets. • The partnership reviews its progress and delivery against clear outcomes, outputs and milestones and takes prompt corrective action if necessary. • Delivery contracts and agreements are monitored and poor performance is tackled. • Arrangements for responding to complaints and dealing with unforeseen problems needing a prompt response are in place and clearly stated. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bi annual reviews are in place. A search committee has a brief to review membership on a regular basis in line with policy changes. Commissioned activity is monitored on a monthly basis and through specialist sector groups, including the NHS led health and work group. • The ESB has been part of a number of national evaluations, including through the city strategy network and has been highlighted as a model of good practice.

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are clearly stated procedures to deal with disputes within the partnership and these are followed when necessary. 		
<p>6. Equalities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership assesses its policies and programmes for their impact on equalities. • The partnership considers impact on inequality and deprivation as part of its performance management. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social inclusion objectives are given a high priority in the implementation plan.
<p>7. Finance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership has access to resources to support delivery of its aims and objectives. It has a financial and /or procurement plan that identifies how it proposes to use these funding to achieve its objectives. • The role of the partnership in relation to finance and the extent of its powers to make financial decisions and approvals are stated and understood. • The partnership has effective arrangements for financial monitoring and reporting. • The partnership uses its resources well and demonstrates how it uses them to add value. It ensures that it uses resources to complement and enhance the work of individual partners. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The executive team is resourced to support the ESB and its partnership and uses resources to complement Nottingham City Council priorities. • The ESB is a proven vehicle for leveraging additional funds for Nottingham and Nottinghamshire. It is currently working alongside NCC to deliver elements of the City Skills Fund and City Deal initiatives. • Funds for additional procurement are currently limited; however the partnership has been successful in influencing partner funds and will build on this approach through the delivery of its priorities.

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<p>8. Partnership Risk Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key people are aware of areas of potential risk in partnerships and the need to allocate resources to manage risk. • The partnership has an agreed mechanism for identifying, assessing and managing risks. • Appropriate tools have been developed and resources are in place to manage risk. • Partnership risks are well managed across organisational boundaries. • There is clear evidence of improved partnership delivery through risk management. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The advisory board is responsible for managing risk on behalf of the ESB. Actions are prioritised according to the impact on key objectives and likelihood.

COMPLETED SUMMER 2022

Overall Headline Risk

Please fill in the table below the most significant risks which the Council needs to be aware of in terms of our involvement with this partnership. These can include strategic, financial and reputational risks. An example risk has been included to guide you.

Some partnerships may not face any risks, whereas others may face many. For those which face many risks, please note only the three most significant risks.

Please write a brief description of the risk, give each risk a rating for likelihood and impact using the criteria below, and bullet point the mitigating actions which will help mitigate the risk.

Risk Description	Impact Rating	Likelihood Rating	Total Risk Rating (Impact x Likelihood)	Mitigating actions
Impact of national policy may weaken local influence over the employment and skills agenda.	3	4	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain a strong role for employment and skills influence through the ESB and the LEP.
The changing funding & economic landscape may mean that partner organisations & private sector employers see less benefit in an E&S partnership and reduce their commitment	4	3	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain a strong role for employment and skills influence through the ESB and seek more ways to align the work of the ESB and Working Nottingham partnerships.

Likelihood rating scale:

- 26. Remote
- 27. Unlikely
- 28. Possible
- 29. Likely
- 30. Almost Certain

Impact rating scale:

- 31. Negligible

32. Minor

33. Moderate

34. Major

35. Catastrophic

Registration document for Greater Nottingham Growth Point Partnership

Completed Summer 2012

Nottingham City Council - Partnership Governance Framework Registration of Significant Partnerships	
<p><u>Partnership</u></p> <p>Greater Nottingham Growth Point Partnership c/o Nottingham City Council Planning, Transport and Intelligence Strategy Loxley House Station Street Nottingham NG2 3NG</p> <p>Tel: 0115 8763982 Email: info@gngrowthpoint.com Website: www.gngrowthpoint.com</p>	<p><u>Status</u></p> <p>Unincorporated voluntary partnership association</p>
<p>Matt Gregory, Greater Nottingham Growth Point Planning Manager Dawn Alvey, Commissioning and Delivery Manager</p>	
<p><u>Aims/focus</u></p> <p>To provide a means for Local Planning Authorities in Greater Nottingham Housing Market Area (HMA) to work together to respond to Government aspirations for housing growth by - aligning planning documents and policies; sharing expertise; jointly commissioning technical studies; ensuring future housing is located on the most sustainable sites and of the highest design standards; ensuring future development is supported by appropriate infrastructure, including green infrastructure; guide the investment of Growth Point funding to support housing growth.</p>	
<p><u>Role in Nottingham Plan/ LAA /LDF /Council Plan</u></p> <p>Nottingham Plan – Will contribute to housing growth targets in Neighbourhood Nottingham Implementation Plan. The Local Development Framework will deliver the strategic spatial elements of the Nottingham Plan and is particularly relevant to NN3 and 4.</p> <p>Local Development Framework and Core Strategy – see above. The Growth Point Partnership is responsible for aligned Core Strategies as part of each local authority’s Local Development Framework.</p>	

<p><u>Resources</u></p> <p><u>2008 – 12</u> <u>Infrastructure</u></p> <p>DCLG (Growth Point) - £315,000</p> <p><u>Services/programmes/activity/delivery</u></p> <p>DCLG (Growth Point):</p> <p>Revenue – £815,893 (excluding infrastructure above) Capital - £10,913,307 (approx)</p> <p>Several private sector led schemes have been short listed for HCA Kick Start Programme</p> <p>East Midlands Regional Assembly - £30,000</p> <p>Transitional Funding – £90,000</p>	<p><u>Reporting</u></p> <p><u>NCC</u></p> <p>(City and County) Joint Committee on Strategic Planning and Transport</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <p>Greater Nottingham Joint Planning Advisory Board 6C's Board DCLG via Leicester City Council (as 6Cs Accountable Authority)</p>
<p><u>Council nominees, responsible Corporate Directors and lead officers</u></p> <p>Councillor Alan Clark, Portfolio Holder for Energy and Sustainability Councillor Jane Urquhart, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transport</p> <p>David Bishop Corporate Director for Development</p> <p>Lead Officer – Sue Flack Director Planning and Transport</p>	<p><u>Members</u></p> <p><u>Joint Planning Advisory Board (Councillors)</u></p> <p>Ashfield: Councillor G Maxwell Broxtowe: Councillor S Barber (Chair) Erewash: Councillor Geoff Smith Gedling: Councillor R Allan Nottingham City: Councillor J Urquhart, Councillor A Clark Nottinghamshire County: Councillor Richard Butler, Councillor Richard Jackson Rushcliffe: Councillor D Bell</p> <p><u>Observer members of the Board</u></p> <p>Naomi Wing, Environment Agency; Mark Banister, Homes and Communities Agency: Colin Mercer, Highways Agency: Mike Taylor, Director, Nottingham</p>

Regeneration Limited
Natural England: Invited but does not attend

Others from time to time by invitation.

Executive Steering Group (officer group)
Nottinghamshire County: Sally Gill, Service Director, Planning, Sustainability and Regeneration (Chair)
Ashfield: Trevor Watson
Broxtowe: Ruth Hyde, Chief Executive/Steve Dance Head of Planning
Derbyshire: Christine Massey, Policy and Monitoring Team Leader/ Erewash: Yvonne Wright Planning Policy Team Leader
Gedling: Peter Baguley, Head of Planning
Growth Point: Dawn Alvey, Matt Gregory
Nottingham City Council; Sue Flack, Director Planning and Transport,
Rushcliffe: Paul Randle Deputy CEX

COMPLETED SUMMARY

NOTTINGHAM CITY COUNCIL
SIGNIFICANT PARTNERSHIPS GOVERNANCE HEALTH CHECK 2012

In consultation with your partnership, please complete the tables below. Once the details have been agreed by the partnership please return them to alice.johnson@nottinghamcity.gov.uk. If you require any assistance please contact Alice Johnson, Policy Officer, Nottingham City Council, on 0115 87 63372.

Name of Partnership: Greater Nottingham Growth Point Partnership
NCC Lead Councillor: Cllr Urquhart and Cllr Clark
NCC Corporate Director: David Bishop, Corporate Director, Development
NCC Lead Officer: Sue Flack, Director Planning and Transport
Partnership Chief Executive/Manager (if appropriate):

We have identified 8 areas of good governance. In each area we have provided a number of clear statements to illustrate what 'excellent' looks like for that area of governance. Using the criteria where 1 is 'excellent' and 4 is 'many key weaknesses' (page 1), please record a score (1-4) for each area of good governance for your significant partnership, making relevant notes on how the score could be improved.

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<p>1. Aims and objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership has clear aims and SMART objectives clearly set out and understandable • Strong alignment between the partnership's and The Nottingham Plan and 2030 vision • In pursuing the 2030 vision, the partnership has a set of values against which decision making and actions can be judged (e.g. code of conduct) • The partnership achieves more than the sum of its parts. It delivers the benefits identified in the 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TOR set out the objectives of the partnership • Regular updates to board include progress against timetable • Strong alignment with The Nottingham Local Plan and statutory duties • Partnership delivers clear added value in quality, skill sharing, and resources.

business case		
<p>2. Membership and structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The structure is clear, is set out in Terms of Reference, a Memorandum of Agreement or other governing documents and is regularly reviewed. • Roles, responsibilities and contributions are defined for all partners and set out in the governing documents, including whistle-blowing, responding to compliments and complaints, risk assessment, personnel and financial management and financial and performance reporting. • Key partners provide effective leadership. Their leadership roles and responsibilities are understood and fulfilled. • The membership provides the necessary knowledge, skills and experience to do the job. Partners ensure that the right people are in the right place at the right time. • The partners are committed at the highest level to deliver the partnership's objectives. There are constructive working relationships between all partners, the right people attend the meetings, and these are supported by lead officers within partner agencies. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TOR approved; • Sets out clear roles and responsibilities; • Financial Regs of NCC take precedence, supplemented by specific approval levels for partnership officers/members. • High level of councillor participation and attendance • Executive officer group in place to support member partnership • 3 dedicated officers provide support to partnership

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes to membership and exit strategies are considered and the governing documents say what will happen if/when a partner wishes to leave. 		
<p>3. Decision making and accountability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision making is clear and transparent. Authority and delegations are set out in governing documents including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Who can make what decisions ○ Delegated responsibilities • The partnership has a clear procedure for dealing with conflicts of interest • Those making decisions are provided with information that is fit for the purpose – relevant, timely and give clear explanations of technical issues and their implications • Decisions are properly recorded and notified promptly to those who are affected by them. • The partnership has a communication plan to inform service users, members and the public about the partnership, its decisions, its achievements and successes, who is accountable and responsible for what. It provides routes for people to comment/contribute to the partnership’s work. • The partnership has clear lines of accountability and arrangements for reporting performance • Arrangements are in place for the partnership to report in a timely way on its work and achievements to Council officers and Councillors. Decisions and activities are 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Political and executive meetings have clear structure, and reporting mechanisms, including back to executive bodies of constituent councils. • Stakeholders organisations invited to Board meetings • TOR set out roles and responsibilities, frequency of meetings, resolution of disputes etc. • Formal approval levels set for reporting financial approval/spend and any changes to programme. • Regular reporting to officer and member meetings.

<p>scrutinized at the appropriate level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are clear routes for members and partners to raise concerns. 		
<p>4. Performance management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership reviews its progress and delivery against clear outcomes, outputs and milestones and takes prompt corrective action if necessary. • Delivery contracts and agreements are monitored and poor performance is tackled. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnership is progress and delivery is reviewed against agreed timetable for preparation and delivery of the Core Strategies. • The Core Strategy has however been deferred due to the abolition of the Regional Strategy and the Coalition's policies. • Regular reporting on progress to executive and members. • Contracts and monitoring arrangements are in place with funding recipients. • Annual Audit undertaken.
<p>5. Evaluation and review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership regularly reviews its policies, strategies, membership and use of resources against its objectives and targets. • The partnership reviews its progress and delivery against clear outcomes, outputs and milestones and takes prompt corrective action if necessary. • Delivery contracts and agreements are monitored and poor performance is tackled. • Arrangements for responding to complaints and dealing with unforeseen problems needing a prompt response are in place and clearly stated. • There are clearly stated procedures to deal with disputes within the partnership and these are 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular review of strategy, policies and resources at each executive and member meeting. • Contracts and monitoring arrangements are in place with funding recipients and action taken to tackle poor performance. • TOR sets out procedure for addressing disputes/conflicts. • Executive officers hosted by Nottingham City Council - and NCC complaint process/response timescale is the default.

followed when necessary.		
6. Equalities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The partnership assesses its policies and programmes for their impact on equalities. The partnership considers impact on inequality and deprivation as part of its performance management. 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact on equalities and deprivation fundamental to purpose of partnership and development of Core Strategies (fundamental reason of partnership existence). Partners preparing joint EIA.
7. Finance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The partnership has access to resources to support delivery of its aims and objectives. It has a financial and /or procurement plan that identifies how it proposes to use these funding to achieve its objectives. The role of the partnership in relation to finance and the extent of its powers to make financial decisions and approvals are stated and understood. The partnership has effective arrangements for financial monitoring and reporting. The partnership uses its resources well and demonstrates how it uses them to add value. It ensures that it uses resources to complement and enhance the work of individual partners. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partnership has access to finance and has a programme for revenue and capital expenditure approved and regularly reviewed by executive offices and councillors. Formal procedure for financial approvals agreed by the partnership, underpinned by NCC financial regulations and procurement requirements. Annual audit undertaken – current audit significant level of assurance. Programme of development geared to maximise impact on local communities. Further work need to demonstrate how resources add value.
8. Partnership Risk Management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key people are aware of areas of potential risk in partnerships and the need to allocate resources to manage risk. The partnership has an agreed mechanism for 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Executive and members aware of key areas of risk. Individual projects supported by risk assessment and contracts to minimise financial risk to partnership and NCC. Joint 6C's risk plan prepared.

identifying, assessing and managing risks. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate tools have been developed and resources are in place to manage risk. • Partnership risks are well managed across organisational boundaries. • There is clear evidence of improved partnership delivery through risk management. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivery at early stage – improvements yet to be assessed.
--	--	--

Overall Headline Risk

Please fill in the table below the most significant risks which the Council needs to be aware of in terms of our involvement with this partnership. These can include strategic, financial and reputational risks. An example risk has been included to guide you.

Some partnerships may not face any risks, whereas others may face many. For those which face many risks, please note only the three most significant risks.

Please write a brief description of the risk, give each risk a rating for likelihood and impact using the criteria below, and bullet point the mitigating actions which will help mitigate the risk.

Risk Description	Impact Rating	Likelihood Rating	Total Risk Rating (Impact x Likelihood)	Mitigating actions
Financial Risk <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revenue/Capital projects delayed/do not perform/mis spend • Risks associated with programme management of capital projects post April 2012 	3	3	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All projects subject to robust contracts minimising risk to NCC with clawback provisions if conditions not met, release of funding subject to successful completion of each phase. • Contingency included in budget to deal with claims/audit post April 2013 • Partnership to consider alternative strategies for progressing core activities

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Threat to future sustainability of partnership in context of finite revenue budget. 				
<p>Strategic Risk</p> <p>Partnership fragments if separate strategies pursued resulting in lost opportunities for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> strategic (cross boundary) joint policy working, consistent HMA wide evidence basis, sharing resources/reduced cost of commissions, benefits of joint engagement with stakeholders and private sector, coherent joint approach to future sub regional funding bids. 	4	3	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Officers/members actively promote benefits of joint working Partnership consider residual benefits/ways of joint working.
<p>Reputational</p> <p>Fragmentation of partnership could damage perception of council's ability for joint working with local, and nation agencies.</p>	4	3	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Officers/members actively reviewing implications of new policy with a view to ongoing joint working In parallel joint working ongoing via HCA's Local Investment

<p>Likelihood rating scale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 31. Remote 32. Unlikely 33. Possible 34. Likely 35. Almost Certain 	<p>Impact rating scale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 36. Negligible 37. Minor 38. Moderate 39. Major 40. Catastrophic
--	--

Registration document for Strategic Cultural Partnership

Completed Summer 2012

Nottingham City Council - Partnership Governance Framework Registration of Significant Partnerships	
<u>Partnership</u> Strategic Cultural Partnership c/o Nottingham City Council Communities Directorate, Loxley House Station Street Nottingham NG2 3NG Tel: 0115 8764980 Email: hugh.white@nottinghamcity.gov.uk	<u>Status</u> Unincorporated voluntary partnership association
Contact: Hugh White, Director Sports, Culture and Parks, Communities, Nottingham City Council	
<u>Aims/focus</u> To achieve an international standing for Nottinghamshire and Nottingham in sports, heritage and culture and provide leadership for cultural activity.	
<u>Role in Nottingham Plan / Council Plan/LDF</u> <u>Nottingham Plan – key priorities 2011 to 2014.</u> <u>World Class Nottingham:</u> - WCN3 5% growth in the visitor economy year on year. - WCN4 Host at least 12 internationally significant cultural and sporting events per year - As measured by economic and reputation impact and levels of community Participation. Will also contribute to Neighbourhood Nottingham targets on resident's satisfaction with their neighbourhood and community cohesion; will support Family Nottingham and Working Nottingham targets and contribute to raising aspirations.	

<p>Local Development Framework and Core Strategy – will contribute to or support – timely and viable infrastructure; economic prosperity; strong safe and cohesive communities; flourishing and vibrant town centres; regeneration; health and wellbeing; opportunities for young people and children; green infrastructure; protecting and enhancing Greater Nottingham’s individual character and local distinctiveness.</p> <p><u>Council Plan Priority:</u></p> <p>- Nottingham offers a range of leisure activities, parks and sporting events – Nottingham Plan Strategic Priority Link/Neighbourhood + World Class.</p>	
<p><u>Resources</u></p> <p>Funding approved from time to time to support specific activity in the Action Plan</p>	<p><u>Reporting</u></p> <p><u>NCC</u> Through Director Communities and briefings to Portfolio Holder</p> <p><u>Other</u> County Council</p>
<p><u>Council nominees, responsible Corporate Directors and lead officers</u></p> <p>John Kelly, Corporate Director, Communities – responsible Corporate Director</p> <p>Lead officer - Hugh White, Director, Sports, Culture and Parks</p>	<p><u>Members of the Board -</u></p> <p>John Kelly, Corporate Director, Communities, Nottingham City Council Hugh White, Director, Sports, Culture and Parks, Nottingham City Council Derek Higton, Service Director, Youth, Families & Cultural Services, Nottinghamshire County Council Lisa Pursehouse, Chief Executive, Nottinghamshire County Cricket Club Shona Powell, Director, Lakeside Arts Centre Skinder Hundal, New Arts Exchange John Everitt, Chief Executive, Notts Wildlife Trust Tim Desmond, Chief Executive, Galleries of Justice Stephanie Sirr, Chief Executive, Nottingham Playhouse Jennifer Spencer, Chief Executive, Experience Nottinghamshire Steve Mapp, Chief Executive, Broadway Cinema Alex Farquharson, Executive Director of Nottingham Contemporary Robert Sanderson, Director, Royal Centre</p>

	Paul Russ, Dance 4. Nigel Hawkins, Head of Culture & Business Management, Nottingham City Council
--	---

COMPLETED SUMMER 2012

NOTTINGHAM CITY COUNCIL
SIGNIFICANT PARTNERSHIPS GOVERNANCE HEALTH CHECK 2012

Completed Summer 2012

In consultation with your partnership, please complete the tables below. Once the details have been agreed by the partnership please return them to alice.johnson@nottinghamcity.gov.uk. If you require any assistance please contact Alice Johnson, Policy Officer, Nottingham City Council, on 0115 87 63372.

Name of Partnership: Strategic Cultural Partnership
NCC Lead Councillor: None
NCC Corporate Director: John Kelly, Corporate Director, Communities
NCC Lead Officer: Hugh White
Partnership Chief Executive/Manager (if appropriate):

We have identified 8 areas of good governance. In each area we have provided a number of clear statements to illustrate what 'excellent' looks like for that area of governance. Using the criteria where 1 is 'excellent' and 4 is 'many key weaknesses' (page 1), please record a score (1-4) for each area of good governance for your significant partnership, making relevant notes on how the score could be improved.

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
1. Aims and objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership has clear aims and SMART objectives clearly set out and understandable • Strong alignment between the partnership's and The Nottingham Plan and 2030 vision • In pursuing the 2030 vision, the partnership has a set of values against which decision making and actions can be judged (e.g. code of conduct) 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership has a ToR clear aims. The action plan is currently being revised in light of funding levels. The partnership has a strong alignment to the Nottingham Plan. • The partnership is a key driver of the World Class Nottingham programme.

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The partnership achieves more than the sum of its parts. It delivers the benefits identified in the business case 		
<p>2. Membership and structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The structure is clear, is set out in Terms of Reference, a Memorandum of Agreement or other governing documents and is regularly reviewed. Roles, responsibilities and contributions are defined for all partners and set out in the governing documents, including whistle-blowing, responding to compliments and complaints, risk assessment, personnel and financial management and financial and performance reporting. Key partners provide effective leadership. Their leadership roles and responsibilities are understood and fulfilled. The membership provides the necessary knowledge, skills and experience to do the job. Partners ensure that the right people are in the right place at the right time. The partners are committed at the highest level to deliver the partnership's objectives. There are constructive working relationships between all partners, the right people attend the meetings, and these are supported by lead officers within partner agencies. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In light of ongoing changes with a number of new local partners, the membership is being refreshed. Whilst there is a strong commitment from all partners and a review process in place there is a very strong City emphasis. There is therefore room for a stronger County profile within the group. The new Corporate Director for Communities has led 2 review sessions with the group and various sub theme groups have been identified to focus on specific areas for improvement and partnership working for 2012/13 onwards. A future external chair remains a possibility.

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes to membership and exit strategies are considered and the governing documents say what will happen if/when a partner wishes to leave. 		
<p>3. Decision making and accountability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decision making is clear and transparent. Authority and delegations are set out in governing documents including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who can make what decisions Delegated responsibilities The partnership has a clear procedure for dealing with conflicts of interest Those making decisions are provided with information that is fit for the purpose – relevant, timely and give clear explanations of technical issues and their implications Decisions are properly recorded and notified promptly to those who are affected by them. The partnership has a communication plan to inform service users, members and the public about the partnership, its decisions, its achievements and successes, who is accountable and responsible for what. It provides routes for people to comment/contribute to the partnership’s work. The partnership has clear lines of accountability and arrangements for reporting performance 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All decisions are clearly minuted and theme responsibilities have been identified. Due to changes within a number of the membership partners, frequency of meetings has been reduced, however, in 2012 2 strategic planning / review meetings were undertaken with subsequent partnership meetings scheduled for Autumn 2012.

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arrangements are in place for the partnership to report in a timely way on its work and achievements to Council officers and Councillors. Decisions and activities are scrutinized at the appropriate level. • There are clear routes for members and partners to raise concerns. 		
<p>4. Performance management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership reviews its progress and delivery against clear outcomes, outputs and milestones and takes prompt corrective action if necessary. • Delivery contracts and agreements are monitored and poor performance is tackled. 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Cultural Partnership Action Plan, with agreed milestones identifies theme leads and responsibilities ensuring that members are accountable for reporting progress. (see above). • Regular reviews are undertaken (see above). • The World Class programme is reported to the corporate Performance team as appropriate.
<p>5. Evaluation and review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership regularly reviews its policies, strategies, membership and use of resources against its objectives and targets. • The partnership reviews its progress and delivery against clear outcomes, outputs and milestones and takes prompt corrective action if necessary. • Delivery contracts and agreements are monitored and poor performance is tackled. 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No issues have arisen from within the partnership and the cross sector approach ensures there is positive support in delivering outcomes • Broadening the partnership is under constant discussion and includes the BID's (leisure and retail) and non traditional cultural sector partners for value added purposes.

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arrangements for responding to complaints and dealing with unforeseen problems needing a prompt response are in place and clearly stated. • There are clearly stated procedures to deal with disputes within the partnership and these are followed when necessary. 		
<p>6. Equalities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership assesses its policies and programmes for their impact on equalities. • The partnership considers impact on inequality and deprivation as part of its performance management. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration of equalities and deprivation are built into the vision of the partnership and all projects build in community involvement and focus on the most deprived.
<p>7. Finance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership has access to resources to support delivery of its aims and objectives. It has a financial and /or procurement plan that identifies how it proposes to use these funding to achieve its objectives. • The role of the partnership in relation to finance and the extent of its powers to make financial decisions and approvals are stated and understood. • The partnership has effective arrangements for financial monitoring and reporting. 	2-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The financial arrangements for the group are delivered through partners resources especially where the World Class Programme is concerned. One of its aims is to support partners in leveraging in additional funding. • Nottingham City Council provides resources in terms of administering and currently chairing (Corporate Director of Communities) and also provides leadership for the partnership. • Partners provide meeting spaces and refreshments as required.

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The partnership uses its resources well and demonstrates how it uses them to add value. It ensures that it uses resources to complement and enhance the work of individual partners. 		
<p>8. Partnership Risk Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key people are aware of areas of potential risk in partnerships and the need to allocate resources to manage risk. The partnership has an agreed mechanism for identifying, assessing and managing risks. Appropriate tools have been developed and resources are in place to manage risk. Partnership risks are well managed across organisational boundaries. There is clear evidence of improved partnership delivery through risk management. 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The risks to the partnership are minimal with the one risk being that of loss of goodwill, which is minimised by the inclusive nature of the partnership and the good relationships that exist.

Overall Headline Risk

Please fill in the table below the most significant risks which the Council needs to be aware of in terms of our involvement with this partnership. These can include strategic, financial and reputational risks. An example risk has been included to guide you.

Some partnerships may not face any risks, whereas others may face many. For those which face many risks, please note only the three most significant risks.

Please write a brief description of the risk, give each risk a rating for likelihood and impact using the criteria below, and bullet point the mitigating actions which will help mitigate the risk.

Risk Description	Impact Rating	Likelihood Rating	Total Risk Rating (Impact x Likelihood)	Mitigating actions
Loss of Goodwill	2	2	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear aims and strong action plan
Relationship with Nottinghamshire County Council				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing contact and discussions
Cuts in public expenditure could constitute a serious risk to partnership working, reduce activity and test relationships	3	4	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing contact and discussions to identify clear value added to partners to retain interest.

Likelihood rating scale: 36. Remote 37. Unlikely 38. Possible 39. Likely 40. Almost Certain	Impact rating scale: 41. Negligible 42. Minor 43. Moderate 44. Major Catastrophic
--	---

Registration document for Nottingham Regeneration Ltd (NRL)

Completed Summer 2012

Nottingham City Council - Partnership Governance Framework Registration of Significant Partnerships	
<u>Partnership</u> Nottingham Regeneration Ltd (NRL) LH Box 24, Loxley House, Station Street, Nottingham NG2 3NG Tel: 0115 876 4511 Email: info@nrl.uk.net Website: www.nottinghamregeneration.ltd.uk	<u>Status</u> Not for profit Public Private Partnership Company Limited by Guarantee
Mike Taylor, Director of Regeneration, Nottingham Regeneration Ltd	
<u>Aims / focus</u> NRL (Nottingham Regeneration Limited) was established in 1998 as a pioneering public/private sector partnership charged with facilitating transformational and sustainable physical regeneration. Although NRL predated the creation of the Urban Regeneration Company movement in 1999, its role was broadly analogous to the other 17 URCs that were set up throughout the country. It effectively grew from the successful but geographically limited Lace Market Heritage Trust. NRL originally operated as a City focused partnership between Nottingham City Council, Emda, English Partnerships (subsequently the Homes and Communities Agency) and the private sector. Overtime, and as a direct result of funding partner's requirements, the geographical scope and remit of the company has evolved and grown to cover first the Nottingham conurbation and then the whole of the Nottinghamshire County area. Going forward the aspiration is to broaden the operational area further through business development initiatives. NRL's role has evolved to a service which can provide support and an additional specialist resource to our clients. This role is possible due to the close working relationship developed with councils and other public sector bodies over recent years. NRL is a partnership organisation dedicated to promoting and securing the delivery of a	

high quality physical environment. We aim to help create, maintain and shape the development of a distinctive and sustainable physical environment into which existing / new residents and businesses can invest.

NRL provides both regeneration experience and a degree of independence. The team acts as a conduit in building public /private sector relationships which can help overcome barriers to development. The team has established a good network of contacts with agents and developers active in the local markets, which can be used where appropriate, for example to assist with soft market testing, or drawing on market intelligence.

NRL's role is to act as a facilitator, to establish delivery strategies and identify the barriers and risks to development. This may involve undertaking an independent review of an existing council strategy for a development site and looking at other mechanisms to progress development or de-risk the site. In addition we may prepare bids for new and innovative forms of public funding.

The original model for the Company relied on grant funding to support its revenue costs; however with the demise of such funding support for urban regeneration companies our model is now reliant on our service level agreement with Nottingham City Council, fee income from specific commissions from other local authority/public sector clients as well as income from our property portfolio.

NRL promote the economic social and environmental regeneration of the Nottinghamshire area by providing a one-stop development and property consultancy service for local authorities seeking to promote sustainable and long term economic and environmental improvements. Our two primary goals reflect the national, regional, local economic and regeneration policy framework, together with the particular opportunities and challenges facing the City and the County Districts. Namely:-

1. Facilitating the delivery of catalytic development projects; and
2. Maximisation of regeneration potential of public sectors property portfolios.

Role in Nottingham Plan / LAA / LDF / Council Plan

Nottingham Plan – contribution to World Class Nottingham Implementation Plan targets on GVA per capita, new jobs, new business VAT registration; Neighbourhood Nottingham target on housing targets; Working Nottingham target on employment rate.

LAA – contributes to NI 152; 151; 171; 154.

Local Development Framework and Core Strategy – NRL leads significant regeneration activities. Key contribution to creating opportunities for – high quality new housing; timely and viable infrastructure; economic prosperity for all; environmentally responsible development; green infrastructure; protecting and enhancing Greater Nottingham's individual character and local distinctiveness.

Council Plan – contributes to WCN 1.1; NN3.1; 3.6; 3.7

Growth Plan – contributes to delivery of key projects including MediPark, Southglade

Food Park, Science Park, Waterside, Southern Gateway etc.	
<p><u>Resources</u></p> <p><u>NCC</u> £84,080 per annum. Plus accommodation/stationary in kind.</p> <p>Trading income from two commercial NRL run properties.</p> <p>External Consultancy.</p> <p>Reserves.</p>	<p><u>Reporting</u></p> <p><u>NCC</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business Plan endorsed by Council Executive Board. • Senior level protocol meetings. • Management of Service Level Agreement. • Bespoke arrangements for specific activities. <p><u>Other</u> NRL Board</p>
<p><u>Council nominees, responsible Corporate Directors and lead officers</u></p> <p>Councillor Alan Clark, Portfolio Holder for Energy and Sustainability David Bishop – Corporate Director of Development Andrew Gregory – Lead Officer</p>	<p><u>Members of the Board</u></p> <p>Mich Stevenson (Chairman) Diana Gilhespy (Deputy Chair) Peter Hipperson Roy Morledge David Williams Councillor Alan Clark</p> <p>David Bishop – Observer Graham Dobbs – Observer John Robinson – Observer</p>

NOTTINGHAM CITY COUNCIL
SIGNIFICANT PARTNERSHIPS GOVERNANCE HEALTH CHECK 2012

Completed Summer 2012

In consultation with your partnership, please complete the tables below. Once the details have been agreed by the partnership please return them to alice.johnson@nottinghamcity.gov.uk. If you require any assistance please contact Alice Johnson, Policy Officer, Nottingham City Council, on 0115 87 63372.

Name of Partnership: Nottingham Regeneration Ltd
NCC Lead Councillor: Councillor Clark
NCC Corporate Director: David Bishop
NCC Lead Officer: Andrew Gregory
Partnership Chief Executive/Manager (if appropriate):

We have identified 8 areas of good governance. In each area we have provided a number of clear statements to illustrate what 'excellent' looks like for that area of governance. Using the criteria where 1 is 'excellent' and 4 is 'many key weaknesses' (page 1), please record a score (1-4) for each area of good governance for your significant partnership, making relevant notes on how the score could be improved.

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
1. Aims and objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership has clear aims and SMART objectives clearly set out and understandable • Strong alignment between the partnership's and The Nottingham Plan and 2030 vision 	1 1 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aims and objectives set out in a Business Plan presented to the NRL Board March 2012. • The agreed Business Plan (above) fully aligns with the Nottingham plan, 2030 vision, and the DDANN prioritisation programme. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ See Staff Handbook.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In pursuing the 2030 vision, the partnership has 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See above, working in partnership with NCC, and the

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<p>a set of values against which decision making and actions can be judged (e.g. code of conduct)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The partnership achieves more than the sum of its parts. It delivers the benefits identified in the business case 	2	private sector NRL is able to help facilitate and broker key economic and physical regeneration initiatives.
<p>2. Membership and structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The structure is clear, is set out in Terms of Reference, a Memorandum of Agreement or other governing documents and is regularly reviewed. Roles, responsibilities and contributions are defined for all partners and set out in the governing documents, including whistle-blowing, responding to compliments and complaints, risk assessment, personnel and financial management and financial and performance reporting. Key partners provide effective leadership. Their leadership roles and responsibilities are understood and fulfilled. The membership provides the necessary knowledge, skills and experience to do the job. Partners ensure that the right people are in the right place at the right time. 	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Company has an approved Articles of Association, Financial Regulations which are reviewed annually and a Staff Handbook. These documents provide clear structure for the operation of the Company. In addition to the above the Company also has a separate Audit and Remuneration Committee with Terms of Reference. All members of the Board and employees receive a copy of the Article of Association, Financial Regulations and Staff Handbook upon induction. The role of the members as key partners is set out in the Articles of Association. The Board currently includes Cllr Clark and the Corporate Director of Development as an observer. In addition to NCC representatives other Board members were selected on the basis of their experience and skill set as is required to support the work of the Company. Thus individuals with knowledge of private sector development, legal and financial matters, academia and regeneration were recruited. Board members were selected based upon their reputation and experience in the industry.

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partners are committed at the highest level to deliver the partnership’s objectives. There are constructive working relationships between all partners, the right people attend the meetings, and these are supported by lead officers within partner agencies. • Changes to membership and exit strategies are considered and the governing documents say what will happen if/when a partner wishes to leave. 	<p style="text-align: center;">1</p> <p style="text-align: center;">1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Company Articles of Association and Business Plan both deal with the exit strategy and future planning including selection of replacement Board members as appropriate.
<p>3. Decision making and accountability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision making is clear and transparent. Authority and delegations are set out in governing documents including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Who can make what decisions ○ Delegated responsibilities • The partnership has a clear procedure for dealing with conflicts of interest • Those making decisions are provided with information that is fit for the purpose – relevant, timely and give clear explanations of technical issues and their implications • Decisions are properly recorded and notified promptly to those who are affected by them. 	<p style="text-align: center;">1</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <p style="text-align: center;">1</p> <p style="text-align: center;">1</p> <p style="text-align: center;">3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Articles of Association, Financial Regulations, Staff Handbook and individual job descriptions set out clear governance arrangements and delegations. • Under the Companies Act 2006 under which NRL operates, conflicts of interest are made explicit with appropriate procedures for exclusions as required. • Board reports are prepared by appropriate officers within the executive team and are sent out in line with the Articles of Association/Terms of Reference. All reports are sent out in advance of meetings and are complete, relevant, and understandable. Outside experts are commissioned where supporting technical information is required. • Meetings are fully minuted and circulated to all members and observers within 7 days.

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership has a communication plan to inform service users, members and the public about the partnership, its decisions, its achievements and successes, who is accountable and responsible for what. It provides routes for people to comment/contribute to the partnership's work. • The partnership has clear lines of accountability and arrangements for reporting performance • Arrangements are in place for the partnership to report in a timely way on its work and achievements to Council officers and Councillors. Decisions and activities are scrutinized at the appropriate level. • There are clear routes for members and partners to raise concerns. 	<p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The NRL website publicises the work of the Company and provides opportunity for public feedback. In addition the Company maintains a practice brochure and prepares an annual monitoring report as part of the SLA. The Company utilises the services of the NCC corporate communication team when engaged on appropriate NCC priority projects. • The Company/executive team is accountable to its Board and/or delegated Committees. The Company reports to the lead officer/Corporate Director in line with the SLA and reports company performance at Board meetings held every 2 months. Time sheets are kept by the executive team. • The Articles of Association and Staff Handbook have clear guidance with respect to escalation of concerns. The Regeneration Director also attends weekly high level decision making forums where issues can be raised.
<p>4. Performance management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership reviews its progress and delivery against clear outcomes, outputs and milestones and takes prompt corrective action if necessary. • Delivery contracts and agreements are monitored and poor performance is tackled. 	<p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The rolling Business Plan and bimonthly Board meetings report progress on all projects and provide the opportunity for corrective action if appropriate. The Regeneration Director attends weekly meeting with the Corporate Director. • As above

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<p>5. Evaluation and review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership regularly reviews its policies, strategies, membership and use of resources against its objectives and targets. • The partnership reviews its progress and delivery against clear outcomes, outputs and milestones and takes prompt corrective action if necessary. • Delivery contracts and agreements are monitored and poor performance is tackled. • Arrangements for responding to complaints and dealing with unforeseen problems needing a prompt response are in place and clearly stated. • There are clearly stated procedures to deal with disputes within the partnership and these are followed when necessary. 	<p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>2</p> <p>2</p> <p>1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Regeneration Director presents a report to each Board meeting outlining progress on projects. The Finance Officer similarly presents management accounts to each Board, making comment to any variances against budgets and evolving risks. • As above, plus the Regeneration Director reports to the lead officer as per the SLA (Andrew Gregory) on a weekly basis. • The weekly meeting with the lead officer identifies progress and any qualitative concerns. The NRL staff Handbook outlines fully the Company's response to poor performance by members of the executive team. • Covered in the SLA and Company Staff Handbook.
<p>6. Equalities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership assesses its policies and programmes for their impact on equalities. • The partnership considers impact on inequality and deprivation as part of its performance management. 	<p>1</p> <p>2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NRL adopts the policies of NCC regarding its equalities programme/policy. It is incorporated into the Company Staff Handbook.

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<p>7. Finance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The partnership has access to resources to support delivery of its aims and objectives. It has a financial and /or procurement plan that identifies how it proposes to use these funding to achieve its objectives. The role of the partnership in relation to finance and the extent of its powers to make financial decisions and approvals are stated and understood. The partnership has effective arrangements for financial monitoring and reporting. The partnership uses its resources well and demonstrates how it uses them to add value. It ensures that it uses resources to complement and enhance the work of individual partners. 	<p>2</p> <p>2</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The NRL Business plan identifies the objectives for the Company. It sets out the budget/forecast for the next rolling 3 years, and is reviewed regularly by the Board. Ongoing reductions in funding from NCC could have implications on resources in the future. NCC is one member of a 6 member Board. Decisions regarding financial matters are considered at each meeting. The Financial Regulations govern the financial operations. Management Accounts are presented at each Board meeting, setting out actual results, budgets and variances. The Regeneration Director on a weekly basis meets with the partnership lead officer to ensure that resources (staff time) are allocated appropriately in accordance with the SLA. Supplier contracts are renegotiated where possible, and procurement is undertaken in line with the Financial Regulations.
<p>8. Partnership Risk Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key people are aware of areas of potential risk in partnerships and the need to allocate resources to manage risk. The partnership has an agreed mechanism for identifying, assessing and managing risks. Appropriate tools have been developed and resources are in place to manage risk. Partnership risks are well managed across organisational boundaries. There is clear evidence of improved partnership 	<p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board meetings and weekly NCC/NRL liaison meetings ensure appropriate risk analysis of key projects are shared /managed. The Company operates a risk register, which is reported to each board meeting.

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
delivery through risk management.		

Overall Headline Risk

Please fill in the table below the most significant risks which the Council needs to be aware of in terms of our involvement with this partnership. These can include strategic, financial and reputational risks. An example risk has been included to guide you.

Some partnerships may not face any risks, whereas others may face many. For those which face many risks, please note only the three most significant risks.

Please write a brief description of the risk, give each risk a rating for likelihood and impact using the criteria below, and bullet point the mitigating actions which will help mitigate the risk.

Risk Description	Impact Rating	Likelihood Rating	Total Risk Rating (Impact x Likelihood)	Mitigating actions
Insufficient funding/fees generated	5	3	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Company is actively seeking to maximise external consultancy income. It is also carrying out an investment appraisal of its assets.
Loss of a significant number of tenants in trading properties managed	4	3	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Marketing drive currently underway. Targeting new sectors for occupation.
Loss of key personnel	3	3	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appraisal system, career progression, added responsibilities.

Registration document for Experience Nottinghamshire

Completed Summer 2012

Nottingham City Council - Partnership Governance Framework Registration of Significant Partnerships	
<p><u>Partnership</u></p> <p>Experience Nottinghamshire The Marketing Suite Gothic House Barker Gate Nottingham NG1 1JU Tel: 0115 962 8300 Email: enquiries@experiencenottinghamshire.com Website: http://aboutus.experiencenottinghamshire.com</p>	<p><u>Status</u></p> <p>“Not for profit” public/private partnership</p>
<p>Jennifer Spencer, Chief Executive, Experience Nottinghamshire</p>	
<p><u>Aims/focus</u></p> <p>To positively enhance the economic impact of the visitor economy of the city in close liaison with key stakeholders including the city Council, County Council and VisitEngland, as well as seeking to better engage the private sector eg Nottingham Hoteliers Association, BIDs and others. Developing and implementing campaigns aimed to bring additional visitors into the city from the region/nationally and internationally, promoting the city as an attract brand supported by a disperse strategy to benefit other areas within the county. Subject to successful ERDF bid create a sustainable promotional model to support the development of business tourism in the city.</p>	
<p><u>Role in Nottingham Plan/ LAA /LDF /Council Plan</u></p> <p>Nottingham Plan – contribution to World Class Nottingham Implementation Plan targets – specifically 50% increase in total annual spending from overnight stays for leisure and business and generally to other targets.</p> <p>LAA – contribution to increasing and sustaining employment rates particularly in tourism sector e.g. hotels but also other sectors e.g. retail, leisure and culture including creative industries through the attraction of visitors. NI 151 – Overall employment rate.</p> <p>Local Development Framework and Core Strategy – promoting Nottingham as great</p>	

<p>place to live and invest in.</p> <p>Council Plan - Named partner WCN 5.3 as part of WCN 5. 'Actively market and promote the city – locally, nationally and internationally'. Contributes to WCN 2.1, WCN 2.2, WCN 2.3, WCN 3.3, WCN 3.4, WCN 3.5, WCN 5.1, WCN 5.2, WCN 5.3, WCN 5.5, WCN 6.1.</p> <p>NIs not in LAA – NI 010 – Visits to museums or galleries, NI 011 – Engagement in the Arts</p> <p>Local PIs – Economic impact measure, World Class events held, events successfully held; number of knowledge based jobs created or safeguarded per annum.</p>	
<p><u>Resources</u></p> <p>A significant proportion of income/funding is performance related or contributions from partners or derived from profit sharing agreements. The income therefore fluctuates from year to year. Staff salaries are dependent on securing income.</p> <p>A Service Level Agreement between the City Council and Experience Nottinghamshire sets out service specification and targets to be delivered if grant payments are to be forthcoming.</p> <p><u>2012/13</u> Income: NCC SLA - £250,00 County Council - £150,000 Private Sector / other - £300,000</p>	<p><u>Reporting</u></p> <p><u>NCC</u></p> <p>Strategically, through Council nominees on the Board comprising Councillors and relevant Corporate Director.</p> <p>A Service Level Agreement between Nottingham City Council and Experience Nottinghamshire sets out service specification, PIs and targets and monitoring arrangements. A new agreement will be drawn up for 2010/2011.</p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <p>The principal stakeholders represented on the Strategic Board i.e. Nottingham City Council, Nottinghamshire County Council, key representatives of the seven district councils within Nottinghamshire, the two universities, business and commercial members including east Midlands Airport, Deloitte, galleries of Justice, Capittla one, Arena and hotel representatives.</p>
<p><u>Council nominees, responsible Corporate Directors and lead officers</u></p> <p>Councillor Chris Gibson,</p> <p>Councillor Malcolm Wood, Chair of Tourism Panel</p> <p>David Bishop Corporate Director for</p>	<p><u>Members of the Board</u></p> <p>Brad Miller, MD East Mids Airport (Chair) Alistair Pritchard, Deloitte Tim Desmond, Chief Executive, Galleries of Justice Councillor Phil McCauley, Gedling Borough Council Tim Hart, Hart Hambleton plc Martin Ingham, Deputy Chief Executive,</p>

<p>Development</p> <p>Lead officer – John Yarham, Director, Young People, Learning and Skills</p>	<p>National Ice Centre and Trent FM Arena Councillor Chris Gibson, Nottingham City Council Councillor Malcolm Wood, Nottingham City Council Stephen Jackson, Chief Financial and Operations Officer, Nottingham Trent University (Vice Chair) Matt Lockley, Head of Economic development Nottinghamshire County Council Councillor John Knight, Nottinghamshire County Council Councillor Keith Girling, Nottinghamshire County Council Cllr John Cottee, Nottinghamshire county Council Suzanne Green, The Cornerhouse Dr Paul Greatrix, Registrar, University of Nottingham Ms Sally Camm, Head of Corporate Affairs Capital One Mr David Clements, Crowne Plaza Hotel Ms Sylvia Manser, Leisure BID (Observer) Cllr Nick McDonald (Growth Plan Observer)</p>
---	--

COMPLETED SUMMER 2012

NOTTINGHAM CITY COUNCIL
SIGNIFICANT PARTNERSHIPS GOVERNANCE HEALTH CHECK 2012

Completed Summer 2012

In consultation with your partnership, please complete the tables below. Once the details have been agreed by the partnership please return them to alice.coleman@nottinghamcity.gov.uk. If you require any assistance please contact Alice Coleman, Policy Officer, Nottingham City Council, on 0115 87 63372.

Name of Partnership: Experience Nottinghamshire
NCC Lead Councillor: Cllr David Trimble
NCC Corporate Director: David Bishop
NCC Lead Officer: John Yarham
Partnership Chief Executive/Manager (if appropriate): Jennifer Spencer

We have identified 8 areas of good governance. In each area we have provided a number of clear statements to illustrate what 'excellent' looks like for that area of governance. Using the criteria where 1 is 'excellent' and 4 is 'many key weaknesses' (page 1), please record a score (1-4) for each area of good governance for your significant partnership, making relevant notes on how the score could be improved.

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
1. Aims and objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership has clear aims and SMART objectives clearly set out and understandable • Strong alignment between the partnership's and The Nottingham Plan and 2030 vision • In pursuing the 2030 vision, the partnership has a set of values against which decision making and actions can be judged (e.g. code of conduct) • The partnership achieves more than the sum of 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EN has a strong, sector representative Strategic Board which is well engaged with the organisation • The CEO reports to this board on a quarterly basis • EN's objectives and subsequent action plans are closely aligned to The Nottingham Plan in relation to World Class WCN2/WCN5/WCN6 • EN works in partnership with Nottingham County Council, District Councils, VisitEngland and the private sector ensuring maximum benefit from NCC's investment • EN provides further influence & leverage from Visit Britain

<p>its parts. It delivers the benefits identified in the business case</p>		<p>& Visit England</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EN also provides a voice for the city in relation to the Core Cities visitor economy working group • EN is also well connected to the D2N2 LEP arrangements.
<p>2. Membership and structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The structure is clear, is set out in Terms of Reference, a Memorandum of Agreement or other governing documents and is regularly reviewed. • Roles, responsibilities and contributions are defined for all partners and set out in the governing documents, including whistle-blowing, responding to compliments and complaints, risk assessment, personnel and financial management and financial and performance reporting. • Key partners provide effective leadership. Their leadership roles and responsibilities are understood and fulfilled. • The membership provides the necessary knowledge, skills and experience to do the job. Partners ensure that the right people are in the right place at the right time. • The partners are committed at the highest level to deliver the partnership's objectives. There are constructive working relationships between all partners, the right people attend the meetings, and these are supported by lead officers within partner agencies. • Changes to membership and exit strategies are 	<p>1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EN has a clear company structure and provides audited accounts on an annual basis • EN has a full set of operational documentation, including equal opportunities policy, health & safety policy, HR policy and a comprehensive staff handbook • All key stakeholders are represented on the EN Strategic Board, mainly at Chief Executive/Director level, and the regular quarterly meetings provide an effective opportunity for each member to play their part. • There are excellent working relationships across the partnership. Ad hoc meetings and sub group meetings take place as required. All parties are encouraged to provide support and input to EN's activities as needed. • Membership of the EN board is reviewed on a regular basis and adjusted in line with organisational needs.

<p>considered and the governing documents say what will happen if/when a partner wishes to leave.</p>		
<p>3. Decision making and accountability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision making is clear and transparent. Authority and delegations are set out in governing documents including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Who can make what decisions ○ Delegated responsibilities • The partnership has a clear procedure for dealing with conflicts of interest • Those making decisions are provided with information that is fit for the purpose – relevant, timely and give clear explanations of technical issues and their implications • Decisions are properly recorded and notified promptly to those who are affected by them. • The partnership has a communication plan to inform service users, members and the public about the partnership, its decisions, its achievements and successes, who is accountable and responsible for what. It provides routes for people to comment/contribute to the partnership’s work. • The partnership has clear lines of accountability and arrangements for reporting performance • Arrangements are in place for the partnership to report in a timely way on its work and achievements to Council officers and Councillors. Decisions and activities are scrutinized at the appropriate level. 	<p>1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EN has clear and transparent protocols in relation to all key decisions with particular regards to HR and Financial. Decisions are sanctioned at Finance & General Purposes sub-committee of Strategic Board • EN holds a conflict of interest register and this is a standing agenda item at Board and all sub-committees. • Minutes are drafted within a two week period of meetings. They are then circulated as appropriate and scrutinised at the following meeting. • EN has a basic communication process in place supported by informal ad hoc activity as required. However, EN is intending to develop a more mature communications strategy and action plan in the year ahead. • In terms of accountability the CEO is responsible for the performance of the organisation and its key activities and reports regularly to the Board. In addition the CEO’s performance is subject to quarterly review by the Chair of the Board • Officers of the Council actively participate in all Board meetings and meet on a one to one basis with the CEO on a monthly basis. • Meetings with the Lead Councillor and others are arranged as required to ensure that they are briefed on all key decisions and developments

<p>4. Performance management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership reviews its progress and delivery against clear outcomes, outputs and milestones and takes prompt corrective action if necessary. • Delivery contracts and agreements are monitored and poor performance is tackled. 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EN reports to Council in line with City's SLA and to other partner funders as required. • Monthly one to one meetings with CEO ensure regular monitoring in place.
<p>5. Evaluation and review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership regularly reviews its policies, strategies, membership and use of resources against its objectives and targets. • The partnership reviews its progress and delivery against clear outcomes, outputs and milestones and takes prompt corrective action if necessary. • Delivery contracts and agreements are monitored and poor performance is tackled. • Arrangements for responding to complaints and dealing with unforeseen problems needing a prompt response are in place and clearly stated. • There are clearly stated procedures to deal with disputes within the partnership and these are followed when necessary. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Board undertakes an annual review of its strategy and use of resources. • Delivery contracts are monitored regularly, with performance updates through the Finance and General Purposes Committee. • Performance is reviewed regularly and any issues addressed as required • Arrangements to deal with complaints are in place and these are dealt within a two week time frame. • Chair of the Board actively seeks feedback from all stakeholders and tackles any issues that emerge as required.
<p>6. Equalities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership assesses its policies and programmes for their impact on equalities. • The partnership considers impact on inequality and deprivation as part of its performance management. 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EN now has a policy in place

<p>7. Finance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership has access to resources to support delivery of its aims and objectives. It has a financial and /or procurement plan that identifies how it proposes to use these funding to achieve its objectives. • The role of the partnership in relation to finance and the extent of its powers to make financial decisions and approvals are stated and understood. • The partnership has effective arrangements for financial monitoring and reporting. • The partnership uses its resources well and demonstrates how it uses them to add value. It ensures that it uses resources to complement and enhance the work of individual partners. 	<p>2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EN has worked hard over the last years to mitigate the impact of the removal of EMDA funding and to tackle the historical balance sheet deficit. Additional funding streams are now being established, including RGF support for 'Growing tourism Locally' via VisitEngland which will support the next three years marketing campaign. • EN has a clear grasp of financial position and its financial decision making process is well defined. • EN has a Finance & General Purposes Committee (F & GP) which reports to the Board and NCC is represented on F & GP • EN produces quarterly management accounts which are scrutinised by F & GP
<p>8. Partnership Risk Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key people are aware of areas of potential risk in partnerships and the need to allocate resources to manage risk. • The partnership has an agreed mechanism for identifying, assessing and managing risks. • Appropriate tools have been developed and resources are in place to manage risk. • Partnership risks are well managed across organisational boundaries. • There is clear evidence of improved partnership delivery through risk management. 	<p>2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EN holds a risk register • CEO reports any significant risks to the Board, along with mitigation plans that have been put in place.

Overall Headline Risk

Please fill in the table below the most significant risks which the Council needs to be aware of in terms of our involvement with this partnership. These can include strategic, financial and reputational risks. An example risk has been included to guide you.

Some partnerships may not face any risks, whereas others may face many. For those which face many risks, please note only the three most significant risks.

Please write a brief description of the risk, give each risk a rating for likelihood and impact using the criteria below, and bullet point the mitigating actions which will help mitigate the risk.

Risk Description	Impact Rating	Likelihood Rating	Total Risk Rating (Impact x Likelihood)	Mitigating actions
Balance sheet deficit	3	3	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional funding streams identified • Thorough financial forecasting and efficient cost control • Restructure implemented and adjustments made as required on an on-going basis.

<p>Likelihood rating scale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 41. Remote 42. Unlikely 43. Possible 44. Likely 45. Almost Certain 	<p>Impact rating scale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 45. Negligible 46. Minor 47. Moderate 48. Major 49. Catastrophic
--	--

Registration document for Castle Cavendish Foundation and Castle Cavendish Ltd (formerly Nottingham Development Company)

Completed Summer 2012

Nottingham City Council - Partnership Governance Framework Registration of Significant Partnerships	
<p><u>Partnership</u></p> <p>Castle Cavendish Foundation and Castle Cavendish Ltd (formerly Nottingham Development Company)</p> <p>Castle Cavendish Business Centre Dorking Road Radford Nottingham United Kingdom NG7 5PN</p> <p>Tel: 0115 978 8553 Email: enquiries@castlecavendish.org.uk Website www.castlecavendish.org.uk</p>	<p><u>Status</u></p> <p>The foundation is a company limited by guarantee with charitable status.</p>
Dave Brennan, Chief Executive, Castle Cavendish Foundation	
<p><u>Aims/focus</u></p> <p>The NDC delivery programme ended in March 2010 and the partnership is changed from managing a delivery programme to managing assets to be used for the benefit of the local community. The organisation is now configured to manage the property portfolio to provide a net income for reinvestment to support the communities of Radford and Hyson Green..</p>	
<p><u>Role in Nottingham Plan/ LAA /LDF /Council Plan</u></p> <p>The NDC contributed to Neighbourhood Nottingham and Working Nottingham Implementation Plan targets at the neighbourhood level.</p>	
<p><u>Resources</u></p> <p>NDC programme ended on 31 March 2010. It is anticipated that the asset base will generate an income that will cover limited management costs and Neighbourhood Improvement Fund. .</p>	<p><u>Reporting</u></p> <p><u>NCC</u> Through the Council representative on NDC Board and, when necessary, meetings between responsible Corporate Director and Chair/Chief Executive of Castle Cavendish Foundation.</p>

	<p>The old NDC accounts have now been closed off and the Audit completed. This was confirmed in a letter to Jane Todd in July 2012.</p>
<p><u>Council nominees, responsible Corporate Directors and lead officers</u></p> <p>No Councillor representative on Trustees at present. Following meeting between Cllr Chapman and Dave Brennan looking to nominate Cllr Steff Williams as trustee.</p>	<p><u>Members of the Board</u></p> <p>Beverley Brooks Garry Bryant Craig Elder John Gibbon June Greenway Jane Hartley Neville Hunter Janet Mills</p> <p>All listed on Website in Oct 2012.</p> <p>(NB most Board members were recruited by public advertisement as independent members to provide the range of required skills and expertise rather than to represent specific interests.)</p>

COMPLETED SUPPLIER 2012

NOTTINGHAM CITY COUNCIL
SIGNIFICANT PARTNERSHIPS GOVERNANCE HEALTH CHECK 2012

Completed Summer 2012

In consultation with your partnership, please complete the tables below. Once the details have been agreed by the partnership please return them to alice.coleman@nottinghamcity.gov.uk. If you require any assistance please contact Alice Coleman, Policy Officer, Nottingham City Council, on 0115 87 63372.

Name of Partnership: Castle Cavendish Foundation (formerly NDC)
NCC Lead Councillor:
NCC Corporate Director: John Kelly, Interim Corporate Director for Communities
NCC Lead Officer: John Marsh, Locality Manager
Partnership Chief Executive/Manager (if appropriate): Dave Brennan

We have identified 8 areas of good governance. In each area we have provided a number of clear statements to illustrate what 'excellent' looks like for that area of governance. Using the criteria where 1 is 'excellent' and 4 is 'many key weaknesses' (page 1), please record a score (1-4) for each area of good governance for your significant partnership, making relevant notes on how the score could be improved.

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
1. Aims and objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership has clear aims and SMART objectives clearly set out and understandable • Strong alignment between the partnership's and The Nottingham Plan and 2030 vision • In pursuing the 2030 vision, the partnership has a set of values against which decision making and actions can be judged (e.g. code of conduct) 	2-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed merger with the Partnership Council is no longer on the agenda. CCF has a new Strategic Development Plan (April 2012). It is also developing an Asset Development Strategy.

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The partnership achieves more than the sum of its parts. It delivers the benefits identified in the business case 		
<p>2. Membership and structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The structure is clear, is set out in Terms of Reference, a Memorandum of Agreement or other governing documents and is regularly reviewed. Roles, responsibilities and contributions are defined for all partners and set out in the governing documents, including whistle-blowing, responding to compliments and complaints, risk assessment, personnel and financial management and financial and performance reporting. Key partners provide effective leadership. Their leadership roles and responsibilities are understood and fulfilled. The membership provides the necessary knowledge, skills and experience to do the job. Partners ensure that the right people are in the right place at the right time. The partners are committed at the highest level to deliver the partnership's objectives. There are constructive working relationships between all partners, the right people attend the meetings, and these are supported by lead officers within partner agencies. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As reported last year, CCF continues to have robust membership and structure. The Trustees appear unchanged from previous year. There is no Councillor representative on the Trustees although DB indicated they were to invite/nominate Cllr Steff Williams. CCF receives no funding from NCC. CCF is a charity with a trading subsidiary. All profits are directed back through the Charitable arm community fund..

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes to membership and exit strategies are considered and the governing documents say what will happen if/when a partner wishes to leave. 		
<p>3. Decision making and accountability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decision making is clear and transparent. Authority and delegations are set out in governing documents including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who can make what decisions Delegated responsibilities The partnership has a clear procedure for dealing with conflicts of interest Those making decisions are provided with information that is fit for the purpose – relevant, timely and give clear explanations of technical issues and their implications Decisions are properly recorded and notified promptly to those who are affected by them. The partnership has a communication plan to inform service users, members and the public about the partnership, its decisions, its achievements and successes, who is accountable and responsible for what. It provides routes for people to comment/contribute to the partnership’s work. The partnership has clear lines of accountability and arrangements for reporting performance Arrangements are in place for the partnership to report in a timely way on its work and 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<p>achievements to Council officers and Councillors. Decisions and activities are scrutinized at the appropriate level.</p>		
<p>4. Performance management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership reviews its progress and delivery against clear outcomes, outputs and milestones and takes prompt corrective action if necessary. • Delivery contracts and agreements are monitored and poor performance is tackled. 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a strong culture of performance management particularly in regard to business elements of work.
<p>5. Evaluation and review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership regularly reviews its policies, strategies, membership and use of resources against its objectives and targets. • The partnership reviews its progress and delivery against clear outcomes, outputs and milestones and takes prompt corrective action if necessary. • Delivery contracts and agreements are monitored and poor performance is tackled. • Arrangements for responding to complaints and dealing with unforeseen problems needing a prompt response are in place and clearly stated. • There are clearly stated procedures to deal with disputes within the partnership and these are followed when necessary. 	1	

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
6. Equalities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership assesses its policies and programmes for their impact on equalities. • The partnership considers impact on inequality and deprivation as part of its performance management. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No particular issues raised at meeting with DB
7. Finance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership has access to resources to support delivery of its aims and objectives. It has a financial and /or procurement plan that identifies how it proposes to use these funding to achieve its objectives. • The role of the partnership in relation to finance and the extent of its powers to make financial decisions and approvals are stated and understood. • The partnership has effective arrangements for financial monitoring and reporting. • The partnership uses its resources well and demonstrates how it uses them to add value. It ensures that it uses resources to complement and enhance the work of individual partners. 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The financial position appears secure as all assets are free of any legal charge. The organisation is not involved in service delivery – they just manage assets.
8. Partnership Risk Management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key people are aware of areas of potential risk in partnerships and the need to allocate resources to manage risk. • The partnership has an agreed mechanism for identifying, assessing and managing risks. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation now has a settled Chief Executive in place. • The organisation has redefined its role following the collapse of the merger with Partnership Council. • The Strategic Development Plan includes a range of short, medium and long term goals.

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate tools have been developed and resources are in place to manage risk. • Partnership risks are well managed across organisational boundaries. • There is clear evidence of improved partnership delivery through risk management. 		

COMPLETED SUMMER 2012

Overall Headline Risk

Please fill in the table below the most significant risks which the Council needs to be aware of in terms of our involvement with this partnership. These can include strategic, financial and reputational risks. An example risk has been included to guide you.

Some partnerships may not face any risks, whereas others may face many. For those which face many risks, please note only the three most significant risks.

Please write a brief description of the risk, give each risk a rating for likelihood and impact using the criteria below, and bullet point the mitigating actions which will help mitigate the risk.

Risk Description	Impact Rating	Likelihood Rating	Total Risk Rating (Impact x Likelihood)	Mitigating actions
Board fails to agree consensus on aims and objectives	3	2	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure aims and objectives are agreed
Property income insufficient to support charitable and other	4	2	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research and consider alternatives
				<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Likelihood rating scale: 46. Remote 47. Unlikely 48. Possible 49. Likely 50. Almost Certain	Impact rating scale: 50. Negligible 51. Minor 52. Moderate 53. Major 54. Catastrophic
--	--

Registration document for Joint Leadership Board (“JLB”)

Completed Summer 2012

Nottingham City Council - Partnership Governance Framework Registration of Significant Partnerships	
<u>Partnership</u> Joint Leadership Board c/o Nottingham City Council Loxley House Station Street Nottingham NG2 3NG Tel: 0115 876 63414 Email: claire.richmond@nottinghamcity.gov.uk	<u>Status</u> Voluntary Association
Claire Richmond, Director for Policy, Partnerships and Communications, Nottingham City Council	
<u>Aims/focus</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• To achieve the promotion and improvement of the economic well-being of Nottingham and Nottinghamshire, its people and businesses through local authorities and key partners working together at a strategic level.• The Joint Leadership Board was established in 2010 in response to the previous Government’s proposals from its Sub-National Review of Economic Development (SNR) and requirements of the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act, 2009.• The 2009 Act also placed a statutory duty upon metropolitan, county and unitary authorities to assess the economic conditions of an area to inform the now abolished Single Regional Strategy and local economic development priorities. These economic assessments were to reflect functional economic areas and not purely administrative boundaries. The JLB was established to provide an effective governance structure for the economic assessment.• Following the Sub-National Growth White Paper 2010, the creation of Local Enterprise Partnerships, the abolition of Regional Development Agencies (RDA) and the statutory requirement to produce an economic assessment, it was agreed to continue with the Joint Leadership Board and to link it formally into the new Derby, Derbyshire, Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Local Enterprise Partnership Board.	

<p><u>Role in Nottingham Plan/ LDF /Council Plan</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Nottingham Plan – The Joint Leadership Board will support the priorities of the World Class Implementation Plan, in particular: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To recover and continue growth in Nottingham GVA (per capita) of 3.8% per year. ○ 20,000 new jobs created in science and technology sector (to 82,100). ○ Continue to increase new business starts by 10% per year. ○ 5% increase in the visitor economy year on year. ○ Host at least 12 internationally significant cultural and sporting events • It will also support the employment, housing growth, transport and sustainable targets. • Local Development Framework and Core Strategy – will contribute or support timely and viable infrastructure, economic prosperity, flourishing and vibrant town centres, regeneration. • Council Plan 2011-2015 priorities – good access to public transport; Nottingham is a good place to do business, invest and create jobs; Nottingham offers a range of leisure activities, parks and sporting events. 	
<p><u>Resources</u></p> <p><u>2010/11</u> The Secretariat for the Joint Leadership Board is provided in kind by the County Council and the City Council.</p>	<p><u>Reporting</u></p> <p>Nottingham City Council Executive Board Nottinghamshire County Council Cabinet</p> <p><u>Other –</u></p> <p>Derby, Derbyshire, Nottingham and Nottingham Local Enterprise Partnership Board.</p>
<p><u>Council nominees, responsible Corporate Directors and lead officers</u></p> <p>Councillor Jon Collins, Leader – Vice-Chair of Joint Leadership Board</p> <p>Carole Mills-Evans, Acting Chief Executive</p> <p>Lead Officer – Claire Richmond, Director for Policy, Partnerships and Communications</p>	<p><u>Board Members</u></p> <p>Leader, Nottinghamshire County Council – Chair</p> <p>Leader, Nottingham City Council – Vice-Chair</p> <p>Chief Executive, Nottinghamshire County Council</p> <p>Chief Executive, Nottingham City Council</p> <p>Leaders and Chief Executives of Nottinghamshire District Councils</p> <p>Chair and Strategic Manager, Nottinghamshire Employment and Skills Board</p> <p>Chair, Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Business Engagement Group</p> <p>Chair and Director, NRL</p> <p>Chair and Chief Executive, Experience Nottinghamshire</p> <p>Chief Executive, Enable</p> <p>Vice Chancellors, University of Nottingham & Nottingham Trent University</p> <p>Senior representative from HCA (as observer)</p>

NOTTINGHAM CITY COUNCIL
SIGNIFICANT PARTNERSHIPS GOVERNANCE HEALTH CHECK 2012

Completed Summer 2012

In consultation with your partnership, please complete the tables below. Once the details have been agreed by the partnership please return them to alice.coleman@nottinghamcity.gov.uk. If you require any assistance please contact Alice Coleman, Policy Officer, Nottingham City Council, on 0115 87 63372.

Name of Partnership: Joint Leadership Board
NCC Lead Councillor: Cllr Jon Collins
NCC Corporate Director: Carole Mills-Evans
NCC Lead Officer: Claire Richmond
Partnership Chief Executive/Manager (if appropriate):

We have identified 8 areas of good governance. In each area we have provided a number of clear statements to illustrate what 'excellent' looks like for that area of governance. Using the criteria where 1 is 'excellent' and 4 is 'many key weaknesses' (page 1), please record a score (1-4) for each area of good governance for your significant partnership, making relevant notes on how the score could be improved.

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
1. Aims and objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The partnership has clear aims and SMART objectives clearly set out and understandable Strong alignment between the partnership's and The Nottingham Plan and 2030 vision In pursuing the 2030 vision, the partnership has a set of values against which decision making and actions can be judged (e.g. code of conduct) 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The partnership has a clear remit set out in the Terms of Reference The partnership helps to deliver The Nottingham Plan, particularly World Class Nottingham With the CCB and Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Business engagement forum, it is a key part of the wider engagement for the D2N2 LEP and the formal mechanism by which Nottingham and Nottinghamshire feeds into the LEP.

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The partnership achieves more than the sum of its parts. It delivers the benefits identified in the business case 		
<p>2. Membership and structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The structure is clear, is set out in Terms of Reference, a Memorandum of Agreement or other governing documents and is regularly reviewed. Roles, responsibilities and contributions are defined for all partners and set out in the governing documents, including whistle-blowing, responding to compliments and complaints, risk assessment, personnel and financial management and financial and performance reporting. Key partners provide effective leadership. Their leadership roles and responsibilities are understood and fulfilled. The membership provides the necessary knowledge, skills and experience to do the job. Partners ensure that the right people are in the right place at the right time. The partners are committed at the highest level to deliver the partnership's objectives. There are constructive working relationships between all partners, the right people attend the meetings, and these are supported by lead officers within partner agencies. 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The membership and relationships/links with other partnership bodies is clearly stated in the Terms of Reference Member Responsibilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Being empowered to represent the views of the partner they represent, and as far as possible being able to commit that partner - Ensuring that the Board has a clear vision and strategic direction, and focusing on achieving these - Taking an active part in proceedings, acting with integrity to ensure fairness, transparency and exclusivity - Consulting within their organisation, and others where appropriate, to gain a range of views to inform discussion - Reporting any decisions, actions and proposals to their organisation - Considering impact of activity on community and environment - Fostering business relationships with a wide range of partners

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes to membership and exit strategies are considered and the governing documents say what will happen if/when a partner wishes to leave. 		
<p>3. Decision making and accountability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decision making is clear and transparent. Authority and delegations are set out in governing documents including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who can make what decisions Delegated responsibilities The partnership has a clear procedure for dealing with conflicts of interest Those making decisions are provided with information that is fit for the purpose – relevant, timely and give clear explanations of technical issues and their implications Decisions are properly recorded and notified promptly to those who are affected by them. The partnership has a communication plan to inform service users, members and the public about the partnership, its decisions, its achievements and successes, who is accountable and responsible for what. It provides routes for people to comment/contribute to the partnership’s work. The partnership has clear lines of accountability and arrangements for reporting performance 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deputies: All members of the Board will be expected to have considerable familiarity with economic development and related agendas, to carry the appropriate authorisation of the organisation they are representing and to prioritise their attendance at Board Meetings. Where Board members are unable to attend a meeting, the attendance of a deputy is allowable. However, to ensure consistency members should ensure that any deputies are suitably accountable, qualified and briefed. Decision making: The principle of decision making by the Board is that agreement will be reached by consensus. Quorum: Two-thirds of members (or their nominated deputies) must be present in order for the meeting to be considered quorate. Delegation of powers: The Chair and the Vice Chair (sitting as a sub-committee) may have decision making powers delegated to them by the Board. Conflict of interest: Local Authority Members are bound by a Code of Conduct which includes requirements to make declarations of personal or prejudicial interest and obligations relating to their conduct. Non Councillor members of the Board abide by the same Code of Conduct.

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arrangements are in place for the partnership to report in a timely way on its work and achievements to Council officers and Councillors. Decisions and activities are scrutinized at the appropriate level. 		
<p>4. Performance management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership reviews its progress and delivery against clear outcomes, outputs and milestones and takes prompt corrective action if necessary. • Delivery contracts and agreements are monitored and poor performance is tackled. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is anticipated that the partnership will review its progress and delivery against clear outcomes, outputs and milestones and takes prompt corrective action if necessary.
<p>5. Evaluation and review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership regularly reviews its policies, strategies, membership and use of resources against its objectives and targets. • The partnership reviews its progress and delivery against clear outcomes, outputs and milestones and takes prompt corrective action if necessary. • Delivery contracts and agreements are monitored and poor performance is tackled. • Arrangements for responding to complaints and dealing with unforeseen problems needing a prompt response are in place and clearly stated. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terms of Reference are clear, and include a clear statement of the Chair's responsibilities • Last year the agendas were reviewed in the light of the establishment of the D2N2 LEP and amended accordingly. • The meeting attracts a strong turnout from public sector members. There is an overlap in discussions on economic strategy with the Nottinghamshire Leaders Group so interest levels are probably being maintained by the opportunity to feed in to and/or challenge the D2N2 LEP. • Given this overlap there may be opportunities to simplify the economic partnership activity, subject to support from partner authorities.

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are clearly stated procedures to deal with disputes within the partnership and these are followed when necessary. 		
<p>6. Equalities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The partnership assesses its policies and programmes for their impact on equalities. The partnership considers impact on inequality and deprivation as part of its performance management. 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members of the Board will have regard to the Ten General Principles of Public Life when acting in their role as members of the Board. This includes Respect for Others - members should promote equality by not discriminating unlawfully against any person, and by treating people with respect, regardless of their race, age, religion, gender, sexual orientation or disability. They should respect the impartiality and integrity of their authority's statutory officers and its other employees.
<p>7. Finance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The partnership has access to resources to support delivery of its aims and objectives. It has a financial and /or procurement plan that identifies how it proposes to use these funding to achieve its objectives. The role of the partnership in relation to finance and the extent of its powers to make financial decisions and approvals are stated and understood. The partnership has effective arrangements for financial monitoring and reporting. The partnership uses its resources well and demonstrates how it uses them to add value. It ensures that it uses resources to complement and enhance the work of individual partners. 	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The JLB has no budgetary responsibilities and no specific allocated finance. The JLB is strategic in nature. It does not formulate delivery arrangements for specific programmes which require the allocation of budgets. This is handled by relevant delivery partners.

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<p>8. Partnership Risk Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key people are aware of areas of potential risk in partnerships and the need to allocate resources to manage risk. • The partnership has an agreed mechanism for identifying, assessing and managing risks. • Appropriate tools have been developed and resources are in place to manage risk. • Partnership risks are well managed across organisational boundaries. • There is clear evidence of improved partnership delivery through risk management. 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No decision is carried unless members reach consensus. As such risk is managed through ensuring that partners, including Nottingham City Council, are in agreement prior to decisions being made.

COMPLETED SUMMER 2019

Overall Headline Risk

Please fill in the table below the most significant risks which the Council needs to be aware of in terms of our involvement with this partnership. These can include strategic, financial and reputational risks. An example risk has been included to guide you.

Some partnerships may not face any risks, whereas others may face many. For those which face many risks, please note only the three most significant risks.

Please write a brief description of the risk, give each risk a rating for likelihood and impact using the criteria below, and bullet point the mitigating actions which will help mitigate the risk.

Risk Description	Impact Rating	Likelihood Rating	Total Risk Rating (Impact x Likelihood)	Mitigating actions
Insufficient co-ordination between the D2N2 LEP and JLB Board limit the ability of public sector partners to influence the LEP agenda.	3	3	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with Nottinghamshire County Council and Economic Development to improve timing. • Explore opportunities to simplify economic partnership activity, subject to support from partner authorities.

Registration Document for Core City Board

Completed Summer 2012

Nottingham City Council - Partnership Governance Framework Registration of Significant Partnerships	
<p><u>Partnership</u></p> <p>Core City Board</p> <p>c/o Nottingham City Council Loxley House Station Street Nottingham NG2 3NG</p> <p>Tel: 0115 876 63414 Email: claire.richmond@nottinghamcity.gov.uk</p>	<p><u>Status</u></p> <p>Voluntary Association</p>
<p>Claire Richmond, Director for Policy, Partnerships and Communications, Nottingham City Council</p>	
<p><u>Aims/focus</u></p> <p>To develop economic strategy and investment programmes at the Core City area to feed into the overall vision and strategic priorities for the wider economic development agenda for Nottingham and Nottinghamshire as agreed by the Joint Leadership Board (see 21). The Joint Leadership Board (JLB) and Core City Board are mutually interdependent and together they formally feed into the Derby, Derbyshire, Nottingham, Nottinghamshire Local Enterprise Partnership.</p>	
<p><u>Role in Nottingham Plan/ LDF /Council Plan</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Nottingham Plan – The Core City Board will support the priorities of the World Class Implementation Plan, in particular: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To recover and continue growth in Nottingham GVA (per capita) of 3.8% per year. ○ 20,000 new jobs created in science and technology sector (to 82,100). ○ Continue the increase in new business starts by 10% per year. ○ 5% growth in the visitor economy year on year. ○ Host at least 12 internationally significant cultural and sporting events • It will also support the employment, housing growth, transport and sustainable targets. • Local Development Framework and Core Strategy – will contribute or support timely and viable infrastructure, economic prosperity, flourishing and vibrant town centres, regeneration. • Council Plan – Good access to public transport; Nottingham is a good place to do business, invest and create jobs; Nottingham offers a range of leisure 	

activities, parks and sporting events.	
<p><u>Resources</u></p> <p>The Secretariat for the Core City Board is provided in kind by the City Council with support from the County Council.</p>	<p><u>Reporting</u></p> <p>Nottingham City Council Executive Board Nottinghamshire County Council Cabinet</p> <p><u>Other –</u></p> <p>Derby, Derbyshire, Nottingham and Nottingham Local Enterprise Partnership Board.</p>
<p><u>Council nominees, responsible Corporate Directors and lead officers</u></p> <p>Councillor Jon Collins, Leader –Chair</p> <p>Carole Mills-Evans, Acting Chief Executive</p> <p>Lead Officer – Claire Richmond, Director for Policy, Partnerships and Communications</p>	<p><u>Board Members</u></p> <p>Leader, Nottingham City Council – Chair Leader, Nottinghamshire County Council – Vice-Chair Leaders, Rushcliffe, Gedling, Broxtowe and Ashfield District Councils Principal, New College Nottingham Vice Chancellors, University of Nottingham and Nottingham Trent University Chair, Nottinghamshire Employment and Skills Board Chair, NRL (private sector) Chair, Experience Nottinghamshire (private sector) Chief Executive, NCVS (Third Sector) Senior representative from HCA (as observer)</p>

NOTTINGHAM CITY COUNCIL
SIGNIFICANT PARTNERSHIPS GOVERNANCE HEALTH CHECK 2012

Completed Summer 2012

In consultation with your partnership, please complete the tables below. Once the details have been agreed by the partnership please return them to alice.coleman@nottinghamcity.gov.uk. If you require any assistance please contact Alice Coleman, Policy Officer, Nottingham City Council, on 0115 87 63372.

Name of Partnership: Core City Board
NCC Lead Councillor: Cllr Jon Collins
NCC Corporate Director: Carole Mills-Evans
NCC Lead Officer: Claire Richmond
Partnership Chief Executive/Manager (if appropriate):

We have identified 8 areas of good governance. In each area we have provided a number of clear statements to illustrate what 'excellent' looks like for that area of governance. Using the criteria where 1 is 'excellent' and 4 is 'many key weaknesses' (page 1), please record a score (1-4) for each area of good governance for your significant partnership, making relevant notes on how the score could be improved.

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
1. Aims and objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership has clear aims and SMART objectives clearly set out and understandable • Strong alignment between the partnership's and The Nottingham Plan and 2030 vision • In pursuing the 2030 vision, the partnership has a set of values against which decision making and actions can be judged (e.g. code of conduct) 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership has a clear remit set out in the Terms of Reference • The partnership helps to deliver The Nottingham Plan, particularly World Class Nottingham

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The partnership achieves more than the sum of its parts. It delivers the benefits identified in the business case The meeting agendas need to focus more on the specific Core City agendas 		
<p>2. Membership and structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The structure is clear, is set out in Terms of Reference, a Memorandum of Agreement or other governing documents and is regularly reviewed. Roles, responsibilities and contributions are defined for all partners and set out in the governing documents, including whistle-blowing, responding to compliments and complaints, risk assessment, personnel and financial management and financial and performance reporting. Key partners provide effective leadership. Their leadership roles and responsibilities are understood and fulfilled. The membership provides the necessary knowledge, skills and experience to do the job. Partners ensure that the right people are in the right place at the right time. The partners are committed at the highest level to deliver the partnership's objectives. There are constructive working relationships between 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The membership and relationships/links with other partnership bodies is clearly stated in the Terms of Reference Member Responsibilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Being empowered to represent the views of the partner they represent, and as far as possible being able to commit that partner Ensuring that the Board has a clear vision and strategic direction, and focusing on achieving these Taking an active part in proceedings, acting with integrity to ensure fairness, transparency and inclusively Consulting within their organisation, and others where appropriate, to gain a range of views to inform discussion Reporting any decisions, actions and proposals to their organisation Considering impact of activity on community and environment Fostering business relationships with a wide range of partners

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<p>all partners, the right people attend the meetings, and these are supported by lead officers within partner agencies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes to membership and exit strategies are considered and the governing documents say what will happen if/when a partner wishes to leave. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Steps have been made to ensure the agenda demonstrates a clear role. There has been some success, e.g. as a forum for shaping and communicating the City Deal and rail lobbying.
<p>3. Decision making and accountability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decision making is clear and transparent. Authority and delegations are set out in governing documents including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who can make what decisions Delegated responsibilities The partnership has a clear procedure for dealing with conflicts of interest Those making decisions are provided with information that is fit for the purpose – relevant, timely and give clear explanations of technical issues and their implications Decisions are properly recorded and notified promptly to those who are affected by them. The partnership has a communication plan to inform service users, members and the public about the partnership, its decisions, its achievements and successes, who is accountable and responsible for what. It provides routes for people to 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deputies: All members of the Board will be expected to have considerable familiarity with economic development and related agendas, to carry the appropriate authorisation of the organisation they are representing and to prioritise their attendance at Board Meetings. Where Board members are unable to attend a meeting, the attendance of a deputy is allowable. However, to ensure consistency members should ensure that any deputies are suitably accountable, qualified and briefed. Decision making: The principle of decision making by the Board is that agreement will be reached by consensus. Quorum: Two-thirds of members (or their nominated deputies) must be present in order for the meeting to be considered quorate. Delegation of powers: The Chair and the Vice Chair (sitting as a sub-committee) may have decision making powers delegated to them by the Board. Conflict of interest: Local Authority Members are bound

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<p>comment/contribute to the partnership's work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The partnership has clear lines of accountability and arrangements for reporting performance Arrangements are in place for the partnership to report in a timely way on its work and achievements to Council officers and Councillors. Decisions and activities are scrutinized at the appropriate level. 		<p>by a Code of Conduct which includes requirements to make declarations of personal or prejudicial interest and obligations relating to their conduct. Non Councillor members of the Board abide by the same Code of Conduct.</p>
<p>4. Performance management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The partnership reviews its progress and delivery against clear outcomes, outputs and milestones and takes prompt corrective action if necessary. Delivery contracts and agreements are monitored and poor performance is tackled. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is anticipated that the partnership will review its progress and delivery against clear outcomes, outputs and milestones.
<p>5. Evaluation and review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The partnership regularly reviews its policies, strategies, membership and use of resources against its objectives and targets. The partnership reviews its progress and delivery against clear outcomes, outputs and milestones and takes prompt corrective action if necessary. Delivery contracts and agreements are monitored and poor performance is tackled. Arrangements for responding to complaints and dealing with unforeseen problems needing a 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Terms of Reference are clear, and include a clear statement of the Chair's responsibilities Last year the agendas have been reviewed in the light of the establishment of the D2N2 LEP and amended accordingly. Forthcoming arrangements to support the Growth Plan and City Deal may result in an overlap with the CCB's agenda.

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<p>prompt response are in place and clearly stated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are clearly stated procedures to deal with disputes within the partnership and these are followed when necessary. 		
<p>6. Equalities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The partnership assesses its policies and programmes for their impact on equalities. The partnership considers impact on inequality and deprivation as part of its performance management. 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members of the Board will have regard to the Ten General Principles of Public Life when acting in their role as members of the Board. This includes Respect for Others - members should promote equality by not discriminating unlawfully against any person, and by treating people with respect, regardless of their race, age, religion, gender, sexual orientation or disability. They should respect the impartiality and integrity of their authority's statutory officers and its other employees.
<p>7. Finance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The partnership has access to resources to support delivery of its aims and objectives. It has a financial and /or procurement plan that identifies how it proposes to use these funding to achieve its objectives. The role of the partnership in relation to finance and the extent of its powers to make financial decisions and approvals are stated and understood. 	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The CCB has no budgetary responsibilities and no specific allocated finance. The CCB is strategic in nature. It does not formulate delivery arrangements for specific programmes which require the allocation of budgets. This is handled by relevant delivery partners.

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The partnership has effective arrangements for financial monitoring and reporting. The partnership uses its resources well and demonstrates how it uses them to add value. It ensures that it uses resources to complement and enhance the work of individual partners. 		
<p>8. Partnership Risk Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key people are aware of areas of potential risk in partnerships and the need to allocate resources to manage risk. The partnership has an agreed mechanism for identifying, assessing and managing risks. Appropriate tools have been developed and resources are in place to manage risk. Partnership risks are well managed across organisational boundaries. There is clear evidence of improved partnership delivery through risk management. 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No decision is carried unless members reach consensus. As such risk is managed through ensuring that partners, including Nottingham City Council, are in agreement prior to decisions being made.

Overall Headline Risk

Please fill in the table below the most significant risks which the Council needs to be aware of in terms of our involvement with this partnership. These can include strategic, financial and reputational risks. An example risk has been included to guide you.

Some partnerships may not face any risks, whereas others may face many. For those which face many risks, please note only the three most significant risks.

Please write a brief description of the risk, give each risk a rating for likelihood and impact using the criteria below, and bullet point the mitigating actions which will help mitigate the risk.

Risk Description	Impact Rating	Likelihood Rating	Total Risk Rating (Impact x Likelihood)	Mitigating actions
Council's reputation is affected by agendas not reflecting the specific Core City issues.	3	3	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain process of agenda review with Economic Development. • Explore opportunities to simplify economic partnership activity once Growth Plan, City Deal and related governance is established, subject to support from partner authorities.

Likelihood rating scale:

- 51. Remote
- 52. Unlikely
- 53. Possible
- 54. Likely
- 55. Almost Certain

Impact rating scale:

- 55. Negligible
- 56. Minor
- 57. Moderate
- 58. Major
- 59. Catastrophic

Registration document for D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership (Derby, Derbyshire, Nottingham, Nottinghamshire LEP)

Completed Summer 2012

Name of Partnership	D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership
Nature of proposal	To set out business case and registration info for the existing Partnership
Reasons for the Partnership	
Is it statutory	No
Key aims	<p>The aim of the LEP is to create the conditions for future economic prosperity and resilience by harnessing our economic power and complementary strengths through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building on shared advantages in internationally competitive science, manufacturing, engineering and creative industries, to drive productivity growth as we develop a low carbon economy. • Developing our distinctive cultural, leisure, sport and tourism offer to world class standards. • Ensuring that the benefits of sustainable economic growth are shared across our cities, towns and rural communities. • Developing our skills, building on the strengths and reputation of our first rate FE and HE sector, that will meet and drive up employers' current and future skills demands. • Continuing to secure investment in regeneration and infrastructure projects to stimulate private sector growth.
<p>How it adds to Council's work on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SCS • Local Development Framework and Core Strategy • LAA • Council Plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SCS – through its overarching role in driving the sub-regional economy, it is proposed that the LEP will have a major contribution to World Class Nottingham programme targets on City GVA (gross value added); jobs in science and technology sector; overnight stays; new business VAT registration; tackling congestion etc. <p>Through its developing role in employment and skills it is envisaged that the LEP will also support, work on Working Nottingham targets to increase City employment rate; raise % adults with minimum Level 2 qualification; take City out of 10% deprived authority areas; take all neighbourhoods out of most deprived 5%.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local Development Framework and Core Strategy – supports economic prosperity, transport and regeneration objectives. The D2N2 operates on sub-regional levels, however it could contribute to the LAA via the Choose Nottingham and part of Young Nottingham theme. Council Plan – increase employment rate; increase working age population qualified to Level 2 (Choose Nottingham).
Performance management	
SMART outcomes and targets – delivery	Timescale
<p>A delivery action plan will be developed out of funding received via the LEP Capacity Fund. This will be in place by end of 2011.</p> <p>Interim delivery will focus upon:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enterprise, Innovation and Sector Support Inward Investment and Trade Promotion and Tourism Employment and Skills Infrastructure and Planning, including Housing 	Progress reported to quarterly Board meeting.
SMART outcomes and targets – governance, capacity and functioning	Timescale
The D2N2 LEP Board has been established but has no legal status. It is linked to the Joint Leadership Board and Core City Board in Nottingham and Nottinghamshire. The Board is supported by an Officer Group.	Quarterly Board meetings. Monthly Officer Group meetings.
Accountability and membership	
To whom is the Partnership accountable	Partners
How/where is performance reported to the Council	<p>Overview and Scrutiny and to Regeneration Select Committee</p> <p>Via Council nominated Board members.</p>
What is the structure (of the Partnership)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D2N2 LEP Board D2N2 LEP Officer Group
What is the membership (organisations/sectors; number of appointments)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D2N2 LEP Board – Nottingham City Council, Derby City Council, Nottinghamshire County Council, Derbyshire County Council, Nottingham Trent University, University of Nottingham, University of Derby, Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Chamber of Commerce, Private Sector. D2N2 LEP Officer Group – As above with exception of Private Sector.

What is the role of the Council? Are there any specific responsibilities?	Board member - influence direction, management responsibility as member of the Board..
What is the role of other key partners? Include any specific responsibilities.	Chair is from the private sector.
Do all members have a clear role and add value?	Inclusive membership – members contribute effectively and bring different perspectives.
Are there key players who should be members but are not?	No
Council representation	
Lead Councillor	Councillor Jon Collins
Responsible Corporate Director	Jane Todd (Chief Executive)
Nominated lead officer (day to day)	Penny Wakefield/Mark Lynam
Any specific roles/responsibilities (Councillors or officers)	No
Risk and Options Appraisal	
<p><u>What is gained from membership of the Partnership – strategic, reputational and financial benefits/opportunities?</u></p> <p><u>Strategic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with partners on key economic and business/transport infrastructure issues for the City and Sub-Region. • Influence and align with planning of significant partners who operate within the sub-region. • Many people who work in the City live in the wider sub-region. • Jobs created/vacancies in the sub-region offer employment for City residents • City/sub-region indivisible in economic and transport terms <p><u>Reputational</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nottingham is the biggest economy in the sub-region. • The City Council is often assumed to have responsibility and influence beyond the City boundaries – therefore needs to be able to influence <p><u>Financial</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Align with and influence spend of partners 	
<p><u>What could go seriously wrong as a result of membership of the Partnership - strategic, reputational and financial risks?</u></p> <p><u>Strategic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implication of agreement with priorities set by the wider partnership when these are not consistent with Council priorities. 	

<p><u>Reputational</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May be unable to achieve City goals but seen as sharing accountability for decisions <p><u>Financial</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential diversion/dilution of resources intended to benefit the City away from Council identified priorities.
<p><u>Are there any employment issues for the Council arising from membership of the Partnership?</u></p> <p>No</p>
<p><u>What would be gained by leaving the Partnership - strategic, reputational and financial benefits/opportunities?</u></p> <p><u>Strategic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear focus on City area and priorities in SCS and Council Plan. • Stronger relationships with some key local economic partners <p><u>Reputational</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearer focus for Council priorities from residents and business's perspective. <p><u>Financial</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will be able to develop locally specific arrangements to secure funding.
<p><u>What would be lost by leaving the Partnership - strategic, reputational and financial risks</u></p> <p><u>Strategic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic development relates to sub-region not City • Loss of agreed mechanism for joined up analysis/understanding/action at sub-regional level. • City may be seen as a "minor" city • Could weaken relationships with key sub-regional/Countywide economic partners (at least at first) • Businesses do not see City boundary as significant <p><u>Reputational</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May be seen as rift with key partners or isolationist. <p><u>Financial</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possible loss of influence over use of funds by some key partners.
<p>Alternative approaches (any other options besides membership of the Partnership)</p>

<u>Have any other working arrangements been considered</u>	
To continue to work on City and County boundaries, as per the SNR arrangements.	
<u>What were/are the strategic, reputational and financial benefits/risks of other arrangements?</u>	
More locally focussed approach to economic development but risk of not working across a functional economic area.	
<u>Why were they rejected?</u>	
They did not represent a functional economic area.	
Timescales	
When was the Partnership established?	October 2010.
Is there a proposed end date?	No
Are resources in place for that period? If open-ended, how long are resources in place for?	No (the LEP currently has no financial or staffing resource)
When will the duration/continuation of the Partnership be reviewed?	Continual review
What is the Strategy for winding up – what happens when it ends?	
Not known.	
What is the Council's exit strategy in the event that it decides to leave?	
To be determined depending on the reasons for leaving, as the City Council leaving would likely result in the D2N2 LEP ending.	
Council resources	
What resources will the Council be required/expected to provide (include all funding streams that the Council has to account for)	
Finance (planned and source) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure/capacity • Services/programmes/activity 	Officer time but not dedicated staffing resource. No financial resource is expected or will be provided by the City Council in the short term.
Finance (funding potentially at risk – eg funding that could be withdrawn; funding dependent on performance; contracts for longer than guaranteed funding; permanent employment contracts financed by short term funding etc)	None

• Staff	No
• Accommodation	No
• Legal and other advice	No
• Support services (please give details)	No
• Communication tools	The Council's Corporate Communications Team provides support to the D2N2 LEP.
• Other	No
Partner resources	
• Infrastructure/capacity (and sources)	Nottinghamshire County Council Derbyshire County Council Derby City Council University of Nottingham Nottingham Trent University University of Derby Chamber of Commerce
• Services/programmes/activity (and sources)	None
Recommendation	
(Delete as appropriate)	
To continue to play a leading role in the development of the D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership and seek to maximise the economic benefit for Nottingham.	

NOTTINGHAM CITY COUNCIL
SIGNIFICANT PARTNERSHIPS GOVERNANCE HEALTH CHECK 2012

Completed Summer 2012

In consultation with your partnership, please complete the tables below. Once the details have been agreed by the partnership please return them to alice.coleman@nottinghamcity.gov.uk. If you require any assistance please contact Alice Coleman, Policy Officer, Nottingham City Council, on 0115 87 63372.

Name of Partnership: Derbyshire and Derby, Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Local Enterprise Partnership
NCC Lead Councillor: Councillor Jon Collins, Leader
NCC Corporate Director: David Bishop, Corporate Director Development
NCC Lead Officer: Dave Tantum
Partnership Chief Executive/Manager (if appropriate): N/A

We have identified 8 areas of good governance. In each area we have provided a number of clear statements to illustrate what 'excellent' looks like for that area of governance. Using the criteria where 1 is 'excellent' and 4 is 'many key weaknesses' (page 1), please record a score (1-4) for each area of good governance for your significant partnership, making relevant notes on how the score could be improved.

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
1. Aims and objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership has clear aims and SMART objectives clearly set out and understandable • Strong alignment between the partnership's and The Nottingham Plan and 2030 vision • In pursuing the 2030 vision, the partnership has a set of values against which decision making and actions can be judged (e.g. code of conduct) 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The board has terms of reference and code of conduct. • The LEP Board has 4 high level strategic priorities: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Developing business skills; 2. Supporting innovation; 3. Available finance; 4. Effective infrastructure; • And 6 Areas of Economic Focus: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Advanced Transport Engineering; 2. Health and Bioscience;

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The partnership achieves more than the sum of its parts. It delivers the benefits identified in the business case 		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Food and Beverage Production; Construction; The Visitor Economy; The Low Carbon Economy. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategy group identified opportunities and challenges for 6 areas of economic focus. This will be turned into a forward strategy and intervention document for Board approval
<p>2. Membership and structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The structure is clear, is set out in Terms of Reference, a Memorandum of Agreement or other governing documents and is regularly reviewed. Roles, responsibilities and contributions are defined for all partners and set out in the governing documents, including whistle-blowing, responding to compliments and complaints, risk assessment, personnel and financial management and financial and performance reporting. Key partners provide effective leadership. Their leadership roles and responsibilities are understood and fulfilled. The membership provides the necessary knowledge, skills and experience to do the job. Partners ensure that the right people are in the right place at the right time. 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The membership and structure are clear and set out in the Terms of Reference. Quality standards have been approved by the Board which include standards for Board reports, agenda's, presentations etc; as well as ways of working between the Board and Officers. The Board members take their leadership roles seriously and provide effective leadership for specific areas e.g. EZ negotiations, driving forward Strategy Group and leading on Visitor Economy. The Board membership will be reviewed in June 2013 Consideration being given to strengthening LEP officer capacity making use of the GPF Capacity fund

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The partners are committed at the highest level to deliver the partnership's objectives. There are constructive working relationships between all partners, the right people attend the meetings, and these are supported by lead officers within partner agencies. Changes to membership and exit strategies are considered and the governing documents say what will happen if/when a partner wishes to leave. 		
<p>3. Decision making and accountability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decision making is clear and transparent. Authority and delegations are set out in governing documents including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who can make what decisions Delegated responsibilities The partnership has a clear procedure for dealing with conflicts of interest Those making decisions are provided with information that is fit for the purpose – relevant, timely and give clear explanations of technical issues and their implications Decisions are properly recorded and notified promptly to those who are affected by them. The partnership has a communication plan to inform service users, members and the public about the partnership, its decisions, its achievements and successes, who is accountable and responsible for what. It 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear terms of reference and quality standards Communications to wider business communities and other partners through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> D2N2 website, on which Board agendas and papers are posted D2N2 newssheet Format links to the JLB/CCB, Derby Renaissance Board and Derbyshire Economic Partnership and Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Business Engagement Group Regular Chamber Events

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<p>provides routes for people to comment/contribute to the partnership's work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership has clear lines of accountability and arrangements for reporting performance • Arrangements are in place for the partnership to report in a timely way on its work and achievements to Council officers and Councillors. Decisions and activities are scrutinized at the appropriate level. 		
<p>4. Performance management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership reviews its progress and delivery against clear outcomes, outputs and milestones and takes prompt corrective action if necessary. • Delivery contracts and agreements are monitored and poor performance is tackled. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will be developed alongside the way forward strategy for the 6 areas of economic focus
<p>5. Evaluation and review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership regularly reviews its policies, strategies, membership and use of resources against its objectives and targets. • The partnership reviews its progress and delivery against clear outcomes, outputs and milestones and takes prompt corrective action if necessary. • Delivery contracts and agreements are monitored and poor performance is tackled. 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A review of the Board, its membership and operations will take place in Jun3 2013

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arrangements for responding to complaints and dealing with unforeseen problems needing a prompt response are in place and clearly stated. • There are clearly stated procedures to deal with disputes within the partnership and these are followed when necessary. 		
<p>6. Equalities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership assesses its policies and programmes for their impact on equalities. • The partnership considers impact on inequality and deprivation as part of its performance management. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equalities are embedded in the code of conduct
<p>7. Finance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership has access to resources to support delivery of its aims and objectives. It has a financial and /or procurement plan that identifies how it proposes to use these funding to achieve its objectives. • The role of the partnership in relation to finance and the extent of its powers to make financial decisions and approvals are stated and understood. • The partnership has effective arrangements for financial monitoring and reporting. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Board has secured LEP capacity fund and start up fund. These funds are managed through partner organisations (NTU and Chamber of Commerce) who are the accountable bodies. • Progress reports on the use of the funds are provided to the Board • GPF Capital – Nottingham City Council is the accountable body. GPF sub group provide progress updates to LEP Board • GPF Revenue funding to be used to develop LEP Capacity, proposals being drawn up for Board approval

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The partnership uses its resources well and demonstrates how it uses them to add value. It ensures that it uses resources to complement and enhance the work of individual partners. 		
<p>8. Partnership Risk Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key people are aware of areas of potential risk in partnerships and the need to allocate resources to manage risk. The partnership has an agreed mechanism for identifying, assessing and managing risks. Appropriate tools have been developed and resources are in place to manage risk. Partnership risks are well managed across organisational boundaries. There is clear evidence of improved partnership delivery through risk management. 	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This needs to be developed and will need to form part of the performance management regime for the way forward strategy for the 6 areas of economic focus

Overall Headline Risk

Please fill in the table below the most significant risks which the Council needs to be aware of in terms of our involvement with this partnership. These can include strategic, financial and reputational risks. An example risk has been included to guide you.

Some partnerships may not face any risks, whereas others may face many. For those which face many risks, please note only the three most significant risks.

Please write a brief description of the risk, give each risk a rating for likelihood and impact using the criteria below, and bullet point the mitigating actions which will help mitigate the risk.

Risk Description	Impact Rating	Likelihood Rating	Total Risk Rating (Impact x Likelihood)	Mitigating actions
Insufficient powers and resources to influence and drive economic growth in the area	3	3	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of GPF revenue funds to strengthen LEP capacity
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Way forward strategy for 6 areas of economic focus
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of GPF Capital fund to get projects away and use as a reinvestment pot

Likelihood rating scale:

- 56. Remote
- 57. Unlikely
- 58. Possible
- 59. Likely
- 60. Almost Certain

Impact rating scale:

- 60. Negligible
- 61. Minor
- 62. Moderate
- 63. Major
- 64. Catastrophic

Registration document for Housing Strategic Partnership

Completed Summer 2012

Nottingham City Council - Partnership Governance Framework Registration of Significant Partnerships	
<p><u>Partnership</u></p> <p>Housing Strategic Partnership</p> <p>c/o Nottingham City Council Loxley House Station Street Nottingham NG2 3NG</p> <p>Tel: 0115 876 3538 Email: graham.demax@nottinghamcity.gov.uk</p>	<p><u>Status</u></p>
<p><u>Aims/focus</u></p> <p>To deliver more homes across all tenures and meet the housing aspirations and needs of citizens, and in doing so assist the economic development and overall prosperity of Nottingham</p>	
<p><u>Role in Nottingham Plan/ LDF /Council Plan</u></p> <p>Has responsibility for delivering key objectives in the Nottingham Plan (housing numbers and fuel poverty)</p>	
<p><u>Resources</u></p> <p>Officer time from within Strategic Housing service to provide support services (servicing meetings, secretariat, co-ordination, communications)</p>	<p><u>Reporting</u></p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <p>One Nottingham</p>
<p><u>Council nominees, responsible Corporate Directors and lead officers</u></p> <p>Councillor Liversidge – lead Councillor</p> <p>David Bishop, Development –</p>	<p><u>Membership</u></p> <p>Councillor Liversidge David Bishop 2 Registered Providers representatives (Mike Andrews, Matt Cooney) Private rented sector rep (Irfan Ahmed)</p>

<p>Responsible Corporate Director</p> <p>Graham de Max, Partnership and Policy Manager- Lead Officer</p>	<p>Homes and Communities Agency (Mark Banister)</p> <p>Nottingham City Homes (Nick Murphy)</p> <p>Voluntary sector representative (Claire Grainger)</p> <p>Lender representative (David Marlow, Nottingham BS)</p> <p>Developer (Nick Ebbs, Blueprint)</p>
--	--

COMPLETED SUMMER 2012

NOTTINGHAM CITY COUNCIL
SIGNIFICANT PARTNERSHIPS GOVERNANCE HEALTH CHECK 2012

In consultation with your partnership, please complete the tables below. Once the details have been agreed by the partnership please return them to alice.johnson@nottinghamcity.gov.uk. If you require any assistance please contact Alice Johnson, Policy Officer, Nottingham City Council, on 0115 87 63372.

Name of Partnership: Housing Strategic Partnership
NCC Lead Councillor: Cllr Liversidge
NCC Corporate Director: David Bishop, Corporate Director, Development
NCC Lead Officer: Graham De Max
Partnership Chief Executive/Manager (if appropriate): N/A

We have identified 8 areas of good governance. In each area we have provided a number of clear statements to illustrate what 'excellent' looks like for that area of governance. Using the criteria where 1 is 'excellent' and 4 is 'many key weaknesses' (page 1), please record a score (1-4) for each area of good governance for your significant partnership, making relevant notes on how the score could be improved.

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
1. Aims and objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The partnership has clear aims and SMART objectives clearly set out and understandable Strong alignment between the partnership's and The Nottingham Plan and 2030 vision In pursuing the 2030 vision, the partnership has a set of values against which decision making and actions can be judged (e.g. code of conduct) The partnership achieves more than the sum of 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Housing Nottingham Plan will be in place by the end of 2012 and will articulate the key objectives for the partnership The HNP is described as "Housing's contribution to the Nottingham Plan"; the alignment is clear. The HSP plans to adopt the One Nottingham code of conduct The partnership is essential to the delivery of positive

<p>its parts. It delivers the benefits identified in the business case</p>		<p>housing outcomes. Its new streamlined structure is already giving the partnership greater focus</p>
<p>2. Membership and structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The structure is clear, is set out in Terms of Reference, a Memorandum of Agreement or other governing documents and is regularly reviewed. • Roles, responsibilities and contributions are defined for all partners and set out in the governing documents, including whistle-blowing, responding to compliments and complaints, risk assessment, personnel and financial management and financial and performance reporting. • Key partners provide effective leadership. Their leadership roles and responsibilities are understood and fulfilled. • The membership provides the necessary knowledge, skills and experience to do the job. Partners ensure that the right people are in the right place at the right time. • The partners are committed at the highest level to deliver the partnership's objectives. There are constructive working relationships between all partners, the right people attend the meetings, and these are supported by lead officers within partner agencies. 	<p>2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership has terms of reference and a structure. These are in the process of being reviewed. • The partnership is not delivering frontline services, nor is it in receipt of direct funding. The key issues here are risk assessment and performance management. Both of these are embedded in the Housing Nottingham Plan • There is strong leadership from the executive group • As well as the executive group, the partnership comprises two standing sub groups. Additionally task and finish groups drawn from partner organisations can be set up to address specific projects and issues as directed by the executive • The executive group comprises senior leadership figures from the partner organisations; the sub groups are made up of experts within the area.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes to membership and exit strategies are considered and the governing documents say what will happen if/when a partner wishes to leave. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This still needs to be addressed within the HSP
<p>3. Decision making and accountability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision making is clear and transparent. Authority and delegations are set out in governing documents including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Who can make what decisions ○ Delegated responsibilities • The partnership has a clear procedure for dealing with conflicts of interest • Those making decisions are provided with information that is fit for the purpose – relevant, timely and give clear explanations of technical issues and their implications • Decisions are properly recorded and notified promptly to those who are affected by them. • The partnership has a communication plan to inform service users, members and the public about the partnership, its decisions, its achievements and successes, who is accountable and responsible for what. It provides routes for people to comment/contribute to the partnership’s work. • The partnership has clear lines of accountability and arrangements for reporting performance • Arrangements are in place for the partnership to report in a timely way on its work and achievements to Council officers and Councillors. Decisions and activities are 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To be addressed • To be addressed • Reports are prepared for meetings setting out options and decisions to be made • Meetings are minuted • The HSP communicates via the One Nottingham structures. For example, the Housing Nottingham Plan is currently out for consultation and the ON network has been utilised in order to gain wide circulation of the draft. As the HNP is implemented and performance managed the HSP will develop a more formal approach to highlighting its work • Performance of delivery of the HNP will be reported into the executive group and where appropriate, One Nottingham.

<p>scrutinized at the appropriate level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are clear routes for members and partners to raise concerns. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The executive group would hear such concerns.
<p>4. Performance management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership reviews its progress and delivery against clear outcomes, outputs and milestones and takes prompt corrective action if necessary. • Delivery contracts and agreements are monitored and poor performance is tackled. 	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Once the HNP is in place this will be the focus of performance management • The HSP does not have delivery contracts
<p>5. Evaluation and review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership regularly reviews its policies, strategies, membership and use of resources against its objectives and targets. • The partnership reviews its progress and delivery against clear outcomes, outputs and milestones and takes prompt corrective action if necessary. • Delivery contracts and agreements are monitored and poor performance is tackled. • Arrangements for responding to complaints and dealing with unforeseen problems needing a prompt response are in place and clearly stated. • There are clearly stated procedures to deal with disputes within the partnership and these are followed when necessary. 	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The HSP's current structure, terms of reference and approach is less than a year old. There will be a review of the current arrangements once they have been in place for a year (Dec2012/Jan 2013) • To be covered in the code of conduct • To be covered in the code of conduct

<p>6. Equalities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership assesses its policies and programmes for their impact on equalities. • The partnership considers impact on inequality and deprivation as part of its performance management. 	2	<p>The housing plan will be subject to an equalities impact assessment</p> <p>A number of the partnership's objectives, as articulated by the housing plan, will be ones which address specific inequalities and aspects of deprivation</p> <p>The partnership has a diverse membership</p>
<p>7. Finance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership has access to resources to support delivery of its aims and objectives. It has a financial and /or procurement plan that identifies how it proposes to use these funding to achieve its objectives. • The role of the partnership in relation to finance and the extent of its powers to make financial decisions and approvals are stated and understood. • The partnership has effective arrangements for financial monitoring and reporting. • The partnership uses its resources well and demonstrates how it uses them to add value. It ensures that it uses resources to complement and enhance the work of individual partners. 		<p>The partnership does not have its own budget; however, individual members' activity will be supported by their own resources. The partnership will use the collective strength of its members' track record of delivery to lever in funding. It has already achieved this with successful bids to the HCA for empty homes funding and the Big Lottery Improving Financial Confidence fund</p> <p>As the partnership does not have any budgets of its own, the requirements on financial management do not apply</p> <p>The partnership's resources are not financial: significant support is provided by the City Council's Strategic Housing service. This support is used to ensure that the work of the partnership is co-ordinated effectively. The appropriate skills, funding capacity and expertise is utilised to maximum effect to deliver benefits for citizens.</p>

<p>8. Partnership Risk Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key people are aware of areas of potential risk in partnerships and the need to allocate resources to manage risk. • The partnership has an agreed mechanism for identifying, assessing and managing risks. • Appropriate tools have been developed and resources are in place to manage risk. • Partnership risks are well managed across organisational boundaries. • There is clear evidence of improved partnership delivery through risk management. 		<p>All aspects of risk and the mechanisms for ongoing risk management will be put in place as part of the performance management of the Housing Nottingham Plan</p>
--	--	---

COMPLETED SUMMER 2012

Overall Headline Risk

Please fill in the table below the most significant risks which the Council needs to be aware of in terms of our involvement with this partnership. These can include strategic, financial and reputational risks. An example risk has been included to guide you.

Some partnerships may not face any risks, whereas others may face many. For those which face many risks, please note only the three most significant risks.

Please write a brief description of the risk, give each risk a rating for likelihood and impact using the criteria below, and bullet point the mitigating actions which will help mitigate the risk.

Risk Description	Impact Rating	Likelihood Rating	Total Risk Rating (Impact x Likelihood)	Mitigating actions
Lack of ownership of HNP actions	4	2	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder workshops as part of consultation, Sept 2012
Commitment of key partners to the HSP reduces	4	2	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain channels of communication, including visits to individual partners
				<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Registration document for Shadow Health & Wellbeing Board
Completed Summer 2012

Nottingham City Council - Partnership Governance Framework Registration of Significant Partnerships	
<p><u>Partnership</u></p> <p>Shadow Health and Wellbeing Board</p> <p>Address: c/o Health Equality Loxley House Station Street NG2 3NG</p> <p>Tel: N/A Email: N/A Website: N/A</p>	<p><u>Status</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Shadow Statutory Board - From April 2013 it will become a committee of the City Council with executive powers. - One Nottingham Theme Partnership
<p><u>Chief Executive / Manager:</u> N/A</p>	
<p><u>Aims/focus</u></p> <p>The Shadow Health and Wellbeing Board (the Board) will promote the development of robust and appropriate governance arrangements to ensure the effective introduction of the formal statutory Health and Wellbeing Board and will oversee relevant transitional arrangements for health, social care and public health until the new arrangements are fully in place for the NHS.</p> <p>The Board will lead and advise on work to improve the health and wellbeing of the population of Nottingham City and specifically to reduce health inequalities. It will support the development of improved and joined up health and social care services.</p> <p>The aims of the Shadow Board are set out in full in the attached Terms of Reference.</p>	
<p><u>Role in Nottingham Plan/LDF /Council Plan</u></p> <p>The shadow Board is the lead partnership for the delivery of the Healthy Nottingham Strategic Priority in the Nottingham Plan to 2020</p>	
<p><u>Resources</u></p> <p>Infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Partnership Team within Healthy Equality. - Supported by mainstream resources. <p>Programmes: To be determined</p>	<p><u>Reporting</u></p> <p>NCC: NCC Executive Board/Commissioning Sub Group</p> <p>Other: One Nottingham Board CCG Governance Board</p> <p>Reports to be received from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Commissioning Executive Group on progress

	<p>towards priorities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Children's Partnership Board on health related activities happening against Children and Young People Plan - Nottingham City Children's Safeguarding Board and Nottingham City Adults' Safeguarding Partnership Board on health related activities
<p><u>Council nominees, responsible Corporate Directors and lead officers</u></p> <p>Lead Councillor: Cllr Nicola Heaton</p> <p>Lead NCC Corporate Director: Ian Curryer, Corporate Director Children and Families</p> <p>Lead NCC Officer: Andrew Hall, Director of Transition</p>	<p><u>Members of the Board</u></p> <p>Voting members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> City Council Portfolio Holder for Adults and Health City Council Portfolio Holder for Children's Services City Council Portfolio Holder for Housing, Regeneration and the Community Sector City Council Executive Assistant for Adults and Health (chair) Three representatives from the NHS Nottingham City Clinical Commissioning Group's Board Chief Operating Officer of the Clinical Commissioning Group City Council Statutory Director of Children's Services City Council Statutory Director of Adult Social Services Joint Director of Public Health (City Council / NHS Nottingham City) One representative of Healthwatch. In the interim Nottingham LINKs will provide a representative. <p>Non-voting Members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> City Council Director for Adult Provision and Health Integration City Council Director for Family Community Teams One representative of Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust One representative of Nottinghamshire Healthcare NHS Trust One representative of Nottingham CityCare Partnership One representative of Nottingham City Homes One representative of the Nottingham Third Sector Forum One representative of the Nottinghamshire Police (Nottingham City Division)

	One representative of Nottingham Jobcentre Plus One representative of Crime and Drugs Partnership
--	--

COMPLETED SUMMER 2012

NOTTINGHAM CITY COUNCIL
SIGNIFICANT PARTNERSHIPS GOVERNANCE HEALTH CHECK 2012

Completed Summer 2012

In consultation with your partnership, please complete the tables below. Once the details have been agreed by the partnership please return them to alice.coleman@nottinghamcity.gov.uk. If you require any assistance please contact Alice Coleman, Policy Officer, Nottingham City Council, on 0115 87 63372.

Name of Partnership: SHADOW HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD
NCC Lead Councillor: COUNCILLOR NICOLA HEATON
NCC Corporate Director: IAN CURRYER
NCC Lead Officer: ANDREW HEALL
Partnership Chief Executive/Manager (if appropriate): N/A

We have identified 8 areas of good governance. In each area we have provided a number of clear statements to illustrate what 'excellent' looks like for that area of governance. Using the criteria where 1 is 'excellent' and 4 is 'many key weaknesses' (page 1), please record a score (1-4) for each area of good governance for your significant partnership, making relevant notes on how the score could be improved.

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
1. Aims and objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The partnership has clear aims and SMART objectives clearly set out and understandable Strong alignment between the partnership's and The Nottingham Plan and 2030 vision In pursuing the 2030 vision, the partnership has a set of values against which decision making and actions can be judged (e.g. code of conduct) 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Shadow Health and Wellbeing Board (SHWB) is a constituted board of the City Council. From April 2013 it will become a statutory board of the City Council in line with the Health and Social Care Act 2012. The Health and Wellbeing Board has clear Terms of Reference (TOR) and operates inside the constitution of the City Council. The TOR includes clear aims, targets and strategic links. The Health and Wellbeing Board is responsible for

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The partnership achieves more than the sum of its parts. It delivers the benefits identified in the business case 		<p>overseeing the JSNA and will be undertaking its refresh.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Board will take responsibility for the implementation of the health targets within the Nottingham Plan. The Board is required to produce a Health and Wellbeing Strategy which will be aligned to the JSNA and the Nottingham Plan. This is being drafted currently Expectations, responsibilities and a code of conduct are set out in detail in the ToR. The SHWB brings together key decision makers from across Nottingham. This will enable a whole system approach to be developed for improving health and wellbeing, and tackling health inequalities and the wider determinants of ill health.
<p>2. Membership and structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The structure is clear, is set out in Terms of Reference, a Memorandum of Agreement or other governing documents and is regularly reviewed. Roles, responsibilities and contributions are defined for all partners and set out in the governing documents, including whistle-blowing, responding to compliments and complaints, risk assessment, personnel and financial management and financial and performance reporting. Key partners provide effective leadership. Their leadership roles and responsibilities are understood and fulfilled. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The TOR, which was agreed in October 2011, set out a structure of the Board. These TOR will be refreshed in 2013 when the Board takes on its full statutory status. The roles, responsibilities and expectations of members of the SHWB are detailed in the TOR. As the TOR, are part of the constitution of the City Council, the protocols and procedures for whistle blowing and complaints within that constitution are followed. All personnel and financial management is undertaken by the City Council. The Board does not have a commissioning role, however, it will receive performance reports from the HWB Commissioning Executive Group. A “Ways of Working” document has been adopted by the Board, which clearly articulates that the aims and values of the Board should be promoted and supported by its members within their own organisations and within the

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The membership provides the necessary knowledge, skills and experience to do the job. Partners ensure that the right people are in the right place at the right time. • The partners are committed at the highest level to deliver the partnership's objectives. There are constructive working relationships between all partners, the right people attend the meetings, and these are supported by lead officers within partner agencies. • Changes to membership and exit strategies are considered and the governing documents say what will happen if/when a partner wishes to leave. 		<p>community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Board is Chaired by an Executive Assistant Councillor of the Council and Vice Chaired by a member of the Clinical Commissioning Group. Statutory Officers from Adult Services, Children Services, Public Health and Clinical Commissioning sit on the Board. Members are of an appropriate level to influence and contribute to a step-change in health inequalities and the outcomes for vulnerable adults. Full meetings take place every 2 months and time limited task and finish groups (set up to meet specific needs) will be made up of relevant and appropriate partners. • Membership includes key providers with representatives, at senior level, from Community Health, Secondary Health, Mental Health, Housing, Employment, Police and the Third sector. • Healthwatch, which represents the voice of citizens, patients, users and carers has a place on the Board. As Healthwatch will not be constituted until March 2013 a board member of Nottingham LINK (Local Involvement Network) currently sits on the SHWB. • Membership arrangements are set out in the ToR, and if any member misses more than two meetings in a row, the SHWB reserves the right to review his/her membership.
<p>3. Decision making and accountability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision making is clear and transparent. Authority and delegations are set out in 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnership decisions are made based on consensus and are clearly recorded in the minutes • Where consensus cannot be reach the statutory members

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<p>governing documents including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Who can make what decisions ○ Delegated responsibilities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership has a clear procedure for dealing with conflicts of interest • Those making decisions are provided with information that is fit for the purpose – relevant, timely and give clear explanations of technical issues and their implications • Decisions are properly recorded and notified promptly to those who are affected by them. • The partnership has a communication plan to inform service users, members and the public about the partnership, its decisions, its achievements and successes, who is accountable and responsible for what. It provides routes for people to comment/contribute to the partnership’s work. • The partnership has clear lines of accountability and arrangements for reporting performance • Arrangements are in place for the partnership to report in a timely way on its work and achievements to Council officers and Councillors. Decisions and activities are scrutinized at the appropriate level. 		<p>of the Board, who have voting rights members will seek a simple majority vote.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The TOR gives clear guidance on the procedure for dealing with conflicts of interest. • An agenda and detailed supporting papers are produced in advance of each meeting and circulated to members. Where appropriate experts will be invited to present to the Board on relevant issues. Clear explanations of technical issues will be provided in order to facilitate effective input from partners. • Minutes are produced and distributed after each SHWB meeting. As a statutory Board of the City Council all agendas, papers and minutes are published on the Council website. • There are clear lines of accountability (both to NHS Nottingham City and Nottingham City Council) and arrangements for reporting performance. The SHWB receives performance reports showing progress against the Health and Wellbeing Strategy, Nottingham Plan health targets and other relevant strategies. • Partnership officers attend the NCC Partnership Performance group and ensure that up to date performance information is entered on Performance Plus, the NCC performance management system.
<p>4. Performance management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership reviews its progress and delivery against clear outcomes, outputs and 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SHWB is developing a Health and Wellbeing Strategy which will be delivered by the SHWB Commissioning Executive Group and other key partners. Performance

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<p>milestones and takes prompt corrective action if necessary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivery contracts and agreements are monitored and poor performance is tackled. 		<p>reports will be received by the SHWB against it strategy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SHWB will not directly commission activities
<p>5. Evaluation and review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership regularly reviews its policies, strategies, membership and use of resources against its objectives and targets. • The partnership reviews its progress and delivery against clear outcomes, outputs and milestones and takes prompt corrective action if necessary. • Delivery contracts and agreements are monitored and poor performance is tackled. • Arrangements for responding to complaints and dealing with unforeseen problems needing a prompt response are in place and clearly stated. • There are clearly stated procedures to deal with disputes within the partnership and these are followed when necessary. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Board will regularly review policies, strategies, membership and use of resources. Full guidance and any secondary legislation is still awaited from the government on the Health and Social Care Act 2012 The SHWB will be continuously reviewed against national guidance to ensure that it meets its statutory obligations. • The SHWB will produce its strategy in early summer 2012 which will inform and guide the SHWB Commissioning Executive Group and other partnerships • Performance against targets is monitored regularly by the SHWB Commissioning Executive Group and reported to the full SHWB. • The SHWB Commissioning Executive Group will <i>oversee</i> the commissioning of integrated health and wellbeing services through the Clinical Commissioning Group and the City Council Commissioning Executive. • The Ways of Working document clearly shows the expectations of members. • As a statutory board of the City Council the constitutional procedures will be followed by the Board.
<p>6. Equalities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership assesses its policies and programmes for their impact on equalities. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership considers the impact of the policies and programmes on health inequalities and uses the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment to ensure partners are

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The partnership considers impact on inequality and deprivation as part of its performance management. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> supported in making commissioning decisions. Impact on inequality is embedded in the Board's performance management arrangements.
<p>7. Finance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The partnership has access to resources to support delivery of its aims and objectives. It has a financial and /or procurement plan that identifies how it proposes to use these funding to achieve its objectives. The role of the partnership in relation to finance and the extent of its powers to make financial decisions and approvals are stated and understood. The partnership has effective arrangements for financial monitoring and reporting. The partnership uses its resources well and demonstrates how it uses them to add value. It ensures that it uses resources to complement and enhance the work of individual partners. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Board does not directly commission activities but influences the integration of health and social care resources to meet local needs through the Health and Wellbeing Board's Strategy. The targets and outcomes identified in the strategy will be delivery by the SHWB Commissioning Executive Group and other partners. The SHWB Commissioning Executive Group will lead work on behalf of the City Councils Commissioning Group and the Clinical Commissioning Group to ensure resources are used as efficiently as possible and the impact on targets is maximised.
<p>8. Partnership Risk Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key people are aware of areas of potential risk in partnerships and the need to allocate resources to manage risk. The partnership has an agreed mechanism for identifying, assessing and managing risks. Appropriate tools have been developed and 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Risks are managed by individual partner organisations

Good governance	Health assessment (score 1-4)	Notes
resources are in place to manage risk. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partnership risks are well managed across organisational boundaries. There is clear evidence of improved partnership delivery through risk management. 		

Overall Headline Risk

Please fill in the table below the most significant risks which the Council needs to be aware of in terms of our involvement with this partnership. These can include strategic, financial and reputational risks. An example risk has been included to guide you.

Some partnerships may not face any risks, whereas others may face many. For those which face many risks, please note only the three most significant risks.

Please write a brief description of the risk, give each risk a rating for likelihood and impact using the criteria below, and bullet point the mitigating actions which will help mitigate the risk.

Risk Description	Impact Rating	Likelihood Rating	Total Risk Rating (Impact x Likelihood)	Mitigating actions
The Health and Social Care Act 2012 will significantly change the arrangements for commissioning NHS services and transfer Public Health responsibilities into Local Authorities by April 2013. A transition process has been underway since summer 2010. During this period there is a risk to the	3	2	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Health and Wellbeing Board has being set up in shadow form from October 2011 and will adopt the current duties of the HWP and the Health and Social Care Commissioning Board. A statutory Health and Wellbeing Strategy will be agreed and performance managed by the Health and Wellbeing Board and a programme of commissioning activity across public health,

Risk Description	Impact Rating	Likelihood Rating	Total Risk Rating (Impact x Likelihood)	Mitigating actions
continued focus of resources on health improvement, a reduction in size of public health resources and fragmentation of partnership working arrangements with the NHS as personalities and organisations change				NHS and City Council community services will be developed to deliver it
As a new board with a membership of 22 it will need to embed itself and to ensure that all members have sufficient knowledge, understanding and engagement to achieve its aspirations.	2	1	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Skills and networking events are being delivered to ensure that all members have sufficient knowledge and strong links within the board to ensure that they engage in the process
The board provides insufficient direction to officers in the refresh of the JSNA and the development of the HWB Strategy.	3	1	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Special events are planned to provide all board members, together with senior officers, to agree framework for refreshing the JSNA and developing the board's Strategy The Health & Wellbeing Executive Commissioning Group will steer the agenda of the Health and Wellbeing Board.