JOINT MEETING OF THE GREATER MANCHESTER COMBINED AUTHORITY AND AGMA EXECUTIVE BOARD

DATE: Friday, 29 January 2016
TIME: At the rise of the GMCA, which starts at 11:30am
VENUE: Guardsman Tony Downes House
5 Manchester Road
Droylsden
M43 7UH - sat nav

AGENDA

1. APOLOGIES

2. CHAIR’S ANNOUNCEMENTS AND URGENT BUSINESS

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS - attached

To receive declarations of interests in any item for discussion at the meeting. A blank form for declaring interests has been circulated with the agenda; please ensure that this is returned to the GMIST Officer at the start of the meeting.

4. MEMBERSHIP OF AGMA – OLDHAM COUNCIL
Verbal Report of the Secretary, Donna Hall

5. MINUTES OF THE JOINT GMCA AND AGMA EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING HELD ON 18 DECEMBER 2015 - attached

To consider the minutes of the Joint GMCA and AGMA Executive Board meeting held on 18 December 2015 as a correct record.

6. FORWARD PLAN OF STRATEGIC DECISIONS OF JOINT GMCA & AGMA - attached

7. HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE DEVOLUTION – THE OUTCOMES OF THE SPENDING REVIEW PROCESS AND FUNDING ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION
Report of Councillor Peter Smith, Portfolio Lead for Health and Social Care, Sir Howard Bernstein, Portfolio Lead Chief Executive for Economic Strategy/Growth and Steven Pleasant, Portfolio Lead Chief Executive for Health and Social Care.

8. GREATER MANCHESTER CONNECT – GREATER MANCHESTER’S STRATEGIC DATA SHARING INITIATIVE - attached
Report of Tony Lloyd, GM Interim Mayor and Andrew Lightfoot, Director of Public Service Reform
9. MINUTES

a. MINUTES OF THE GMCA AND AGMA AUDIT COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 22 JANUARY 2016 - to follow
   To note the minutes of the meeting held on 22 January 2016.

b. MINUTES OF THE JOINT GMCA AND AGMA SCRUTINY POOL MEETING – 11 DECEMBER 2015 AND 15 JANUARY 2016 - attached
   To note the minutes of the meeting held on 11 December 2015 and 15 January 2016.

10. GMCA AND AGMA BUDGETS

a. GMCA & AGMA BUDGET FOR NON TRANSPORT FUNCTIONS 2016/17 - attached

b. GREATER MANCHESTER FIRE & RESCUE BUDGET 2016/17 & MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY - attached
   Report of Councillor David Acton, Chair, Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue Service Authority and Pete O’Reilly, County Fire Officer and Chief Executive, Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue Service.

c. GREATER MANCHESTER WASTE DISPOSAL AUTHORITY BUDGET 2016/17 & BEYOND - attached
   Report of Councillor Cath Piddington, Chair, Greater Manchester Waste Disposal Authority and Carolyn Wilkins, Chief Executive, Oldham Council.

11. REVIEW OF SERVICES FOR CHILDREN IN GREATER MANCHESTER
    Report of Councillor Cliff Morris, Portfolio Lead for Services for Children and Jim Taylor, Portfolio Lead Chief Executive for Services for Children.
AGMA EXECUTIVE BOARD

29 January 2016

APOLOGIES

Section 6.1 of the AGMA constitution states that:

_The Board comprises the Leader of the Council of each of the Parties to this agreement. Each of the Parties will appoint for each Municipal Year two additional members of their Executive one of whom may substitute for the Leader as necessary. The Parties will inform the Secretary to the Board in writing of these annual appointments._

The Secretary has been advised of the following substitute members for the Executive Board for 2014/15. Any substitute attending today is requested to confirm his/her attendance under this item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Executive Board Member</th>
<th>Named Substitute</th>
<th>Named Substitute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bolton</td>
<td>Cllr C Morris</td>
<td>Cllr L Thomas</td>
<td>Cllr E Adia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bury</td>
<td>Cllr M Connolly</td>
<td>Cllr R Shori</td>
<td>vacancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>Cllr R Leese</td>
<td>Cllr S Murphy</td>
<td>Cllr B Priest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldham</td>
<td>Cllr J McMahon</td>
<td>Cllr J Stretton</td>
<td>Cllr D Hibbert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochdale</td>
<td>Cllr R Farnell</td>
<td>Cllr Peter Williams</td>
<td>Cllr A Brett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salford</td>
<td>Ian Stewart</td>
<td>Cllr D Lancaster</td>
<td>Cllr P Dennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockport</td>
<td>Cllr S Derbyshire</td>
<td>Cllr I Roberts</td>
<td>Cllr S Alexander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tameside</td>
<td>Cllr K Quinn</td>
<td>Cllr J Taylor</td>
<td>Cllr J Fitzpatrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trafford</td>
<td>Cllr S Anstee</td>
<td>Cllr M Young</td>
<td>Cllr P Myers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wigan</td>
<td>Cllr P Smith</td>
<td>Cllr D Molyneux</td>
<td>Cllr C Ready</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Donna Hall
AGMA Secretary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute Item No. / Agenda Item No.</th>
<th>Nature of Interest</th>
<th>Type of Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal / Prejudicial / Disclosable Pecuniary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal / Prejudicial / Disclosable Pecuniary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal / Prejudicial / Disclosable Pecuniary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal / Prejudicial / Disclosable Pecuniary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal / Prejudicial / Disclosable Pecuniary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal / Prejudicial / Disclosable Pecuniary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MINUTES OF THE JOINT MEETING OF THE GREATER MANCHESTER COMBINED AUTHORITY AND AGMA EXECUTIVE BOARD HELD ON FRIDAY 18 DECEMBER 2015 AT MANCHESTER TOWN HALL

GM INTERIM MAYOR          Tony Lloyd (in the Chair)
BOLTON COUNCIL            Councillor Ebrahim Adia
BURY COUNCIL              Councillor Mike Connolly
MANCHESTER CC             Councillor Richard Leese
OLDHAM COUNCIL            Councillor David Hibbert
ROCHDALE MBC              Councillor Allen Brett
SALFORD CC                Councillor Paul Dennett
STOCKPORT MBC             Councillor Sue Derbyshire
TAMESIDE MBC              Councillor Kieran Quinn
TRAFFORD COUNCIL          Councillor Sean Anstee
WIGAN COUNCIL             Councillor Peter Smith

JOINT BOARDS AND OTHER MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

GMFRA                      Councillor David Acton
GMWDA                      Councillor Nigel Murphy
TfGMC                      Councillor Andrew Fender

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE

Keith Davies               Bolton Council
Mike Owen                  Bury Council
Howard Bernstein          Manchester CC
Carolyn Wilkins           Oldham Council
Steve Rumbelow            Rochdale MBC
Jim Taylor                Salford CC
Eamonn Boylan             Stockport MBC
Steven Pleasant           Tameside MBC
Theresa Grant             Trafford Council
Donna Hall                Wigan Council
Andrew Lightfoot          GM Director of Public Service Reform
Peter O’Reilly            GM Fire & Rescue
John Bland                GM Waste Disposal Authority
Mark Hughes               Manchester Growth Company
Simon Nokes               New Economy
Ian Williamson            Health Devolution Team
Katy Calvin-Thomas        Health Devolution Team
121/15  APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Margaret Asquith (Bolton), Councillors Richard Farnell (Rochdale), Jim McMahon (Oldham) and Ian Stewart (Salford).

122/15  DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

Councillor Richard Leese declared a prejudicial interest in Item 6a Budget Strategy as a Director of the Growth Company Board.

123/15  MINUTES OF THE JOINT GMCA AND AGMA EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING HELD ON 27 NOVEMBER 2015

The minutes of the Joint GMCA and AGMA Executive Board meeting held on 27 November 2015 were submitted for consideration.

RESOLVED/-

To approve the minutes of the Joint GMCA and AGMA Executive Board held on 27 November 2015.

124/15  FORWARD PLAN OF STRATEGIC DECISIONS OF THE JOINT GMCA AND AGMA EXECUTIVE BOARD AND AGMA EXECUTIVE BOARD

Consideration was given to a report of Julie Connor, Head of the Greater Manchester Integrated Support Team, which set out the Forward Plan of those strategic decisions to be considered over the next four months.

RESOLVED/-

To note the Forward Plan of Strategic Decisions as set out in the report.

125/15  BUDGET STRATEGY 2016/17

Councillor Kieran Quinn introduced a report detailing the proposals for the GMCA and AGMA budgets as part of the 2016/17 budget strategy process, and the Joint Authority levy/precept assumptions for 2016/17. Richard Paver confirmed that all the Scrutiny Process meetings have now taken place.
Councillor David Action appraised the meeting of the direct implications of the Local Government Settlement on the Fire and Rescue Services.

RESOLVED/-

1. To agree the recommendations of the GMCA transport scrutiny panel as detailed in paragraph 4.9 of the report, and below:
   i) the Transport Levy for 2016/17 remain unchanged from 2015/16 at £195.123m;
   ii) the previously planned increase of 1.8% (£3.5 million) with respect to the Greater Manchester Transport Fund would be deferred and would be reviewed again in future years;
   iii) any bus related efficiency savings would be ‘ring fenced’ to part fund the future costs of Bus Franchising; and
   iv) any other efficiency savings, over and above those included to reach a “cash standstill” position would be ring-fenced to reduce the currently forecast deficits in 2017/18 and 2018/19.

2. To agree the recommendations of the AGMA/GMCA non transport scrutiny panel as detailed in paragraph 5.31 of the report, in particular:
   v) All priorities and pressures are to be put forward for approval;
   vi) All savings are to be put forward for approval subject to further detail on the impact being considered;
   vii) That further information is provided regarding the scope of the Manchester Investment and Development Agency Service Limited (MIDAS) review;
   viii) Commitments against the Transformation Challenge Award and Public Service Reform Development Fund to be provided to consider utilisation of the funds;
   ix) Further information to be provided regarding the use of reserves;
   x) Further information to be provided to consider the options for AGMA Section 48 Grants.

3. To agree the potential additional capacity of £350,000 on AGMA/GMCA non transport budget, subject to approval of all proposals, and whether this should be set aside in a budget for other GM priorities.

4. To agree the Greater Manchester Waste Disposal Authority budget proposals of a zero percent levy increase in 2016/17 as detailed in paragraph 6.1 of the report.

5. To note that at the time of writing the report, the scrutiny of the Police and Crime Commissioner’s budget is yet to take place and that formal approval of proposals will follow the timeline as detailed in paragraph 6.5 of the report.

6. To agree the GM Fire and Rescue Service budget proposals as detailed in paragraphs 6.6 to 6.13 of the report, although this may need to be amended in light of the funding received in the 2016/17 RSG Settlement and information from Local Authorities about Council Tax or Business Rates income.

Tony Lloyd introduced a report providing an update on the expenditure from the Greater
Manchester Transformational Challenge Award budgets including commitments identified for 2016/17 where identified.

Members requested a detailed breakdown of how each Local Authority has utilised the Locality Exemplar support and that it is submitted to the GMCA in January 2015.

RESOLVED/-

1. To note the current commitments against these budgets and the proposed plans for further use in 2016/17.

2. To agree to the transfer of the funding from the devolution element of the transformational Challenge Award budget to support Health and Social Care and the expansion of the Working Well Programme to the relevant organisations hosting these specific budgets as outlined in the report.

3. To agree that a detailed breakdown of how each Local Authority has utilised the Locality Exemplar support be submitted to the GMCA in January 2015.

127/15 BUSINESS RATES POOLING

Councillor Kieran Quinn introduced a report detailing arrangements for the continuation of a Business Rates Pool in 2016/17 to include all GM Local Authorities plus Cheshire East and Cheshire West.

Richard Paver advised the meeting that the 12 Authorities will need to confirm their participation in the 2016/17 Pool, after receipt of the Revenue Support Grant settlement, with a recommendation that this is be considered by the GMCA Treasurer and Portfolio Holder for Finance, Kieran Quinn, with a recommendation to be made to 10 Local Authorities. The GMCA Treasurer will seek confirmation from the Cheshire authorities to the same timescale.

RESOLVED/-

1. To note that the provisional RSG Settlement will include the designation of the 12 Authorities to form a Business Rate Pool in 2016/17.

2. To note the arrangements for reaching a final decision on the 2016/17 Pool and to authorise the GMCA Treasurer, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Finance, Kieran Quinn, to make an appropriate recommendation to the Greater Manchester Local Authorities.

3. To note that Greater Manchester Treasurers will be discussing the sharing arrangements for the 2016/17 Pool.

4. To note that any discussion on the utilisation of any proceeds from the Business Rate Pool should follow once final discussions have taken place with Government as outlined in the GM Devolution announcements of late November.
Councillor Peter Smith introduced a report providing members with the final draft of the Greater Manchester Health and Social Care Strategic Plan. The plan was considered at the Health and Social Care Strategic Partnership Board earlier in the day recommending that the GMCA support and endorse the Plan for commending to the Greater Manchester Local Authorities, adding that there are a number of grammatical errors to be corrected before the final Plan is published later in the day.

Ian Williamson reported that the Plan still required some minor drafting and reordering amendments to reflect the work underway around prevention; that the level of Transformation Fund determined by NHS England is £450M; and that work continues to finalise the detail of the financial and operational management arrangements. A number of the paragraphs in the plan will also be reordered.

RESOLVED/-

1. To endorse the Greater Manchester Health and Social Care Strategic Plan.

2. To commend the Greater Manchester Health and Social Care Strategic Plan to the ten local authorities for approval.

129/15 UPDATED GOVERNANCE PROPOSALS

Councillor Peter Smith introduced a report setting out the proposals and recommendations from the governance focus session held with representatives of all stakeholders on 17 November, in particular the role of primary care providers in the governance structure and confirming the process for agreement of the Strategic Plan and the progress on the Greater Manchester wide Joint Commissioning arrangements.

He also requested that the appointment to the vacancy on the Strategic Partnership Board Executive be deferred pending the outcome of the process for appointment of Deputy Lead Portfolio Members, adding that one of the Health and Well Being Deputies should be considered for the seat on the Board Executive.

RESOLVED/-

1. To agree the GMCA and AGMA representation on the Strategic Partnership Board Executive, noting AGMA have four seats, these are currently occupied by members from Cllr Peter Smith (Wigan), Cllr Cliff Morris (Bolton), and Cllr Sue Murphy (Manchester).

2. To defer the appointment of the fourth GMCA representative to the board Executive pending the outcome of the Appointment of Deputy Lead Portfolio Members process, with the seat to be allocated to one of the Health and Well Being Deputies.

3. To endorse the recommendations agreed by the Strategic Partnership Board on 27th November, as outlined below:
i. To agree that primary care providers will receive four seats on the Strategic Partnership Board, and have one seat at the Strategic Partnership Board Executive.

ii. To agree that voting arrangements for the Strategic Partnership Board and Strategic Partnership Board Executive are revised to reflect those set out in the report.

iii. To agree that the Terms of Reference for the Strategic Partnership Board and Strategic Partnership Board Executive are amended to reflect (1) and (2).

iv. To agree that the Governance Sub Group work with Primary Care partners to develop their governance arrangements.

v. To agree the Strategic Plan approval process.

vi. To agree the role of the Strategic Partnership Board in respect of the Transformation Fund, and to instruct the Strategic Partnership Board to develop the criteria by which such funding will be accessed.

vii. To agree the role of the Strategic Partnership Board in shadow form.

viii. To agree the principles of the conflict resolution process for the Strategic Partnership Board, and instruct the Governance Sub Group and Strategic Partnership Board Executive to further develop.

ix. To agree the functions and form of the GM Joint Commissioning Board.

x. To instruct the Governance Sub Group to develop terms of reference for the Joint Commissioning Board.

xi. To agree that a GM Commissioning Strategy is developed aligned with the Strategic Plan.

xii. To instruct the Governance Sub Group to develop the criteria by which NHSE could exercise its ability to request that decisions are not considered at the Joint Commissioning Board.

xiii. To agree that the Joint Commissioning Board be supported by smaller Executive Group.

xiv. To agree that the GMJCB establish a research and innovation board to inform its decisions.

xv. To agree that existing scrutiny arrangements are reviewed, and request that a report be brought to a future meeting.

130/15 EU LIFE INTEGRATED PROJECT (LIFE IP) IN GREATER MANCHESTER

Councillor Sue Derbyshire introduced a report updating Members on AGMA’s involvement in a successful £14m LIFE Integrated Project bid by the Environment Agency and seeking AGMA’s agreement for Salford City Council to act as the lead Authority on behalf of AGMA.
RESOLVED/-

1. To note the success of the Environment Agency’s (EA) £14m LIFE IP funding bid; a formal offer of funding has been received naming AGMA as a significant beneficiary.

2. To formally agree to request Salford City Council (SCC) to act as the lead Authority and enter into a Partnership Agreement with the Environment Agency on behalf of AGMA in order to release funding for the project.

3. To note that back to back local agreements between Salford City Council and the relevant Local Authorities will need to be entered into to release funding for the relevant Local Authorities.

4. To note the benefits to Greater Manchester, opportunities and responsibilities plus the key actions and deadlines of the sign up process for those Local Authorities formally involved in project delivery.

131/15 GREATER MANCHESTER METROPOLITAN DEBT ADMINISTRATION FUND - ESTIMATED RATES OF INTEREST AND BORROWING STRATEGY 2015/16 REVISED AND 2016/17 ORIGINAL

Councillor Kieran Quinn Pleasant as designated lead Authority to administer the loan fund of the former Greater Manchester County Council, presented the report detailing the Greater Manchester Debt Administration Fund’s estimated rates of interest for 2015/16 and 2016/17 together with the borrowing strategy to be employed.

RESOLVED:

To note the revised 2015/16 estimate and the original 2016/17 estimate.
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 At their meeting on 24 June 2011, the GMCA agreed procedures for developing a Forward Plan of Strategic Decisions for the Authority, in line with the requirements of the GMCA’s constitution. The latest such plan is attached as the Appendix to this report.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 GMCA and AGMA Executive Board members are invited to note, comment and suggest any changes they would wish to make on the latest Forward Plan of Strategic Decisions for the Joint GMCA and AGMA Executive Board; attached to this report.

3 FORWARD PLAN: CONSTITUTIONAL REQUIREMENTS

3.1 In summary the Secretary of the Joint GMCA and AGMA Executive Board meeting is required to:-

- prepare a plan covering 4 months, starting on the first day of the month
- to refresh this plan monthly
- to publish the plan fourteen days before it would come in to effect
- state in the plan

   (i) the issue on which a major strategic decision is to be made;
   (ii) the date on which, or the period within which, the major strategic decision will be taken;
   (iii) how anyone can make representations on the matter and the date by which any such representations must be made; and
   (iv) a list of the documents to be submitted when the matter is considered

3.2 Key decisions are defined as being those which are likely:-

   a. to result in the local authority incurring expenditure which is, or the making of savings which are, significant having regard to the local authority’s budget for the service or function to which the decision relates; or
b. to be significant in terms of its effects on communities living or working in an area comprising two or more wards or electoral divisions in the area of the local authority.

In further guidance issued by the Secretary of State local authorities are required to "agree as a full council limits above which items are significant. The agreed limits should be published."

3.3 The constitution is also quite specific about the matters which would need to be included within the Forward Plan:-

- any matter likely to result in the GMCA and AGMA Executive Board incurring significant expenditure (over £1 million), or the making of significant savings; or
- any matter likely to be significant in terms of its effects on communities living or working in the area of the Combined Authority.

plus the following more specific requirements:-

1. a sustainable community strategy;
2. a local transport plan;
3. approval of the capital programme of the GMCA and TfGM and approving new transport schemes to be funded by the Greater Manchester Transport Fund;
4. other plans and strategies that the GMCA may wish to develop;
5. the preparation of a local economic assessment
6. the development or revision of a multi-area agreement,
7. the approval of the budget of the GMCA;
8. the approval of borrowing limits, the treasury management strategy and the investment strategy;
9. the setting of a transport levy;
10. arrangements to delegate the functions or budgets of any person to the GMCA;
11. the amendment of the Rules of Procedure of the GMCA;
12. any proposals in relation to road user charging

3.4 All the matters at 1-12 above require 7 members of the Joint GMCA and AGMA Executive Board to vote in favour, except those on road user charging, which require a unanimous vote in favour

3.5 The attached plan therefore includes all those items currently proposed to be submitted to the Joint GMCA and AGMA Executive Board over the next 4 months which fit in with these criteria. Members should be aware that:-
• Only those items considered to fit in with the above criteria are included. It is not a complete list of all items which will be included on the Joint GMCA and AGMA Executive Board agendas

• Items listed may move dependent on the amount of preparatory work recorded and external factors such as where matters are dependent on Government decisions; and

CONTACT OFFICER:

Julie Connor 0161 234 3124 j.connor@AGMA.gov.uk
Sylvia Welsh 0161 234 3383 sylvia.welsh@AGMA.gov.uk
The Plan contains details of Key Decisions currently planned to be taken by the Joint Meeting of the Greater Manchester Combined Authority and AGMA Executive Board; or Chief Officers (as defined in the GMCA and AGMA constitution) in the period between 1 February 2016 and 31 May 2016.

Please note: Dates shown are the earliest anticipated and decisions may be later if circumstances change.

If you wish to make representations in connection with any decisions please contact the contact officer shown; or the offices of the Greater Manchester Integrated Support Team (at Manchester City Council, P.O. Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester, M60 2LA, 0161-234 3124; info@agma.gov.uk) before the date of the decision.

**JOINT GMCA AND AGMA EXECUTIVE BOARD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Contact Officer</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Anticipated Date of Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contact Officer: Susan Ford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portfolio Lead: Tony Lloyd Wider Leadership Team Lead Officer – Andrew Lightfoot</td>
<td>Breakdown of LA utilisation of Locality Exemplar Support</td>
<td>26 February 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contact Officer: Rachel Pykett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 18 March 2016 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Contact Officer</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Anticipated Date of Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>29 April 2016</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change Strategy</td>
<td><strong>Portfolio Lead:</strong> Councillor Sue Derbyshire</td>
<td>Update of the progress of the Implementation Plan</td>
<td>29 April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wider Leadership Team Lead Officer: Steve Rumbelow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contact Officer: Mark Atherton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>27 May 2015</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be confirmed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Rates Retention</td>
<td><strong>Portfolio Lead:</strong> Councillor Kieran Quinn</td>
<td>Contribution to Support the Promotion of Greater Manchester’s Growth and Reform Strategies</td>
<td>To be confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wider Leadership Team Lead Officer – Richard Paver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contact Officer: Jannice Gotts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AGMA EXECUTIVE BOARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Contact Officer</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Anticipated Date of Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>29 January 2016</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGMA Section 48 Grants Programme</td>
<td><strong>Portfolio Lead:</strong> Howard Bernstein</td>
<td>Year 2 Funding</td>
<td>26 February 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wider Leadership Team Lead Officer – Julie Connor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contact Officer: Howard Bernstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic Gateway</td>
<td><strong>Portfolio Lead:</strong> Councillor Richard Leese</td>
<td>Infrastructure Priorities</td>
<td>26 February 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wider Leadership Team Lead Officer:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Portfolio Lead:</td>
<td>Title/Description</td>
<td>Lead Officer:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 February 2016</td>
<td><strong>Greater Manchester Housing – Redefining Affordability</strong></td>
<td>Maximising Social Housing Assets in GM</td>
<td>Steve Fyfe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 January 2016</td>
<td><strong>Greater Manchester Land Programme</strong></td>
<td>Proposition for gap funding to unlock sites</td>
<td>Eamonn Boylan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 June 2016</td>
<td><strong>AGMA Revenue Outturn</strong></td>
<td>Outturn Report</td>
<td>Amanda Fox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 July 2016</td>
<td><strong>AGMA Revenue Update</strong></td>
<td>Quarterly Update</td>
<td>Richard Paver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 October 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGMA Revenue Update</strong></td>
<td><strong>Portfolio Lead:</strong> Councillor Kieran Quinn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wider Leadership Team Lead Officer: Richard Paver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contact Officer: Amanda Fox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Quarterly Update</strong></td>
<td><strong>29 October 2016</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Date: 29 January 2016
Subject: Health and Social Care Devolution – the outcomes of the Spending Review process and funding issues for consideration
Report of: Lord Peter Smith, Portfolio Lead Leader for Health and Wellbeing

PURPOSE OF REPORT

This paper summarises the emerging work to develop a GM commissioning approach for social care that is aligned to the delivery of the GM Strategic Plan and Locality Plans. It summarises the outcomes of the Spending Review and the impact that these outcomes will have on the development of the financial framework required to underpin that commissioning approach.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that:

1. Local authorities support the 2% council tax increase;

2. The question of whether there should be a common approach to a four year financial settlement, including the production of an Efficiency Plan, be deferred until more information becomes available;

3. The development of a Commissioning Strategy for approval by all 10 local authorities via the joint Commissioning Board no later than 31 March be supported;

4. The GMCA Section 151 Officer be requested to consult Treasurers on the
development of proposals for resourcing a "smoothing mechanism" for social care funding should this be required by local authorities for 2017/18.

CONTACT OFFICER

Carol Culley 0161 234 3406 carol.culley@manchester.gov.uk
BACKGROUND PAPERS:


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRACKING/PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does this report relate to a major strategic decision, as set out in the GMCA Constitution (paragraph 14.2) or in the process (paragraph 13.1 AGMA Constitution) agreed by the AGMA Executive Board:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXEMPTION FROM CALL IN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there any aspects in this report which means it should be considered to be exempt from call in by the AGMA Scrutiny Pool on the grounds of urgency?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGMA Commission</th>
<th>TfGMC</th>
<th>Scrutiny Pool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT

1. The Devolution Agreement of November 2014 established the principle of a transformation fund to support the integration of health and social care provision across GM. As part of the MoU signed in February 2015, GM was invited to bring forward a Strategic Plan, based upon the NHS Five Year Forward View (FYFV), which would set out how GM would achieve clinical and financial sustainability during a five year period. The approach to this challenge was set out in Greater Manchester’s 2015 Spending Review submission, which identified that in order to close the £2bn gap and achieve fiscal neutrality the following key elements are required to be in place:

- a fair share of the £8bn FYFV money;
- protection of the Social Care baseline;
- bringing forward access to a fair share of the £8bn FYFV funding to create the capacity for one-off transformation funding to support the delivery of the savings opportunities;
- access to capital funding to support both the enablers such as development of a single patient record and for the reconfiguration of the estate required.

2. The GM Strategic Plan ‘Taking Control of our Health and Social Care’ has now been agreed and published and sets out the scale of the ambition and change required and will be underpinned by the locality plans currently under development.

3. This report summarises the emerging work to develop a GM commissioning approach for social care that is aligned to the delivery of the GM Strategic Plan and Locality Plans. It summarises the outcomes of the Spending Review and the impact that these outcomes will have on the development of the financial framework required to underpin that commissioning approach.

OUTCOMES OF THE SPENDING REVIEW

Transformation Fund

4. A Transformation Fund of £450m has been secured, representing a unique opportunity to transform how health and social care is delivered within GM and to make significant progress towards achieving clinical and financial sustainability. The current profile of the fund is shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>£60</td>
<td>£120</td>
<td>£150</td>
<td>£70</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>£450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NHS Allocations

5. NHSE have secured a five year settlement and on 8 January 2016 published three years of firm allocations, followed by two years of indicative allocations for commissioners (with some caveats for circumstances in which they might change the figures).
Funding for Social Care

6. The settlement for social care has been announced, with the ability to raise an additional 2% in council tax over and above the referendum limit. Additional Better Care Fund monies have been announced to support transformation and integration of health and social care provision. These funds will start to come on stream from 1 April 2017 but are predominately backloaded to the last two years of the SR settlement – 2018/19 and 2019/20. Whilst the additional funding is welcome, this backloading creates challenges for Greater Manchester as, unlike much of the rest of the country, the implementation of transformation and integration begins in April 2016, and access to resources is required earlier in the Spending Review period.

7. The GM BCF allocations are shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017/18</th>
<th>2018/19</th>
<th>2019/20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bolton</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bury</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldham</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochdale</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salford</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockport</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tameside</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trafford</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wigan</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>59.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>102.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. It should be noted that just over 50% of the BCF is funded via savings in the New Homes Bonus scheme.

Estates Strategy

9. An Estates Strategy is being developed, based around the ability to bring together the estates function across GM into a single property management function and the ability to retain any capital receipts. How this is to be implemented, alongside the detailed work underway, will inform the exact nature of the investment required. A key component of the work will be ready access to the national funding "pots" which are available. A high level strategy was produced in December 2015 and from this
a business plan and financial ask will be developed by 31 March 2016 for discussion with HMT, DH and NHSE.

10. Finally the principle remains that GM will still be able to access other national funding opportunities which have relevance to health and social care programmes as they arise over the next few years,

Implications

11. GM local authorities face significant challenges in addressing the health and social care budget gap, particularly in the first two years, when additional Better Care Fund monies will not have come on stream. Although many have now set budgets for 2016/17 the financial position for 2017/18 remains very challenging.

12. Overall the Spending Review, the Financial Settlement and other recent announcements have provided a financial platform to enable GM to progress to the next stage of health and social care integration. To do so a detailed financial plan for GM, underpinned by robust locality plans, will all need to be in place for the next financial year.

13. Work is now moving into the implementation phase, with the need to ensure that the infrastructure for delivery is in place and the development of detailed commissioning and financial plans key priorities.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A GM COMMISSIONING APPROACH

Commissioning Strategy

14. As part of the governance structure agreed by all stakeholders, a Joint Commissioning Board is now in place, comprising representatives of the 10 local authorities and the 13 CCG’s. This is charged with responsibility for developing a commissioning strategy for all health and social care programmes by 31st March 2016. Two of the primary requirements of that strategy have already been established by the Partnership Executive Board:

   a) the need to identify what can sensibly be commissioned once rather than 10 times to maximise value and efficiency for local authorities; and
   b) to extend as far as possible and at a pace which is consistent with practical delivery the range of programmes which can be commissioned in this way.

15. Work is already underway to examine how this approach can be applied to social care and public health programmes, with ambitions to extend this work over time to include appropriate services to children. Further details will be developed through the Partnership Executive Board for endorsement by the Strategic Partnership Board progressively over the next few months.

16. Any resources decisions that are taken to underpin the development of the Joint Commissioning Strategy will need to ensure that the level of benefit which is captured by all local authorities is in direct relation to the investment which is made at locality level. This will be achieved by:
• actual resourcing decisions being made through the JCB, where all local authorities are represented;
• taking decisions in accordance with a Commissioning Strategy which all local authorities (and the CCG's) will have agreed; and
• maximise the value and efficiency for what can be delivered on health and social care and other appropriate services through that Commissioning Strategy, which will be delivered, where possible and appropriate, through one contract rather than 10 or more contracts, whilst clearly specifying clear outcomes to be delivered within each locality.

17. For the avoidance of doubt, no formal pooling of any social care resource at GM level is being contemplated at the present time. Such policy can only be considered in the future if all local authorities agree to such a course, and where they are satisfied that such an approach would be appropriate and clear evidence has been produced to demonstrate that significant advantages will be captured by all local authorities. The current approach to commissioning is intended to do no more than maximise efficiencies and impact in the deployment of resources held at locality level.

Financial Framework

18. Local authorities within GM now also need to consider how they will set the financial framework to address the financial challenges for social care within the settlement, particularly for 2016/18 and in such a way that incentivises the new ways of working required to reduce demand and realise the ambition in the Strategic Plan. Key areas for consideration include:

19. **Certainty of funding across the SR period**
This is fundamental to the successful implementation of the GM Strategic Plan and the ten Locality Plans due to the complexity of the various programmes that are being executed and the requirement to deliver financial sustainability over the SR period. CCGs have been given three plus two year settlements and there is an opportunity for local authorities to secure a four year funding deal, although this is dependent on the production of an efficiency plan. It should be noted that the resource envelope envisaged by government in the settlement assumes a 3.75% per annum council tax increase which includes the 2% for social care. The details of the Government requirements that underpin such an arrangement are not yet known. When further details are available it is suggested that the question of a possible common approach to the 4 year settlement is considered.

20. **The alignment of resources to deliver the ambition in the GM Strategic Plan and the move to significant pooling of resources at a locality level to support the ambition in the Locality Plans**
The development of the Joint Commissioning Strategy will need to consider the totality of resource across health and social care and avoid decision making on a silo basis. There is a commitment to the integration of relevant Local Authority budgets at a locality level, with the ambition to move to a full pooled locality budget to deliver the Locality Plan. This will be complemented by the development of the Joint Commissioning Strategy.
21. **The development of a stable funding framework for social care**
The importance of sufficient funding for social care, not simply to maintain the status quo but to drive transformation and approaches that support financial sustainability are recognised.

22. The ability to raise council tax by 2% is to support the provision of social care services. Following consultation with GM Leaders there is commitment that the increase in council tax by 2% should be supported in order to relieve some of the pressures that social care services within localities are facing and to support delivery of GM priorities for Health and Social Care through the implementation of locality plans, including the priorities of the GM commissioning platform.

23. As outlined earlier in this report, the additional Better Care Funding for local authorities will only come on-stream towards the end of the SR period whilst the work in GM is beginning now. There is a need for each local authority to consider how, within the allocations announced for BCF, it can consider cash-flowing spend at an earlier date through their own reserves where it would be prudent to do so. There is a mechanism available to do this using GMCA resources. This would need to be actioned via the Transport Levy so the decision would need to be a unanimous one amongst all GM local authorities and the decision taken prior to the CA budget being set. It should also be noted that due to how the levy operates population changes may mean local authorities paying back slightly different amounts to that they received but the impact of this is likely to be marginal. As many councils have already taken budget decisions for 2016/17 consideration should be given to whether this option should be explored for the 2017/18 budget early in the new financial year.

**Conclusion and Recommendations**

24. This report records the outline of discussions which have taken place amongst Leaders on how resources can be aligned to support the ambition in the GM Strategic Plan and to gain maximum benefit from the opportunities of devolution.

25. Detailed recommendations appear at the front of this report.

*Lord Peter Smith*
*Portfolio Leader for Health and Wellbeing*
Date: 29 January 2016

Subject: GM-Connect: Greater Manchester’s Strategic Data Sharing Initiative

Report of: Tony Lloyd, Portfolio Holder for Public Service Reform

PURPOSE OF REPORT

This report presents the strategic outline case for the establishment of a GM Data-Sharing Authority (GM-Connect). The report highlights the transformational impact that could be achieved through a new approach to managing and using data across public services:

- supporting the delivery of our health and social care Strategic Plan and wider Public Service Reform agenda
- enabling improved understanding of population level (current and future), public service demand and risk; and
- supporting our capacity to bring together data held by different partners, providing a clearer picture of the challenges individuals and families are facing, enabling improved decision making in relation to individual cases

RECOMMENDATIONS

GMCA is asked to:

1. Agree to the establishment of GM-Connect and the release of up to £500k of the Transformation Challenge Award grant to support organisation set-up costs.

2. Agree the GM-Connect governance proposals, as outlined in section 3 of the report, which includes the creation of a new GM function (led by a GM Chief Information Officer), noting the implications for individual organisational information governance and data standards policies.

CONTACT OFFICER

Andrew Lightfoot 0161 219 2857 a.lightfoot@manchester.gov.uk
1. BACKGROUND

1.1 In November 2014, GMCA was awarded £12.4M Transformation Challenge Award funding to support the delivery of our devolution commitments and our Public Service Reform agenda. £4M of this award was specifically allocated to enable a place-based approach to ‘data, information and knowledge sharing’, spanning all public sector organisations across GM.

1.2 Data sharing is an issue repeatedly raised as a barrier to our capacity to deliver better joined up services and to build a clear picture of where to target our resources across GM. With improved data sharing and technical capacity to share, we can better identify those people and families in need of support. By better interrogating the collective data we hold we will also put ourselves in a better position to understand where the likely future challenges for GM might be and develop cheaper, more effective preventative interventions. Improved use of information is a fundamental building block in enabling the transformation of GM public services, delivering the improved outcomes and efficiencies that GM is committed to achieving.

1.3 Over the last 6 months GMCA has worked in partnership with the Government’s Centre of Excellence for Information Sharing and KPMG to develop a proposition to establish a GM-wide transformational data sharing capability and governance structure, which we have named: ‘GM-Connect’.

1.4 Extensive consultation with local stakeholders has been undertaken as part of this process (see Annex 1) and links established with existing relevant GM initiatives (such as Health Innovation Manchester, the GM Data Synchronisation Programme, and work leading the development of GM Open Data). This has demonstrated overwhelming support for the establishment of a formal GM framework to drive more effective sharing of appropriate data across public bodies.

1.5 Experienced GM stakeholders and independent external advisors now firmly believe that as a result of GM’s strong governance frameworks and the opportunities afforded through recent devolution deals, we have the potential to significantly advance the agenda and to be at the forefront of transformational data sharing in the UK.

1.6 The recently published GM plan, Taking Charge of our Health and Social Care in Greater Manchester specifically highlights the importance of information to enabling transformational change to the way we provide care services and identifies GM-Connect as a key enabler for its implementation. As the strategic plan highlights, this transformation cannot be achieved by individual organisations – it requires new models of working and collaboration across GM.
2. WHAT IS GM-CONNECT?

2.1 GM-Connect will be a small GM-wide capability, hosted by the GMCA. It will direct and own our data-sharing strategy across public agencies, ensuring a GM-wide approach and replacing the myriad of existing data policies with a single coordinated approach. The core team will encompass Information Governance, Technology and Data Analytics specialists who will support and provide a framework for existing GM groups, such as the GM IT Managers, the GM Information Governance Group and the Health and Social Care IM&T group. It will set the GM information policy direction and support local implementation of GM policy.

2.2 GM-Connect’s vision is:

*To create value and insight across GM: supporting improved and more efficient services and improved outcomes for GM and residents, by breaking down information silos and barriers to sharing data.*

This vision is supported by the following proposed strategic principles:

1. Assign clear **accountability** for leading information sharing.
2. Start with the premise of a **duty to share** equal to a duty to protect.
3. **Build trust and confidence** between residents, communities and local services.
4. Establish a **user centric** (resident and worker/public service sectors) approach to service delivery.
5. Support a **place based** approach to service delivery.
6. Increase and manage secure **accessibility** of data and information.
7. Utilise **modern and flexible** methods and technologies.
8. Be **outcome led** to ensure a focus on value and impact.
9. **Minimise duplication** and **encourage re-use**.
10. Drive a **single comprehensive view** and common understanding of the data and approach to sharing.
11. Align with and **enable** Greater GM’s **ICT and Digital strategies**.
12. Leverage value by extending data sharing to include unstructured **Open Data**.

2.3 GM-Connect will develop a series of information sharing use cases (e.g. ‘using datasets a, b and c will support decision making x and deliver benefits y) and the permissions required to share data across public service providers in GM and the accessibility and quality of data sources. GM-Connect will provide clear and consistent guidance for data quality standards. The team will develop consistent approaches to privacy and consent, ensuring that sensitive personal data is only shared where there is
appropriate legislative cover and/or explicit consent provided by the service user. This will start with the principle that across GM data should be shared unless there is a legal or statutory reason not to do so. GM-Connect will provide clear and consistent guidance for data quality standards.

2.4 This cross-sector collaboration will be vital to understanding the assets and challenges faced by places. Workers will be able to run reports to establish trends, identify previously undetected patterns, map relationships, and test scenarios in the context of the individual, family, and/or place. Workers will have relevant and timely information at their fingertips, when they need it. Collaboration, both internally and pan-organisation, will be enabled through information sharing and the tools to better equip workers to perform their roles. Workers will be automatically notified of important life events and changes in residents’ circumstances when they occur e.g. a young person moving to adulthood, or a person moving from shelter to homelessness.

2.5 In turn, data sharing will enable residents to have more convenient online access to public services and greater knowledge about the services available to them. GM-Connect will support the vision for residents to provide information to GM only once, but for GM to use that data many times. As well as reducing the number of interactions and duplication of efforts between the resident and GM, a ‘tell us once’ approach will also support fewer service delivery errors, improved interactions and reduced costs.

2.6 GM-Connect will support the transformation of GM public services. It will support GM’s wider vision to be a leading example of efficient integrated public services. It will enable improved and more efficient services, improved outcomes for GM and residents, and contribute to the achievement of public service savings. Coordinated data sharing will contribute to the growth of the economy, establishing GM as a connected city. Data sharing helps organisations to provide improved services, but also helps residents interact with GM in ways which work better for them, creating a place where people want to live and work and ultimately improving the lives and well-being of its population. This will start with the principle that across GM data should be shared unless there is a legal or statutory reason not to do so.

2.7 GM-Connect will have the dual role of promoting better use of information and ensuring GM is effectively protecting information it holds. The governance arrangements outlined in section 3 of this report will provide the oversight to ensure GM-Connect protects the integrity of GM data, regulating of the use made of data and protecting citizens.

2.8 In developing the GM-Connect proposals a number of local and national examples of incidents that could have been better managed through improved information sharing have been highlighted. For example, following a hip operation, the family of one man had to repeat his story to ten different agencies when trying to arrange their father’s support and aftercare. The agencies involved didn’t share any information about his case with one
another and none of them recorded his NHS number. As a result, the family ended up sourcing his wheelchair from a charity shop and had to find someone to administer injections, because the District Nurse had not been advised in time to add the patient to her schedule. This is just one of many examples for which data sharing could make a significant improvement to the interaction between residents and GM Public Services across all sectors.

2.9 GM-Connect will identify external funding opportunities to advance our data-sharing capabilities and recommend on the most effective deployment of the Transformation Challenge Award (TCA) funding that is currently held by GMCA to support this agenda.

2.10 GM-Connect will provide a ‘Centre of Excellence’ capability in data insight, research and analytics. The team will develop a business case for the establishment of a GM common resident index, which will provide a GM-wide integrated view linking residents across the conurbation. GM-Connect will support GM’s wider vision to be a leading example of efficient integrated Public Services. It will enable improved and more efficient services, improved outcomes for GM and residents, and contribute to the achievement of public service savings. At a time when it is important to gain the most from reducing resources and drive outcomes in the most efficient manner, we must have a forward-thinking, transparent and joined-up approach to our use of data. GM-Connect will create the cross-sector leadership, capability and culture change required to create and sustain this approach.

2.11 Coordinated data sharing will contribute to the growth of the economy, establishing GM as a connected city. Data sharing helps organisations to provide improved services, but also helps residents interact with GM in ways which work better for them, creating a place where people want to live and work and ultimately improving the lives and well-being of its population.

2.12 Critically, GM-Connect will support the delivery of the Health and Social Care Strategic Plan (Taking Charge). The successful delivery of the new models of care outlined in the Strategic Plan is predicated on matched patient datasets across GM and technology enabled change. The Plan states:

“We will use technology to understand patient needs, and develop services more efficiently and effectively as a result. We want people to have greater access, ownership and responsibility over their own data, generating multiple ways to interact with the health and social care system and putting people at the heart of how their information is collected, stored and used. More effective use of information across organisations, driven by patient ownership, will reduce duplication and ensure more speedy access to the right services.”
We want technology to support self-management, from staying well to living well with long term conditions. We need to share data and information across organisations on a day to day basis to support assessment, triage and integrated multiagency case management.

The health and social care system in GM will work with the wider public sector on the implementation of our information sharing strategy GM-Connect. As part of the wider GM reform activity, GM-Connect will own the data sharing mandate and will deliver GM wide solutions for employees and people to access, update and analyse data”.

2.13 GM-Connect will realise the GM data-sharing vision through a commitment to a federated data sharing model and an evolutionary approach, ensuring GM builds on existing best practice across our region. Data about an individual resident will continue to be held in a number of data repositories across different GM organisations. Data will be held on different technology platforms, in different formats, have different owners and be updated by a range of applications. A federated strategy leaves data in its existing repository where it is owned and managed by its existing owners. The GM-wide federated platform enables appropriate data to be drawn from existing systems, in accordance with strict business rules, and combined dynamically with other data to provide a unified view. This approach avoids expensive investment in the consolidation of existing data systems or the need to manage all data in a single repository.

2.14 The high level programme of activity for GM-Connect for the forthcoming year will cover:

- Establishing a GM-wide approach to Data Sharing. Establishing the governance and an organisation structure to support and deliver GM-Connect (Feb - April 2016).
- Establishing a GM-wide Data Sharing Governance Executive Board and Delivery Committee (Feb – April 2016).
- Establishing the core GM-Connect team and the GM-Wide Data Sharing programme for coordination and delivery of GM data sharing capabilities (Feb – June 2016).
- Delivering a workstream of Quick Wins building on areas of good practice in GM that can be expanded to GM-wide practice (Feb 2016 – March 2017).
- Delivering a strategic technology solution (in parallel to Quick Wins).
- Developing a detailed business case for implementation of the GM-Connect programme, identifying suitable external funding opportunities and potential for re-alignment of existing budgets at individual
organisation level (high level business plan developed Feb – April 2016. A longer-term business plan will be developed during year 1 of GM-Connect activity)

- Aligning the data sharing strategy to the related IT strategies for GM, in particular GM’s Digital and IT infrastructure strategies (by end of March 2017).

2.15 Further detail on this activity is outlined in Annex 2.

2.16 A key early task for GM-Connect will be the production of a full business plan and clear timeline for project implementation, building on the high-level timeline set out in the full information sharing and collaboration roadmap attached to this report.

3. GM-CONNECT GOVERNANCE

3.1 Federated approaches to data collaboration have already been successfully implemented globally. New York City’s Health and Human Services (HHS) Connect programme, initiated by Mayor Bloomberg, transformed the city’s delivery of health and social care services and delivered significant efficiencies and service improvements for residents.

3.2 Similarly, Canada’s Service Alberta programme has aligned data and processes across 34 programmes and 117 services, creating a citizen-centred vision with aligned, integrated and rationalised social services.

3.3 We have also drawn on the lessons from Estonia, one of the most advanced e-societies in the world which has reaped pronounced benefits through their e-Estonia program, ensuring citizens can complete any municipal or state transaction through the web.

3.4 A common theme across these global case studies has been the importance of strong political leadership and governance frameworks that are focussed on the service objectives, (as opposed to the technology or systems challenges) to drive the delivery of more pro-active data-sharing across public service providers in a place.

3.5 Of equal importance is the need to ensure from the outset that the protection of personal data is of equal importance to its more effective use to deliver better quality services. GM-Connect will have the dual role of promoting better use of information and ensuring GM is effectively protecting information it holds. The governance arrangements proposed will provide democratic oversight to ensure GM-Connect protects the integrity of GM data, regulating of the use made of data and protecting citizens.

3.6 In light of the learning from international best practice in this field, it is proposed that we establish a governance and delivery framework for GM-
Connect that provides leadership and cross-sector support to build an integrated approach to our collective use of data across GM.

3.7 **A GM-Connect Executive Board** (co-chaired by the GMCA lead for Public Service Reform and the chair of the Health and Social Care Strategic Partnership Board) will oversee the strategic direction of GM-Connect and provide senior executive sponsorship. The Board will report into the GMCA and the Health and Social Care Strategic Partnership Board and have senior cross-sector representation, covering the following areas:

- Health (Commissioner, Primary care, Provider)
- Social Care (Adults and Childrens)
- OPCC / GMP
- GMFRS
- Employment and Skills
- Housing provider representative
- Local Authority lead CEx
- Growth (Planning Economic Regeneration)
- Transport – TfGM
- New Economy
- National Centre of Excellence for Information Sharing

All Members of the GM-Connect Executive Board will be senior advocates of data sharing.

3.8 **A GM-Connect Programme Delivery Committee** will be the operational group that will work to the Executive Board on the development and implementation of a delivery programme. The Committee will be chaired by the GM-Connect Programme Director (a new role that will provide the leadership for a GM-wide information strategy) and will have core representation from GMITM, GMIG officers, legal, finance, and cross-sector service representatives as appropriate. The GM-Connect delivery programme will develop: Information Governance practical guidance e.g. GM-wide data sharing agreements; technology tools to host the GM-wide data sharing platform; and, will offer expertise in data analytics and intelligence to support Public Service Reform. The team will operate with 4 dedicated FTEs initially: a GM CIO / data guardian, a data analytics specialist, the GM Information Governance lead (already established) and a Programme Director. The GM CIO and other proposed roles will provide the capacity and leadership to deliver this significant change programme, ensuring GM is able to deliver on the vision set out for GM-Connect. Initially this resource can be funded through the TCA funding allocated to support the development of a GM information sharing function. On-going costs will be determined through the business planning process that will be carried out once the development team is in place.

4. **RESOURCING GM-CONNECT**

4.1 In November 2014 an allocation of £4M Transformation Challenge Award funding was identified to support the implementation of GM data sharing.
4.2 Approval is now sought to release a sum of up to £500k to support set-up costs for GM-Connect.

4.3 This funding will enable the appointment of the 4 dedicated posts referred to in paragraph 3.7 above and the sourcing of external technical support to develop the detailed programme and business case. It is envisaged that the balance of the TCA funds will be deployed to support investment in technology solutions. The GM-Connect Executive Board will oversee and approve all GM-Connect expenditure.

4.4 The TCA funds are one-off and it is envisaged that the detailed GM-Connect business case and funding strategy will identify on-going revenue funding to support the core GM-Connect team from April 2017 onwards. A detailed assessment of existing costs and budgets across GM will be undertaken. This will identify any opportunities for rationalisation, and economies of scale. A detailed technology options assessment will identify any opportunities to reduce non-staffing costs, including the use of open source or packaged solutions, re-use of existing infrastructure and assets and/or leveraging and extending existing capabilities and resources.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 This report summarises the strategic outline case for the establishment of a GM Data-Sharing Authority (GM-Connect), which will:

- support the delivery of our health and social care Strategic Plan and wider Public Service Reform agenda
- enable improved understanding of population level (current and future), public service demand and risk; and
- support our capacity to bring together data held by different partners, providing a clearer picture of the challenges individuals and families are facing, enabling improved decision making in relation to individual cases.

5.2 GMCA are therefore requested to:

a) agree to the establishment of GM-Connect and the release of up to £500k of the Transformation Challenge Award grant to support organisation set-up costs;

b) agree the GM-Connect governance proposals, as outlined in paragraph 3 of the report, which includes the creation of a new GM function (led by a GM Chief Information Officer), noting the implications for individual organisational information governance policies.
# ANNEX 1: STAKEHOLDERS ENGAGED IN GM-CONNECT DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authorities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bob Brown</td>
<td>CIO, Manchester City Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul James</td>
<td>IT Director Stockport Borough Council, New Chair of the GMITM (GM IT Managers) Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julian Massel</td>
<td>Head of Customers and Corporate Services, Rochdale Borough Council and legacy Chair of the GMITM (GM IT Managers) Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Evans</td>
<td>Chair of GM IG Network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Gorman</td>
<td>Policy, Performance and Communications, Bolton Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Morrissy</td>
<td>Head of Policy, Performance and Communications, Bolton Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Wilson</td>
<td>GM PSR Information Governance lead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Swan</td>
<td>Director, iNetwork.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Taylor</td>
<td>Senior Lawyer Information Governance, Manchester City Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Henry</td>
<td>Head of Intelligence and Performance, Manchester City Council.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Bodies</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Dobson</td>
<td>Chair of IM&amp;T (Health and Social Care Devolution).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart North</td>
<td>CE Bury CCG (Lead CE for IM&amp;T, Health and Social Care Devolution).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clive Morris</td>
<td>Director, Health Innovation Manchester.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicky Sharrock</td>
<td>Associate Director Health and Social Care Reform at Greater Manchester Health and Social Care Reform.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Leeming</td>
<td>Associate Director of Informatics, GM Academic Health Science Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Kerry</td>
<td>Assistant Director of Technology and Integration, NHS Wigan Borough Clinical Commissioning Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Willis</td>
<td>Head of Information Governance, Wrightington, Wigan and Leigh NHS Foundation Trust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iain Buchan</td>
<td>Clinical Professor in Public Health Informatics, University of Manchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ainsworth</td>
<td>Senior Research Fellow, University of Manchester and Deputy Director, Centre for Health Informatics and the MRC Health eResearch Centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Burrows</td>
<td>Managing Director of the GM Academic Health Science Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Speed</td>
<td>Information Systems Manager and Information Governance Lead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I3 Service. University Hospitals of Morecambe Bay NHS Foundation Trust.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Police</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tim Forber</strong></td>
<td>Chief Superintendent Greater Manchester Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phil Davies</strong></td>
<td>Superintendent, Greater Manchester Police.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Centre of Excellence for Information Sharing</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nicola Underdown</strong></td>
<td>Head of Engagement (West), Centre of Excellence for Information Sharing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stephen Curtis</strong></td>
<td>Director, Centre of Excellence for Information Sharing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GMITM</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All GM Local Authority IT Directors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GM Information Governance Officers</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Local Authority Information Governance Officers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GM Health and Social Care IM&amp;T Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Bee - Trafford CCG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Birch - Bolton CCG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Blackburn - Salford City Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Boardman - GM Health &amp; Social Care Devolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Chadwick - HMR CCG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Dafter - Stockport MBC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Daines - Oldham CCG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Dobson - Wrightington, Wigan &amp; Leigh NHS FT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Dunscombe - Salford Royal FT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Farenden - Ernst &amp; Young</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nic Fox - Health &amp; Social Care Information Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denis Gizzi - Oldham CCG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Green - Salford City Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr John Hampson - Bury CCG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Amir Hannan - Tameside &amp; Glossop CCG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul James - Stockport MBC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Kerry - Wigan Borough CCG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Leeming - Greater Manchester Academic Health Science Network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julian Massel - Rochdale MBC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe McGuigan - Trafford CCG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart North - Bury CCG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Outram - The Christie Hospital NHS Foundation Trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiten Patel - Pennine Care FT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicky Sharrock - NHS CENTRAL MANCHESTER CCG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Smith - Bridgewater Community Healthcare NHS Foundation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Spear - KPMG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avtar Ubbi - Bolton CCG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position/Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Swan</td>
<td>Inetwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Thomas</td>
<td>Salford Royal FT CIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Watson</td>
<td>The Christie Hospital NHS Foundation Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Whalley</td>
<td>Health &amp; Social Care Information Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Wood</td>
<td>Wrightington, Wigan &amp; Leigh NHS FT (finance Rep)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Willis</td>
<td>Wrightington, Wigan &amp; Leigh NHS FT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillipa Winter</td>
<td>Bolton FT CIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Wright</td>
<td>Manchester CCGs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ANNEX 2: HIGH-LEVEL YEAR 1 GM-CONNECT PROGRAMME ACTIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Priorities</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Current state assessment</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Establish a GM-wide approach to Data Sharing. Establish governance and an organisation structure to support and deliver. | Data sharing is a fundamental pillar of a supporting GM’s wider ambition for Manchester as a place to live and work. The data sharing strategy needs to align to the overall business strategy and IT strategies and operate in a manner which provides support across GM both for Information Sharing guidance and provision of services. In order to leverage resources, capabilities and aid collaboration and decision making, it is recommended that a single coordinated GM-wide approach to data sharing is established. | There are pockets of data sharing operating across GM to varying degrees but it operates in silos within functional or geographical boundaries with no line of sight to business strategy. | Holistic view of the resident/patient across sectors.  
In depth understanding of future and current needs.  
Focus on early intervention and prevention.  
Resident access to data and single channel to access many public services- aka Tell Us Once.  
Target most efficient use of resources, thereby saving cost.  
Integration of GM specific and open data.  
Data intelligence and research to provide a richer more nuanced view of the resident/patient.  
Alert notification of events e.g. move from child to adulthood. | GM-Connect will set the vision and strategy for data sharing across public services in Greater Manchester, replacing the myriad of individual organisational strategies currently in place. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Priorities</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Current state assessment</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establish a GM-wide Data Sharing Governance Executive Board and Delivery Committee.</td>
<td>The Governance structure will be led by a senior Executive who will own the data sharing mandate for GM and chaired by the GMCA Public Service Reform Portfolio holder and the chair of the Health and Social Care Strategic Partnership Board. The Board will have senior representation across all GM Public Services and priorities and will be accountable for articulating and sharing the overall vision for data sharing in GM. The Delivery Committee will work to the Board, developing the GM programme, administering funding, providing practical guidance on implementing data sharing, take external best practice guidance and resolve issues of contention.</td>
<td>No coordinated data sharing governance currently exists. Data sharing is in silos and best endeavors are made to interpret legislation.</td>
<td>Centralised GM-wide Data Sharing Governance approach for GM Operates appropriate governance between Duty to Share and Duty to Protect Provides practical guidance and support for sectors regarding data sharing, with delivery of resident/patient and business benefit at its heart.</td>
<td>GM-Connect Executive Steering Committee will provide the overall direction for data sharing across GM to which all public services will be expected to adhere, replacing individual organisational approaches. GM-Connect will be accountable for the provision of a GM-wide data sharing policy and Information Governance standards and Technical Standards to which all public services will be expected to adhere, replacing individual organisational approaches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Priorities</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td>Current state assessment</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Implications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish the core GM-Connect team and the GM-Wide Data Sharing programme for</td>
<td>Leverage benefit through a coordinated development and delivery of data sharing</td>
<td>Data sharing conducted in silos with duplication of effort. No GM-wide capabilities.</td>
<td>Provision of GM-wide data sharing capabilities and expertise e.g. GM-wide Data Sharing Agreement, clear information sharing guidance,</td>
<td>GM-Connect will coordinate (high touch and low touch) all data sharing activities across GM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coordination and delivery of the GM-wide data sharing capabilities.</td>
<td>capabilities across GM. Consider skills/capability/resources across GM and how they can be used to build a coordinated team.</td>
<td>Varying levels of skills/capabilities/effectiveness of data sharing in practice.</td>
<td>data sharing technology platform including portals to view data for workers and residents, expertise in data analytics for research and intelligence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliver a workstream of Quick Wins based upon existing effective capabilities</td>
<td>Some data sharing capabilities are already in use across GM to address specific areas of functionality. These could be rolled out further across GM to deliver early value in parallel to the development of strategic solutions.</td>
<td>Data sharing capabilities exist both in the information governance and technology tools areas.</td>
<td>Early benefit across GM</td>
<td>GM-Connect will be accountable for identifying the existing best practice GM data sharing capabilities to be rolled out across GM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Priorities</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td>Current state assessment</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Implications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliver a strategic technology solution (in parallel to Quick Wins)</td>
<td>A strategic solution is required which can provide GM with a data sharing platform for the medium and long term to deliver a common client index. This will be based upon a federated model which pulls data from a number of sources without impacting the data owner. In addition, it will ultimately use a master data management approach to ensure accuracy of query results.</td>
<td>No GM-wide technology capability exists.</td>
<td>Ability to have a holistic view of a resident/patient via a web based portal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Resident portal to be able to view their own data. Single channel of interaction with GM.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic platform which is scalable and aligns with GM’s overall business, Digital and IT infrastructure strategies.</td>
<td>GM-Connect will be accountable for the development and rollout of a single strategic data sharing solution across GM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop the detailed business case for implementation of the GM-Connect programme, identifying suitable external funding opportunities and potential for re-alignment of existing budgets at individual organisation level.</td>
<td>Funding required to establish the data sharing organisation, capabilities and delivery of the services.</td>
<td>£4m of funding has already been secured through TCA. Funding which has already been budgeted for in localities could be re-assigned.</td>
<td>Funding approach established as combination of TCA funding and re-assigning existing budgets.</td>
<td>Funding for data sharing across GM public services will be better co-ordinated and aligned. GM-Connect will be accountable for funding, prioritisation and management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Priorities</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td>Current state assessment</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Implications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Align the data sharing strategy to the related IT strategies for GM, in particular GM’s Digital and IT infrastructure strategies.</td>
<td>Data sharing strategy will form a component part of the Digital strategy and has a reliance on the IT infrastructure strategy.</td>
<td>Strategies are currently evolving.</td>
<td>Integrated GM IT strategies and roadmaps which align to the overall GM business strategy.</td>
<td>The GM-Connect data sharing vision will align to the broader GM IT Strategy and all public services across GM will be expected to align.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MINUTES OF THE JOINT GREATER MANCHESTER COMBINED AUTHORITY & AGMA EXECUTIVE AUDIT COMMITTEE, HELD AT MANCHESTER TOWN HALL ON FRIDAY, 22 JANUARY 2016

Present:

Mayor Ian Stewart   GMCA (Chair)
Councillor Colin McLaren   Oldham Council
Councillor Peter Williams   Rochdale MBC
Councillor David Lancaster   Salford CC
Councillor Patrick Myers   Trafford Council
Councillor Pam Stewart   Wigan Council
Stephen Downs   Independent Member

Officers in Attendance:

Richard Paver   GMCA Treasurer
Tom Powell   Internal Audit and Risk Management, MCC
Mark Heap   Grant Thornton
John Farrar   Grant Thornton
Michael Lafon   Manchester Growth Company
Amanda Fox   GMCA
Janice Gotts   GMCA
Kerry Bond   GM Integrated Support Team

AC16/01 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Alan Bury (Bolton), Paul Simpson and Susan Ford.

AC16/02 CHAIRS ANNOUNCEMENTS AND URGENT BUSINESS

Mayor Ian Stewart advised members that he would be standing down in May, and that his last meeting would be the meeting scheduled for 15 April 2016 and that a new Chair would need to be elected at the Audit Committee AGM in July.

Members queried whether there are any constitutional reasons stating that the Independent Member could not be the Chair of the GMCA / AGMA Audit Committee.

Resolved/-

Officers would confirm whether there any constitutional reasons stating that the Chair could not be the Independent Member.

AC16/03 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None were received.
AC16/04 MINUTES OF THE MEETING 18 SEPTEMBER 2016

Resolved/-

That the minutes of the Joint GMCA and AGMA Audit Committee held on 18 September 2016 be approved as a correct record.

AC 16/05 AUDIT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2016/17

Members considered the Joint GMCA and AGMA Audit Committee Work Programme for 2015/16.

Members were advised that it is no longer a requirement to include AGMA accounts and audit reports on the Audit Committee work programme, officers will produce financial statements for the Audit Committee to review.

Resolved/-

To note the Audit Committee Work Programme for 2016/17.

AC16/06 GMCA CORPORATE RISK REGISTER AND ASSURANCE MAP

Members received a report from Richard Paver, Treasurer to the Greater Manchester Combined Authority and Tom Powell, Head of Audit and Risk Management detailing the quarterly review of the Combined Authority’s Risk Register and Assurance Map following a refresh of the assurance map format.

One new risk has been added to the register-

- Risk 5 (High) that transition of powers and responsibilities and changes in roles, responsibilities and governance arising from devolution legislation across GM are not managed effectively

A further full review is planned for February 2016 as part of the development of the Internal Audit Plan for 2016/17.

It was noted that completion of the Risk Register is linked to the assurance map and by liaising with officers in all themed areas.

Resolved/-

1. To note the GMCA Corporate Risk Register and Assurance Map.
2. That a further detailed report be brought to the next meeting.

AC16/07 TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY STATEMENT, BORROWING LIMITS AND ANNUAL INVESTMENT STRATEGY 2015/16 - 2016/17

Members received a report presented by Richard Paver, Treasurer to the Greater Manchester Combined Authority setting out the proposed Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Borrowing Limits for 2015/16 - 2016/17 and Prudential Indicators for 2016/17 to 2018/19.

The Treasurer made particular reference to the change in MRP Policy to allow
for circumstances where grant income was used to repay debt with a consequent adjustment to the MRP to be charged to the revenue account.

**Resolved/-**

1. To agree to recommend to the GMCA to approve the proposed Treasury Management Strategy Statement, in particular:
   
   i. The Treasury Indicators listed in Appendix A of the report.
   ii. The MRP Strategy outlined in Appendix B of the report.
   iii. The Treasury Management Policy Statement at Appendix C of the report.
   iv. The Treasury Management Scheme of Delegation at Appendix D of the report.
   v. The Borrowing Requirements listed in Section 4 of the report.
   vi. The Borrowing Strategy outlined in Section 7 of the report.
   vii. The Annual Investment Strategy detailed in Section 8 of the report.

**AC16/08  INTERNAL AUDIT Q3 PROGRESS REPORT 2015/16**

Members received a report presented by Richard Paver, Treasurer to the Greater Manchester Combined Authority and Tom Powell, Head of Audit and Risk Management provides an update on progress with plan delivery and related assurances for the Annual Internal Audit Plan 2015/16, including:

- Audit Plan progress
- Counter Fraud
- External Assurances

Members queried why the table on page 5 of the report highlighted the Capacity to Improve for GMIF as high when the audit status is marked as complete. Members were advised that this would be expected to improve following prompt engagement with companies that receive funding.

**Resolved/-**

1. To note progress with delivery of the 2015/16 audit plan.
2. That a report detailing counter fraud arrangements, allegations and outcomes be brought to the next meeting.
3. That officers review and revise the report format to give greater clarity over recommendations made and actions to be taken in response to audit reports.

**AC16/09  GMCA AUDIT COMMITTEE UPDATE**

Members received a report of Mark Heap and John Farrar, Grant Thornton providing detail on progress in delivering their responsibilities as the GMCA external auditors, including a summary of emerging national issues and developments that may be relevant to the GMCA.

**Resolved/-**

1. To note the GMCA Audit Committee Update.
2. That further detail on Value for Money conclusion be brought to the next meeting.
3. That the HCA Compliance Audit Report 2015/16 be circulated to members.

**AC16/10 GMCA ANNUAL AUDIT LETTER 2014/15**

Members were presented with the Annual Audit letter from Grant Thornton which summarises the key findings arising from the work carried out for the year ended 31 March 2015.

Resolved/-

That the GMCA Annual Audit Letter 2014/15 be noted.

**AC16/11 AGMA ANNUAL AUDIT LETTER 2014/15**

Members were presented with the Annual Audit letter from Grant Thornton which summarises the key findings arising from the work carried out for the year ended 31 March 2015.

Resolved/-

1. That the AGMA Annual Audit Letter 2014/15 be noted
2. To note that this would be the last AGMA Annual Audit letter received.

**AC16/12 FUTURE MEETINGS**

Resolved/-

To agree the proposed dates for 2015/16 meetings as follows:

- Friday, 15 April 2016, 12noon-2:00pm, Manchester Town Hall
- Friday 22 July 2016 1:30-3:00pm, Manchester Town Hall.
- Friday 16 September 2016 1:30-3:00pm, Manchester Town Hall.
- Friday 20 January 2017 1:30-3:00pm, Manchester Town Hall.
- Friday 13 April 2017 1:30-3:00pm, Manchester Town Hall *
- Friday 21 April 2017 1:30-3:00pm, Manchester Town Hall *
- * April 2017 date to be confirmed, 14th April 2017 is Good Friday.
GMCA AND AGMA SCRUTINY POOL

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON FRIDAY 11 DECEMBER 2015
AT FRIENDS MEETING HOUSE, MOUNT STREET, MANCHESTER

PRESENT

Manchester CC  Cllr Angeliki Stogia
Oldham MBC  Cllr Colin McLaren
Rochdale MBC  Cllr Robert Clegg
Cllr Sara Rowbotham
Salford CC  Cllr John Ferguson
Cllr John Walsh
Stockport MBC  Cllr Wendy Wild
Cllr John McGahan
Tameside MBC  Cllr John Bell
Trafford MBC:  Cllr Barry Brotherton
Cllr Pam Dixon
Wigan MBC  Cllr John O’Brien (Chair)

IN ATTENDANCE

Salford CC  Chris Findley
GM Planning & Housing Team  Anne Morgan
GMIST  Susan Ford
Rebecca Heron
Kerry Bond
Garreth Bruff

15/54 APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Cllrs Andrew Morgan (Bolton), Ian Bevan (Bury); Jane Black (Bury); Ahmed Ali (Manchester), Matt Strong (Manchester), Cath Ball (Oldham), Julia Turner (Oldham), Neil Butterworth (Rochdale), Jillian Collinson (Salford), Susan Ingham (Stockport), Maria Bailey (Tameside), Gill Peet (Tameside), Jonathan Coupe (Trafford), Edward Houlton (Wigan), Pam Stewart (Wigan).

15/55 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made in respect of any item on the agenda.
15/56 MINUTES OF THE GMCA AND AGMA SCRUTINY POOL MEETING HELD ON 13 NOVEMBER 2015

The minutes of the GMCA and AGMA Scrutiny Pool meeting held on 13 November 2015 were submitted for consideration.

RESOLVED/-

To approve the minutes of the GMCA and AGMA Scrutiny Pool meeting held on 13 November 2015.

15/57 SCRUTINY POOL WORK PROGRAMME 2015/16 AND UPDATE ON IMPLEMENTING THE SCRUTINY REVIEW

Susan Ford introduced the report detailing progress made in task and finish working and suggested topics, the role description for scrutiny members, and the work programme schedule for the coming months.

The task and finish group met on 1 December 2015 and have proposed task and finish working on two themes:

1. Post 16 provision of education and training (including the GM area review). It is proposed to initiate this work before Christmas and to report back to March 11 Pool meeting.
2. Digital infrastructure as an enabler of GM’s growth ambitions. It is proposed to commence this work in January.

Members were advised that additional support on the two task and finish groups would be welcomed and if they wish to get involved in the work to contact GMIST officers.

RESOLVED/-
1. To agree the items for the meeting scheduled for 15 January 2015.
2. To agree the contents of the work programme, noting the consolidated forward plan for GMCA and AGMA meetings for the next four months.
4. To note the progress made in task and finish working.
5. That members would contact GMIST officers if they would like to participate in either of the two task and finish groups being established as described in section 2 of the report.
6. To agree the revised Scrutiny member role description as set out in section 3 of the report.

15/58 GREATER MANCHESTER SPATIAL FRAMEWORK – STRATEGIC GROWTH OPTIONS CONSULTATION

Chris Findley presented a report and gave a presentation updating members on the current consultation on the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework, including:

- Priorities
- GM Devolution – Strategic Planning Powers
• GMSF: status, purpose and scope
• Aims
• Strategic Growth Options – current consultation 9 November-11 January
• Strategic Objectives
• Growth Options
• Call for additional development sites
• Next steps

Questions and comments from the Scrutiny Pool included:

Q. Has work on local plans stopped, and what does the GMSF mean for the three districts without local plans in place: Bury, Salford and Tameside.
A. Work on local plans still continues as the GMSF is a local plan, albeit, being undertaken at a GM scale and collaboratively. We will have to sequence events to deliver the GMSF and any other local individual district plans. Discussions are also taking place between GM senior officers, DCLG and Treasury around the governments target to have all local plans in place by 2017.

Q. Will the GMSF look at wider cultural changes such as, for example apartment living?
A. The GMSF isn’t just about setting housing numbers, but will need to consider types and quality of housing. We will also need to look at consultation responses to enable selection of correctly evidence based growth options.

Q. There is a lot of controversy relating to brownfield sites, many sites are privately owned which creates obstacles; do GM have any powers to overcome any problems that may emerge?
A. As part of the devolution agreements the government and the HCA are working with GM to establish a Land Commission that will help to unlock public land for housing development. A Land Programme is also being explored through the latest devolution agreement, discussions are taking place with government and the HCA to enable a business case to be developed to unlock brownfield sites.

Q. Will the GMSF help to identify and protect Green Infrastructure and what does it mean for localities?
A. Green Infrastructure is important, for example, open spaces, parks, nature conservation areas etc. As the GMSF is a statutory plan we will have to understand this and reflect the importance of green infrastructure in GM. We are liaising with the GM Ecology Unit to ensure we have the evidence required.

Q. How can planning authorities encourage development, address stalled sites and land banking as well as making sure developers contribute to infrastructure?
A. The government provide advice on viability, planning authorities have to take viability into account when preparing a plan or planning decisions. Contributions from developers can be sought through Section 106 or Community Infrastructure Levy, local authorities often use their own valuers to ensure they carry out a rigorous process.
Q. Some local authorities have more land than others, how will we distribute development around districts?
A. The GMSF will help identify the objectively assessed needs for housing and employment land in GM and districts, but will get a better understanding of distribution that can be policy driven and part of the GMSF process.

In conclusion, the Chair emphasised a number of matters which could be picked up through the process going forwards-

- Integration of training and skills to access opportunities from development being driven by the GMSF.
- How do DCLG reach their housing figures? GM has a 3% growth, which in comparison to London figures is very disproportionate.
- Looking at whether the Infrastructure Levy could open up sites to build on.
- The benefits of a single GM public enquiry for the framework rather than 10 individual ones.
- Green Space: there is a duty within GM to raise awareness on the differences between green belt, green land and open space. Realistic communications and engagement is required.
- Types of and quality of housing, to make GM a place where people would want to move to.

RESOLVED/

1. To note the report and presentation.
2. That a report be brought to the April 2016 meeting.

15/59 SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS 2015/16

The schedule of meetings for 2015/16 was agreed as-

15 January 2016  
12 February 2016  
11 March 2016 - hosted by Manchester Airport  
8 April 2016  
10 June 2016  

All meetings will be held 1:00pm - 3:00pm at Manchester Town Hall except for the meeting scheduled for 11 March 2016.

Chair
GMCA AND AGMA SCRUTINY POOL

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON FRIDAY 15 JANUARY 2016
AT SCRUTINY ROOM, TOWN HALL, MANCHESTER

PRESENT

Bolton Council  Cllr Andrew Morgan
Manchester CC   Cllr Ahmed Ali
              Cllr Angeliki Stogia
Oldham MBC     Cllr Colin McLaren
Rochdale MBC   Cllr Neil Butterworth
              Cllr Robert Clegg
              Cllr Sara Rowbotham
Salford CC     Cllr John Ferguson
              Cllr Jillian Collinson
              Cllr John Walsh
Stockport MBC  Cllr Wendy Wild
Tameside MBC   Cllr John Bell
              Cllr Gill Peet
Trafford MBC   Cllr Barry Brotherton
              Cllr Pam Dixon
Wigan MBC      Cllr John O’Brien (Chair)

IN ATTENDANCE

Interim Mayor   Tony Lloyd
Trafford Council Cllr Sean Anstee
GM PSR Team     Andrew Lightfoot
New Economy     Gemma Marsh
GMIST           Susan Ford
                Kerry Bond

15/60  APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Cllrs Alan Bury (Bolton); Ian Bevan (Bury); Matt Strong (Manchester); Cath Ball (Oldham); Julia Turner (Oldham); Susan Ingham (Stockport); John McGahan (Stockport); Maria Bailey (Tameside); Jonathan Coupe (Trafford); Edward Houlton (Wigan); Pam Stewart (Wigan).
15/61 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Greater Manchester Employment and Skills Update
Councillor Robert Clegg - Personal - Councillor Clegg declared an interest the as the Chair of Corporation at Hopwood Hall College.

15/62 MINUTES OF THE GMCA AND AGMA SCRUTINY POOL MEETING HELD ON 11 DECEMBER 2015

The minutes of the GMCA and AGMA Scrutiny Pool meeting held on 11 December 2015 were submitted for consideration.

RESOLVED/-

To approve the minutes of the GMCA and AGMA Scrutiny Pool meeting held on 11 December 2015.

15/63 SCRUTINY POOL WORK PROGRAMME 2015/16 AND UPDATE ON IMPLEMENTING THE SCRUTINY REVIEW

Susan Ford introduced the report detailing the work programme schedule for the coming months.

It was agreed that the meeting scheduled fro 13 May 2016 be cancelled.

RESOLVED/-

1. To agree the contents of the work programme, noting the consolidated forward plan for GMCA and AGMA meetings for the next four months.
2. To agree that the meeting scheduled fro 13 May 2016 be cancelled.
3. To note that the transport update scheduled for February be deferred to a future meeting.
4. To agree to receive a report on Children Service Review to the meeting scheduled for 12 February 2016.

15/64 GREATER MANCHESTER DEVOLUTION UPDATE

Tony Lloyd and Andrew Lightfoot presented a report updating members on the additional freedoms and flexibilities awarded to Greater Manchester as part of a further Devolution Agreement, announced as part of the Spending Review announcement made on 25 November 2015.

This agreement reaffirmed the Government’s commitment to maximising devolution to Greater Manchester over time and also identified a number of areas for further joint work including, housing, energy, employment support, apprenticeships and energy. The work programme contained in table 2 of the report summarises the key tasks to be undertaken to progress the key areas of work, prior to the development of a wider implementation plan which will cover all aspects of the devolution settlement to date. This plan will be considered by the GMCA in January.
Questions and comments from the Scrutiny Pool included-

Q. **With regards to the health agenda, are we on schedule and receiving cooperation from government departments involved with the April 2017 timeline?**

A. The GMCA will require the ability to exercise health related functions from April 2016 to enable it to play a full part in health and social care devolution. It is proposed that this will be the way of providing for the GMCA to have the function that all local authorities have under the Health and Social Care Act 2012 to take appropriate steps to improve the health of people who live in their area.

The Cities and Devolution Bill went through the report stage in the House of Commons on 7th December and went back into the House of Lords on 12th January, it is anticipated that it will receive Royal Assent within the next week. Further work is taking place on other additional powers required to implement devolution from April 2016.

Discussions have taken place with DCLG on the timetable for implementation of the Orders required. The first Order will create the GM Mayor role, and allow for the Mayor to exercise the functions of the PCC for the Greater Manchester police area. It also provides for the election of the Mayor in May 2017 for an initial three year term and removes the requirement for a GM PCC election in May 2016. It is anticipated that the Order will be laid immediately after the bills Royal Assent to meet the timetable required to stop the PCC election. The Order requires the consent of GMCA and the 10 constituent Councils.

Q. **What resource is available and how will this, and future requirements be managed, due to local authority cuts?**

A. We are fortunate to be starting with an established AGMA resource, receiving significant contribution from the 10 local authorities and partners enabling the delivery the best possible outcomes from the funds awarded. The cuts within authorities will have an impact to some extent but Leaders and Chief Executives are committed to the devolution deal.

Q. **Local Councillors need an assurance that they have a role to play.**

A. It has recently been proposed to improve the efficiency of the GMCA portfolio arrangements and increase strategic leadership capacity through the appointment of Deputy Portfolio lead members. Each portfolio area will have an overview of key priorities and areas of responsibility, there will also be a cross-portfolio role profile for deputy lead members.

GMCA and AGMA meetings are now being live streamed this will be rolled out to other strategic GM meetings, including Scrutiny Pool. The role of local Councillors to liaise with local communities is important; a report being taken to a future GMCA meeting will be circulated to Scrutiny Pool members when available.
Q. **What are your views on hotel bedroom tax?**
A. We want Government to understand the merits of hotel bedroom tax that could be used to fund particular strategic initiatives. Under our current devolution deal, a business rate may be implemented by the elected mayor to enhance capacity of jobs, employment etc, this would need be agreed by the GMCA and LEP.

**RESOLVED/-**

1. To note the report.
2. That the report, when taken to the GMCA be circulated to Scrutiny Pool members.

**15/65 GREATER MANCHESTER EMPLOYMENT AND SKILLS UPDATE**

Councillor Sean Anstee and Theresa Grant presented a report updating members on employment & skills activity across Greater Manchester, including:

- **Area Based Review**
  - National reforms to post-16 education
  - GM Context
  - Progress update since instigation of the review on 21 September 2015
- **Expansion of the GM Working Well Programme - Employment Devolution**
  - Working Well Pilot
  - Jointly Commissioned Work Programme with DwP
  - Work and Health Programme – to replace the work programme at it’s conclusion in April 2017
- **Job Centre Plus (JCP)**
  - One GM JCP district
  - JCP service delivery integration
  - GM Context
- **European Social Fund (ESF)**
  - ESF Calls: launched and in the pipeline
- **Spending Review and Devolution opportunities**
  - Employment
  - Skills
  - Apprenticeships

Q. **How are demographic needs taken into account under the Area Based Review and is there pressure on resource as participation age increases?**
A. The need of communities are to be considered within detailed analysis of provision across GM, recognising that raising participation age does have resource implications. We will be working collaboratively with primary and secondary schools to improve performance so that Post 16 education doesn’t need to allocate as much resource to ensuring young people reach GCSE equivalent in english and maths.

Q. **Has a business and apprenticeships needs analysis been carried out?**
A. GMCA have commissioned New Economy, Oxford Economics & KPMG to carry out detailed financial modelling which will provide us with overarching GM forecasts by
sector and qualification level which will outline expansion and replacement demand, as well as provide in-depth information relating to growth opportunities for specific districts. This work is scheduled to be completed by 31st January 2016.

In the Spending Review it was announced that the Work Programme will not be re-commissioned, but would be replaced by a new Work and Health Programme, similar to GM’s Working Well. The new programme will focus on long-term benefit claimants with a disability or health condition.

GM has been fully engaged with DWP to shape every stage of the new programme, it may also be decided to use its ESF to increase capacity in the new programme and extend eligibility to further cohorts.

Q. Is NEETS data tracked across the 10 authorities?
A. There isn’t enough NEET analysis taking place, a more effective mechanism to track NEETS across GM boundaries is required.

Q. There has been a series of separate college workshops and NEET workshops, will these be linked?
A. Yes, they have been set up to follow the Area Based Review process, there are additional GM workshops to cover for example travel to learn, these all flow into the Area Based Review.

Q. There is a concern that a high percentage of children are not school ready, what can be done to address this?
A. The need to concentrate on early intervention and prevention is recognised, if we are to address the issue of children not being school ready.

We need to look at the children’s aspect of devolution, taking best of provision to ensure that there is a service that is beneficial to all children across the GM districts.

RESOLVED/-

1. To note the report.
2. That an update report including NEET, apprenticeships and Work & Health Programme commissioning be brought to a future meeting.
3. That a report on Children Service Review be brought to the meeting scheduled for 12 February.

15/66 SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS 2015/16

The schedule of meetings for 2015/16 was agreed as-

12 February 2016
11 March 2016 - hosted by Manchester Airport
8 April 2016
10 June 2016

All meetings will be held 1:00pm - 3:00pm at Manchester Town Hall except for the meeting scheduled for 11 March 2016.

Chair
JOINT GREATER MANCHESTER COMBINED AUTHORITY
& AGMA EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING

Date: 29 January 2016

Subject: GMFRS Revenue Budget 2016/17 and Medium Term Financial Strategy

Report of: Peter O’Reilly – County Fire Officer & Chief Executive, Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue Service

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To provide an updated budget paper outlining information on Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue Authority’s current budget position. There is also a high level forward forecast for the three subsequent years using the indicative four year financial forecasting which sets out the scale of the future financial challenge. The report also highlights some of the key service delivery changes that will be needed to meet the financial challenge and which will be the subject of a 12 week public consultation process from February 2016.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Note the range of strategic issues and risks set out in the report which will influence the Medium Term Financial Strategy and the Authority budgetary requirements.

2. Note the proposed precept increase of 2% for 2016/17

3. Note the proposal to increase at £4.99 for Band D rates if any approval is provided from DCLG as part of the Final Local Government Finance Settlement.

4. Note the public consultation process which will commence this year.

CONTACT OFFICERS:

Peter O’Reilly – County Fire Officer & Chief Executive
Tel: 0161 608 4004 Email: oreillyp@manchesterfire.gov.uk

Paul McKeivitt – Treasurer to the Fire & Rescue Authority
Tel: 01942 827232 Email: P.McKevitt@wigan.gov.uk

Andrea Heffernan – Director of Corporate Support
Tel: 0161 608 4122 Email: andrea.heffernan@manchesterfire.gov.uk
BACKGROUND PAPERS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRACKING/PROCESS</th>
<th>[All sections to be completed]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does this report relate to a Key Decision, as set out in the GMCA Constitution or in the process agreed by the AGMA Executive Board</td>
<td>No [Delete as appropriate]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXEMPTION FROM CALL IN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there any aspects in this report which means it should be considered to be exempt from call in by the AGMA Scrutiny Pool on the grounds of urgency?</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGMA Commission</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TfGMC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrutiny Pool</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **INTRODUCTION**

1.1 The report sets out the draft Authority budget requirements for 2016/17 with a medium term projection through to 2019/20 to match the Spending Review period. The report includes a range of key issues and sets out a financial model to illustrate projected reductions in central government grant (based on the most recent CLG announcements) and the likely impact on the overall financial position of the Authority.

1.2 The figures in this report are based on the provisional local government finance settlement consultation for 2016/17 and the indicative figures published for the following three years.

2. **PROVISIONAL LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE SETTLEMENT DECEMBER 2015**

2.1 The provisional Local Government Finance settlement was announced on Thursday 17th December. This included some important shifts in the Government’s principles. There has been a move away from freezing council tax towards using council tax to generate additional funding, and more recognition between areas with high and low tax bases.

2.2 Key Elements in Settlement:

- Allocations determined by equal % cuts in settlement core funding (Revenue Support Grant + Business Rates + Council Tax)
- The cuts will be applied to the Revenue Support Grant element
- DCLG headline cut in spending power is 2.8% in 2016/17
- No additional social care funding has been allocated except the Social Care Precept of 2% that local authorities with this responsibility can now raise
- Council Tax referendum limits are 2%
- All previous council tax freeze grants will be maintained and rolled into the base Revenue Support Grant, and no freeze grant has been offered for 2016/17
• Provisional settlement figures have been issued for four years. Authorities that wish to confirm them can do however there is limited information on how this is to be agreed to
• Capital receipts can be used to support transformation expenditure including revenue as long as ongoing savings can be delivered

2.3 Key Impacts for GMFRA

• Total reduction from 2015/16 (base year) of 16.5% on Settlement Funding
• Revenue Support Grant Reductions of 40% by 2019/20
• Based on no precept increases for the 4 years, the total budget shortfall by 2019/20 would be £15.8m
• Total Core Spending Power Reduction based on 3.7% for GMFRA in CLG calculations
• This is almost double the stand-alone Fire and Rescue Authority National average of 2%
• Nationally, 4 FRA’s look to either stay the same or increase overall funding
• 12 FRA’s reduce by less than the 2% average
• 13 FRA’s reduce by more than the 2% average- All Metropolitan Fire Authorities are in this category
• The highest reduction is to West Midlands at 4.1%, then Cleveland 3.9%, West Yorkshire 3.8% and Greater Manchester 3.7%.

Further Detail on Key Elements

Four Year Settlement

2.4 The provisional Local Government Finance Settlement for 2016/17 includes the Provisional Settlement for 2016/17 and further indicative details of funding covering the 4 year period. The Government will offer any Authority that wishes to take it up a four-year funding settlement to 2019/20. This offer will be available to Authorities should they choose to accept it, and if they have published an Efficiency Plan included in their Medium Term Financial Strategies. The details of how this will happen in practice or how an Authority takes up this offer haven’t been published at this stage.

Core Funding

2.5 The phasing out of Revenue Support Grant was announced in the Autumn Statement, and the Provisional Settlement sets out the of the core resources available to Authorities, taking into account business rates and Council Tax, as well as their Revenue Support Grant. In the case of Authorities with less Revenue Support Grant in later years, funding from other elements of their core funding will be required to meet their budget requirements, and the Settlement includes the proposal to adjust the tariff or top up under the Business Rates Retention Scheme. The Settlement confirms that local government will retain 100% of the Business Rate by the end of the period, and that the arrangements for top ups and tariffs will be retained. Consultation
on this is due in Summer 2016 to set out the details of how this will be achieved. It is intended that engagement will be made with authorities in the months running up to the consultation.

Changes in Core Spending Power

2.6 The Core Spending Power reduction for GMFRA is showing as 3.7% over the four years. This is almost twice the Fire and Rescue Authority average at 2%. The below chart shows the impact on all stand-alone FRA’s.

Council Tax

2.7 There is an offer of support to councils in the lower quartile band D to raise council taxes by up to £5 for band D but this has not included Fire Authorities. As part of the feedback to the settlement consultation it has been requested to consider allowing GMFRA to be able to also utilise this.

2.8 Our colleagues over at Greater Manchester Police (GMP) are in the lowest quartile (which equates to 10 PCC’s) of changes compared with other constabularies and have secured the right to precept £4.99 on local bills, in the wake of the recent terrorist attacks in Paris. It must be stated that our
firefighters would be standing shoulder-to-shoulder in the face of similar attacks here. It would not just be the Police.

Apprenticeship Levy

2.9 Apprenticeship Levy - An additional cost pressure was identified following the Autumn Statement, the Apprenticeship Levy of 0.5% of the pay bill, an estimated cost of £0.300m per annum based on current employees. This will be effective from 2017/18. At this stage, until further details emerge, we have included this as a budget risk and not reflected in the model. It is anticipated that the cost to GMFRS will be less than the estimated £0.300m per annum by 2017/18 as the pay bill will reduce. There is also an incentive for GMFRS to seek funding for apprenticeships through this route, details of which are awaited.

2.10 The following chart shows the shift in funding from central government to locally raised funding based on the 4 year indicative figures.

3. MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY MODELS AND IMPACTS FOR GMFRS

3.1 Please refer to Appendices 1 to 3 which indicate the potential Medium Term Financial Strategy models based on the following scenarios for precept/council tax increase for 2016/17:

- Precept Freeze 0% (Scenario 1)
- Precept Increase 1.99% (Scenario 2)
- Precept Increase £4.99 Band D (Scenario 3)
3.2 As part of the local government settlement, and if no precept increase was supported GMFRA will need to save £15.8m in four years, with a massive £12.6m in the first two years. To cope with this Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue Service (GMFRS) will need to drastically reduce its frontline service.

3.3 The following table shows the Budget Requirement against the funding expected to be received across those years and the budget gap that this creates (based on Scenario 1):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Net Budget requirement</th>
<th>£M</th>
<th>£M</th>
<th>£M</th>
<th>£M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>104.558</td>
<td>106.004</td>
<td>106.926</td>
<td>108.084</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funded by:</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>2018-19</th>
<th>2019-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share of Business Rates (including Top Up)</td>
<td>29.320</td>
<td>29.900</td>
<td>30.780</td>
<td>31.760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Support Grant</td>
<td>27.160</td>
<td>22.540</td>
<td>19.940</td>
<td>18.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted Tax Base Increases</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>1.200</td>
<td>1.800</td>
<td>2.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expected Funding</td>
<td>96.873</td>
<td>93.433</td>
<td>92.313</td>
<td>92.203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Budget Shortfall Requiring Savings</th>
<th>£M</th>
<th>£M</th>
<th>£M</th>
<th>£M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>7.685</td>
<td>12.571</td>
<td>14.613</td>
<td>15.881</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 GMFRS is at the forefront of public sector reform and a driving force for devolution in Greater Manchester. The Service has numerous collaborative projects including:

- A national flagship station at Irlam which includes police, fire and ambulance but also ground-breaking community access initiatives
- Developing the UK’s first Safe and Well holistic safety visits focussing on health and crime prevention as well as fire safety
- The first Fire and Rescue Service in the UK to offer all frontline firefighters and resources to respond to cardiac arrests on behalf of the local ambulance service
- Building a joint fire and ambulance station in Wigan
• Providing offices to Greater Manchester Police (GMP) in Stockport, Stalybridge and Mossley
• Launching the Community Risk Intervention Team to support GMP and health services
• Opening prevention hubs with GMP and Salford Council to support troubled families
• Developing and delivering joint realistic multi-agency public disorder training

3.5 A further cut of £15.8m will undoubtedly impact on these projects and limit the kind of joint-working GMFRS has done so successfully with the police and others. This work has seen the Service providing resources to support GMP during the 2011 riots, during the operations to tackle organised crime, during civil contingencies training and during the recent flooding. GMFRS has delivered more than 425,000 home visits and reduced fires by 42% over the last six years. However previous cuts are now starting to impact. The trend of reduced incidents is levelling off and in places reversing. Between July and September 2015, special service calls (e.g. road traffic collisions, flood response etc.) rose by 28.22% compared with the same period in the previous year. Non-domestic fires (e.g. businesses), accidental house fires and fire casualties also all increased.

3.6 Since 2009/10 GMFRA has saved £28m, amounting to a 25 per cent reduction in budget. This has been achieved through reductions in the number of firefighters (539), increased collaboration, reductions to numbers of support staff and senior management, revisions to firefighter shift and crewing arrangements, improved procurement, the reduction of ill health retirements and through sustainability and energy conservation.
3.7 With these steps now taken, a further £15.8m cut will require a reduction in the fire and rescue cover the Service can provide. To take the Service forward and in response to the budget reductions faced by GMFRS, the Authority has developed an Efficiency Plan for the period 2016/17 to 2019/20, as set out below.
## Proposed Efficiency Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2016/17 £000s</th>
<th>2017/18 £000s</th>
<th>2018/19 £000s</th>
<th>2019/20 £000s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REQUIRED CUMULATIVE SAVINGS</td>
<td>7,685</td>
<td>12,571</td>
<td>14,613</td>
<td>15,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUMULATIVE ONGOING SAVINGS IDENTIFIED BELOW</td>
<td>4,791</td>
<td>9,373</td>
<td>12,629</td>
<td>15,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHORTFALL COVERED BY RESERVES IN YEAR</td>
<td>2,894</td>
<td>3,198</td>
<td>1,984</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ANNUAL SAVING BY 2019/20 £000s</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of Reserves</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Specific Reserves</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required use of General Balances</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>3,198</td>
<td>1,984</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Use of Reserves</strong></td>
<td>2,894</td>
<td>3,198</td>
<td>1,984</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ANNUAL SAVING REQUIRED</strong></td>
<td>7,685</td>
<td>7,780</td>
<td>5,240</td>
<td>3,252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ongoing Savings

#### Reduction in Cost Pressures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
<th>2018/19</th>
<th>2019/20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay Cost Pressures</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Service Budget Savings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
<th>2018/19</th>
<th>2019/20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Firefighter Posts</td>
<td>3,120</td>
<td>3,120</td>
<td>3,120</td>
<td>3,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firefighters Pension Scheme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers Contribution</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability- Utilities</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability- Fuel</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back Office &amp; Support Services Review</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention &amp; Protection Directorate Review</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>450</td>
<td></td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Departments and Non Pay Target</td>
<td>398</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4,487</td>
<td>4,532</td>
<td>3,206</td>
<td>3,202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Capital Financing Saving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
<th>2018/19</th>
<th>2019/20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non Pay- Capital Financing</td>
<td>274</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Saving Required</strong></td>
<td>4,791</td>
<td>4,582</td>
<td>3,256</td>
<td>3,252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Use of Reserves

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Specific Reserves</th>
<th>2,400</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required use of General Balances</td>
<td>494 3,198 1,984 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Use of Reserves</strong></td>
<td>2,894 3,198 1,984 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ANNUAL SAVING REQUIRED</strong></td>
<td>7,685 7,780 5,240 3,252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.8 Maintaining high levels of service delivery to the public during the Authority’s significant change programme remains a high priority, but becomes increasingly challenging as resources and capacity is reduced. There has been a deliberate strategy to maximise cashable efficiency savings before revisiting front line services, but as front line services make up the majority of our spending, further reductions in this area are unavoidable.

3.9 The Efficiency Plan includes the savings associated with reviews of all back office functions undertaken by GMFRA across the four year period. These will comprise savings from both pay and non-pay budgets in all back office areas, and these savings are planned ahead of further reductions in frontline firefighter positions, to support front line services.

3.10 The scale of these new cuts will still require the loss of a further 312 firefighter posts and the associated reduction of cover. The cuts will reduce frontline GMFRS firefighters from 1,311 to 999 by 2019. In 1996 it had over 2,000. Fewer firefighters means fewer crewed up fire engines being immediately available. This means it will take longer to get to emergencies and fires will spread more extensively. With fewer resources firefighters will be unable to enter burning buildings and be forced to fight fires from the outside. More buildings will be completely destroyed by fire. The service is continuing to research alternative rostering models to deliver the most effective model within the available resources.

3.11 The delivery of the Sustainability Strategy (2009 – 2014) has allowed the service to deliver savings in utilities and fuel costs as well as significant reductions in carbon emissions. The Authority has recently set out it’s commitment to 2050 in the latest Sustainability Strategy (2014 – 2050) which will see the service continue to reduce it’s carbon footprint, by 50 per cent by 2020 and to a carbon positive position by 2050. The delivery of our Sustainability Strategy will continue to allow the service to deliver associated financial savings, which underpin the Efficiency Plan.

3.12 To date, GMFRA has used capital resources and reserves to support transformation projects including a joint fire / ambulance station and new firefighter training facilities. The Authority’s Efficiency Plan uses it’s reserves and balances to smooth the effects of previous budget cuts and those imminently faced.

3.13 If there are any changes to funding allocations including precept increases, or additional savings from non-frontline delivery, all extra available resource will be used to reduce the savings target from frontline and give the ability to increase the number of fire crews available. For example, if there becomes an agreed option from DCLG to increase the precept by £4.99, supported by GMCA/AGMA, this would increase the precept income by £3.44m and would protect 86 firefighter posts.
4. CORPORATE PLANNING

4.1 The Authority’s Corporate Plan for the next financial year and onwards will be open for consultation from 11th February 2016 following the Authority meeting on the same day which will incorporate the significant financial challenge that the Authority is facing.

4.2 The Corporate Plan is based on a ‘Confronting the Future’ agenda and looks at the key emerging threats and opportunities and how the Authority is responding:

   a) Future Firefighting- changing the way fires are tackled by introducing new techniques and equipment
   b) Training – ensuring the maintenance of firefighter skills (New site in Bury/Incident Command Academy)
   c) Technical Response Unit- specialist rescue team
   d) Partnerships- helping the delivery of the Authority’s aims
   e) Public Service Reform- fundamentally changing the way services are delivered
   f) Pathways to Employment- traineeships and opportunities for young people
   g) Sustainability- Target 2050
   h) Ageing Workforce- Firefighter fitness/ Health & Wellbeing programme
   i) Financial Austerity

5. STRATEGIC RISKS

5.1 The following is a list of known issues which may impact upon the medium term financial strategy but which cannot be quantified with any precision at the present.

5.2 There is a risk associated with collection levels for both Council Tax and Business Rates in the districts of Greater Manchester. Any reduction of business rates collection would have an impact on the Authority up to a potential loss of income of c£2m before triggering the safety net position set by CLG (7.5% of the baseline). This has been earmarked within General Balances.

5.3 Demands on FRS following fire-fighter fatalities / HSE inspection. A number of inquests remain outstanding and the implications for GMFRS are yet unknown as to issues that may be identified. The new operational training site will fundamentally address many of the issues which have emerged from the learning from these tragic events. The Authority will have to continue resourcing work associated with the death of Stephen Hunt at a fire in Oldham Street, Manchester, on 13th July 2013.

5.4 Potential fall out of external and partnership income following local spending decisions made from the results of the Comprehensive Spending Review. There may be significant financial pressure on resources for partners that have invested in Community Safety activities. The key specific area is the
income received for Children and Young People’s activities and the Prince’s Trust programmes.

5.5 The next period of Actuarial review for both the Firefighters and Local Government pension schemes is due to be carried out from 2016/17- any impact to the Employers contribution rates from 2017/18 (LGPS) and 2019/20 (Firefighter’s scheme) will be concluded as part of these reviews.

5.6 Business Continuity Management arrangements (including strike action, flu pandemic or any potential spate condition) have been logged as to be funded from balances to mitigate this risk. Under the Civil Contingencies Act the Authority has a range of obligations which have become more onerous since the withdrawal of military assistance. The Authority has a Business Continuity Plan event known as County Guard which has seen the service recruit and train approximately 200 emergency fire staff to provide a basic emergency service. There are potential costs in respect of any required ongoing refresher training for the Emergency Fire Crew.

5.7 There is a National Emergency Services Mobile Communications Project (ESMCP) which is to procure and replace the Emergency Services Network. The North-West is due to transition from early 2017 on the current project plan. Transitional Funding is being made available from CLG but exact details are yet to be confirmed.

5.8 Implications of the spending review period, the continuation of the fiscal consolidation, and the significant savings targets required due to this need to be considered. There is also no indication yet on future capital funding from CLG.

6. COUNCIL TAX

6.1 Last year the Authority agreed a Band D equivalent precept of £57.64 which was a freeze on 2014/15 rates. An increase is sought for 2016/17 and this is modelled in Appendices 2 and 3. Appendix 2 shows the 1.99% increase which would be within the referendum limits announced for 2016/17. Appendix 3 shows the £4.99 on Band D which would be sought if the Fire and Rescue Authorities can be included in the eligible group for this increase. This is being fed back to DCLG as part of the Local Government Provisional Finance Settlement consultation.

6.2 The current Medium Term Financial Strategy models a zero % increase for the years from 2017/18 onwards for precept income. There will be ongoing consultation with AGMA/ Combined Authority every year to request an increase to the maximum allowed by the referendum limit in order to protect frontline firefighter posts.

6.3 The following graph illustrates that the Authority continues to remain one of the lowest Fire and Rescue Authority’s in England at Band D. The Metropolitan Authorities are the ones highlighted in red.
7. MEDIUM TERM FORECAST

7.1 Appendices 1 to 3 provide details of the budget models, and identify the amount of reductions required to meet the Government’s funding targets. The settlement figures are currently provisional but are unlikely to change significantly and provide us with figures for 2016/17.
8. RESERVES AND BALANCES

8.1 The Government and external auditors are interested in the level of balances held as part of a sustainable medium term financial strategy. The following table shows the estimated level of reserves and balances maintained by the Authority for the period of the budget forecast i.e. 2016/17 to 2019/20.

Analysis of Balances and Reserves

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimated Balance As at 31/3/17 £m</th>
<th>Estimated Balance As at 31/3/18 £m</th>
<th>Estimated Balance As at 31/3/19 £m</th>
<th>Estimated Balance As at 31/3/20 £m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Balances</td>
<td>13.087</td>
<td>9.889</td>
<td>7.905</td>
<td>7.905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earmarked Reserves</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership /CYP</td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td>0.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restructuring</td>
<td>1.140</td>
<td>1.140</td>
<td>1.140</td>
<td>1.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>2.599</td>
<td>2.599</td>
<td>2.599</td>
<td>2.599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The Partnership reserve provides the necessary funding for future partnership and innovation schemes and to support children’s and young people’s initiatives. It has been utilised to support the CRIT pilot.
- The Restructuring reserve was created from available balances to give the Authority this balance available to assist in the delivery of any future efficiency requirements.
- The Authority also retains an Insurance Reserve of £2.599m. The reserve provides a prudent contingency against unforeseen future claims, including the MMI Scheme of Arrangement. It also provides a prudent hedge against changes in the insurance market which may require premium increases.
- The Capital Reserve is expected to be fully utilised by 2017/18. Alternative funding routes will be required for future years.
- Please note that revenue shortfalls have been modelled into the above based on the assumption of the zero precept increase for 2016/17 model.

9. CONCLUSIONS

9.1 The Authority will be consulting on its new Corporate Plan/Integrated Risk Management Plan (IRMP) from 11th February 2016. ‘Confronting the Future’ was a Strategic Intent Document issued in 2014 which includes a reflection on where the service is and sets out the challenges that it will face. The purpose was to explain how the service’s ambitions will address the major challenges to continue to deliver and achieve its purpose and aims. There are three key themes in the ambitions; transforming the service, better community outcomes and our people and culture. This will be built upon by the draft Corporate Plan/IRMP, which issues proposals on how the service intends to address the challenges to the Financial austerity position it faces.
9.2 The Authority’s medium term strategy needs to be able to withstand the events that lie ahead and revenue balances and reserves remain an important feature of enabling phased change to take place in a managed way. The timing and delivery of changes, particularly those where public consultation or negotiations with representative bodies are required will mean that retaining a degree of flexibility is prudent, with any timing issues being handled through the appropriate use of reserves and balances if required. This has come into fruition for the expected budget model with a planned use of reserves of £8m until 2019/20 (Scenario 1) to support the annual budget.

9.3 Precept increases (supported) will reduce the necessary reductions in operational frontline posts, as outlined in this report and models in the appendices.
### MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY MODEL - SCENARIO 1 (ZERO PRECEPT INCREASE)

#### APPENDIX 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£M</td>
<td>£M</td>
<td>£M</td>
<td>£M</td>
<td>£M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Budget - Starting Point from Previous Year</td>
<td>105.785</td>
<td>104.448</td>
<td>102.605</td>
<td>99.469</td>
<td>97.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay &amp; price inflation</td>
<td>1.563</td>
<td>0.892</td>
<td>0.892</td>
<td>0.892</td>
<td>0.892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Pressures and Variations</td>
<td>0.429</td>
<td>1.752</td>
<td>0.504</td>
<td>-0.020</td>
<td>0.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Budget Net Expenditure</td>
<td>104.448</td>
<td>102.605</td>
<td>99.469</td>
<td>97.135</td>
<td>95.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Financing</td>
<td>2.904</td>
<td>2.630</td>
<td>2.630</td>
<td>2.630</td>
<td>2.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reversal of Asset charges</td>
<td>-5.388</td>
<td>-5.388</td>
<td>-5.388</td>
<td>-5.388</td>
<td>-5.388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Balances</td>
<td>-0.080</td>
<td>-0.080</td>
<td>-0.080</td>
<td>-0.080</td>
<td>-0.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to/from(-) Balances/Reserves</td>
<td>-2.034</td>
<td>-2.400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Budget requirement</td>
<td>99.850</td>
<td>97.367</td>
<td>96.631</td>
<td>94.297</td>
<td>92.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding for the Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Rates</td>
<td>29.278</td>
<td>29.320</td>
<td>29.900</td>
<td>30.780</td>
<td>31.760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Support Grant</td>
<td>30.249</td>
<td>27.160</td>
<td>22.540</td>
<td>19.940</td>
<td>18.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Funding Total</td>
<td>60.598</td>
<td>56.480</td>
<td>52.440</td>
<td>50.720</td>
<td>50.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Base Increases</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>1.200</td>
<td>1.800</td>
<td>2.400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Funding</td>
<td>99.850</td>
<td>96.873</td>
<td>93.433</td>
<td>92.313</td>
<td>92.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Budget gap to be met from reserves</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.494</td>
<td>3.198</td>
<td>1.984</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY MODEL - SCENARIO 2 (1.99% PRECEPT INCREASE)  
### APPENDIX 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£M</td>
<td>£M</td>
<td>£M</td>
<td>£M</td>
<td>£M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Budget - Starting Point from Previous Year</td>
<td>105.785</td>
<td>104.448</td>
<td>102.925</td>
<td>100.187</td>
<td>97.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay &amp; price inflation</td>
<td>1.563</td>
<td>0.892</td>
<td>0.892</td>
<td>0.892</td>
<td>0.892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Pressures and Variations</td>
<td>0.429</td>
<td>1.752</td>
<td>0.504</td>
<td>-0.020</td>
<td>0.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Budget Net Expenditure</td>
<td>104.448</td>
<td>102.925</td>
<td>100.187</td>
<td>97.927</td>
<td>95.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Financing</td>
<td>2.904</td>
<td>2.630</td>
<td>2.630</td>
<td>2.630</td>
<td>2.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reversal of Asset charges</td>
<td>-5.388</td>
<td>-5.388</td>
<td>-5.388</td>
<td>-5.388</td>
<td>-5.388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Balances</td>
<td>-0.080</td>
<td>-0.080</td>
<td>-0.080</td>
<td>-0.080</td>
<td>-0.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to/from(-) Balances/Reserves</td>
<td>-2.034</td>
<td>-2.400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Budget requirement</td>
<td>99.850</td>
<td>97.687</td>
<td>97.349</td>
<td>95.089</td>
<td>92.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding for the Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Rates</td>
<td>29.278</td>
<td>29.320</td>
<td>29.900</td>
<td>30.780</td>
<td>31.760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Support Grant</td>
<td>30.249</td>
<td>27.160</td>
<td>22.540</td>
<td>19.940</td>
<td>18.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Funding Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuts are on Base Year of 2015/16</td>
<td>60.598</td>
<td>56.480</td>
<td>52.440</td>
<td>50.720</td>
<td>50.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Base Increases</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>1.200</td>
<td>1.800</td>
<td>2.400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Precept Income</td>
<td>39.793</td>
<td>40.585</td>
<td>40.585</td>
<td>40.585</td>
<td>40.585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Funding</td>
<td>99.850</td>
<td>97.665</td>
<td>94.225</td>
<td>93.105</td>
<td>92.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Budget gap to be met from reserves</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>3.124</td>
<td>1.984</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY MODEL - SCENARIO 3 (£4.99 BAND D PRECEPT INCREASE)

### APPENDIX 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Original Budget - Starting Point from Previous Year</strong></td>
<td>105.785</td>
<td>104.448</td>
<td>103.325</td>
<td>100.707</td>
<td>98.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changes:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay &amp; price inflation</td>
<td>1.563</td>
<td>0.892</td>
<td>0.892</td>
<td>0.892</td>
<td>0.892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Savings Target</td>
<td>-3.329</td>
<td>-3.767</td>
<td>-4.014</td>
<td>-2.752</td>
<td>-1.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Pressures and Variations</td>
<td>0.429</td>
<td>1.752</td>
<td>0.504</td>
<td>-0.020</td>
<td>0.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Budget Net Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>104.448</td>
<td>103.325</td>
<td>100.707</td>
<td>98.827</td>
<td>98.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Financing</td>
<td>2.904</td>
<td>2.904</td>
<td>2.904</td>
<td>2.904</td>
<td>2.904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reversal of Asset charges</td>
<td>-5.388</td>
<td>-5.388</td>
<td>-5.388</td>
<td>-5.388</td>
<td>-5.388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Balances</td>
<td>-0.080</td>
<td>-0.080</td>
<td>-0.080</td>
<td>-0.080</td>
<td>-0.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to/from(-) Balances/Reserves</td>
<td>-2.034</td>
<td>-0.442</td>
<td>-1.264</td>
<td>-0.504</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Budget requirement</strong></td>
<td>99.850</td>
<td>100.319</td>
<td>96.879</td>
<td>95.759</td>
<td>95.649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding for the Budget</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Rates</td>
<td>29.278</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
<td>29.320</td>
<td>1.98%</td>
<td>29.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Support Grant</td>
<td>30.249</td>
<td>-11.59%</td>
<td>27.160</td>
<td>-15.04%</td>
<td>22.540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement Funding Total</strong></td>
<td>60.598</td>
<td>-5.81%</td>
<td>56.480</td>
<td>-6.67%</td>
<td>52.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Base Increases</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>1.200</td>
<td>1.800</td>
<td>2.400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Precept Income</td>
<td>39.793</td>
<td>8.66%</td>
<td>43.239</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>43.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funding</strong></td>
<td>99.850</td>
<td>100.319</td>
<td>96.879</td>
<td>95.759</td>
<td>95.649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Budget gap to be met from reserves</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Subject: GM Waste Disposal Authority (GMWDA) Budget 2016/17 and Beyond
Report of: Councillor Cath Piddington and Carolyn Wilkins, Clerk to the GMWDA

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To provide an update to the AGMA Executive Board on the GMWDA’s budget proposals for 2016/17 to 2020/21, and to seek support for a zero percent (average) increase in levy for 2016/17.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that the Board:

a) Support a zero percent levy increase in 2016/17; and
b) Note the work being overseen by the Leader’s Waste Task Group (WTG) to reduce the levy burden from 2017/18 onwards

CONTACT OFFICERS:

John Bland
Treasurer & Deputy Clerk
GMWDA
0161 770 1747
john.bland@gwmda.gov.uk
**BACKGROUND PAPERS:** Files held by John Bland, Treasurer & Deputy Clerk, Greater Manchester Waste Disposal Authority, Medtia Chambers, 5 Barn Street Oldham, OL1 1LP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRACKING/PROCESS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does this report relate to a major strategic decision, as set out in the GMCA Constitution (paragraph 14.2) or in the process (paragraph 13.1 AGMA Constitution) agreed by the AGMA Executive Board:</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXEMPTION FROM CALL IN</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there any aspects in this report which means it should be considered to be exempt from call in by the AGMA Scrutiny Pool on the grounds of urgency?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGMA Commission</td>
<td>TFGMC</td>
<td>Scrutiny Pool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 At its January 2013 meeting the Board supported a medium term financial plan (MTFP) proposed by the GMWDA to use Reserves to reduce the burden of the levy, including average increases of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>Zero percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>minus 3 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>Zero percent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and noted the potential for significant levy increases from 2017/18 as the use of Reserves was ceased. In the January 2015 Board report it was anticipated delivering the levy profile agreed in 2013 would require use of around £48m of Reserves and that levy increases in 2017/18 and 2018/19 of 8.1% and 9.9% respectively would be required.

1.2 In order to ensure oversight of the GMWDA proposed saving options to mitigate in so far as possible levy increases from 2017/18, a Leaders Waste Task Group (WTG) was established in October 2015. The remit for that Group is wide ranging, but includes:-

a) exploring cost reductions through sale of spare capacity, facility optimisation and “right sizing” facilities to meet only projected future waste arisings;

b) examining alternative methods to allocate the levy to districts, compared to the existing methodology set out in the Inter Authority Agreement (IAA);

and

c) reviewing opportunities for further levy reductions, by other cost reduction or income generation.

That review process is in turn being externally supported by the Department of the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) and Local Partnerships/technical and financial experts.

2. Budget Requirements 2016/17 and Levy Proposals

2.1 Final figures on tonnages have now been received from districts and a further update on budget requirements prepared. At the time of preparing this report district council taxbase have yet to be finalised (provisional updates have been used) and the December 2015 Retail Price Index (excluding mortgages) (RPIx) has not yet been published (that drives the annual increase under the Recycling and Waste Management Contract (the Contract)), and as such final budget requirements are not yet known. Based on an assumed 1.2% RPIx increase the budget and levy requirements would be:-
2. Budget requirements and levy 2017/18 to 2020/21

2.1 District figures for recycling performance (measured excluding trade waste) show a significant projected increase, which if delivered would mean that by 2018/19 the Authority’s 50% recycling level would be achieved. In 2018/19 recycling levels would also show less variation, ranging from around 41% in Manchester City Council to 64% in Trafford (NB actual 2014/15 figures show a 32% to 61% range). In turn those recycling numbers, and in particular significant improvements in districts which have recently introduced changes to limit residual bin capacity (which show up to 17% improvement) mean that individual district levy impact around the 0% average increase also show significant variation (from minus 18% (Tameside) to plus 10% (Stockport)).

3. Budget requirements and levy 2017/18 to 2020/21

3.1 Budget projections for a further 4 years (i.e. 5 year total MTFP period) have also been produced, based on district tonnages/recycling performance and Office of Budget Responsibility (OBR) inflation forecasts these show:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017/18</th>
<th>2018/19</th>
<th>2019/20</th>
<th>2020/21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>£m</td>
<td>£m</td>
<td>£m</td>
<td>£m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement</td>
<td>(+1.7%)</td>
<td>(+2.3%)</td>
<td>(+2.5%)</td>
<td>(+2.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from Reserves</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy amount</td>
<td>176.3</td>
<td>189.8</td>
<td>194.6</td>
<td>199.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% levy increase</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Levy increase range</td>
<td>2.5 to 6.1</td>
<td>2.3 to 2.8</td>
<td>2.4 to 2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBR inflation assumption %</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 The sharp rises in levy in 2017/18 and 2018/19 (9.4% and 7.7% respectively), are caused by the reducing level of support from Reserves, as budget requirements show relatively modest increases (1.7% and 2.3% respectively).
3.3 The increase in levy in these years is recognised by the GMWDA as particularly difficult for its constituent districts with further cuts in Government support being anticipated also in these years. The GMWDA remains focused on achieving spend reductions (see section 4) to mitigate, in so far as possible, its levy requirements.

3.4 The Board is also asked to note that beyond the headline increases there is a considerable range in district levy increase requirements in 2017/18 of around 11%. That reflects the timing of changes to residual collection arrangements. Once those have been concluded by 2019/20, however, the districts levy increase range is only around 0.5%.

4. **Leaders WTG**

4.1 The Group has now commenced its oversight work on budget reduction measures/review of the IAA. Detailed terms of reference for each work stream have been approved, and it is intended to report back fully in September 2016 to Leaders on proposals. If required interim reports would also be produced. Initial work has identified, however, that gross savings of around £10m per annum by 2018/19 may be possible. That is dependent, however, on:-

   a) Delivery of recycling performance improvements advised by districts;
   b) Resolution of current residual waste facility processing issues;
   c) Market conditions, particularly in the area of refinancing; and
   d) Detailed negotiations with the Contractor.

5. **Budget Challenge**

5.1 As usual the Leaders of Bolton and Stockport Councils have overseen a budget challenge process, supported by their district Treasurers. In turn that process has been augmented by detailed review/challenge by district Chief Officers (SOG) and Treasurers (GMAMT). Those processes endorsed the zero percent average 2016/17 levy increase.
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PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of the report is to provide Members with an update on the review of Services for Children which forms part of the Greater Manchester Devolution Agreement.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Members are requested to note the progress made on the Greater Manchester Services for Children review since it was announced by Government as part of the Devolution Agreement.

2. Members are invited to comment on the workstreams as priorities for the review and note the positive response from Government in relation to the scoping.

3. Members are requested to note the immediate next steps for the review.

CONTACT OFFICERS:

Jim Taylor (City Director, Salford City Council) - jim.taylor@salford.gov.uk
Charlotte Ramsden (Director, Children’s Services, Salford City Council) - charlotte.ramsden@salford.gov.uk

BACKGROUND PAPERS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRACKING/PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does this report relate to a Key Decision, as set out in the GMCA Constitution or in the process agreed by the AGMA Executive Board?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXEMPTION FROM CALL IN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there any aspects in this report which means it should be considered to be exempt from call in by the AGMA Scrutiny Pool on the grounds of urgency?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

AGMA Commission  TfGMC  Scrutiny Pool

Devolution Agreement Government and Greater Manchester Local Authorities would work together to undertake a fundamental review of all services for children. Alongside Health & Social Care Integration, the review of Services for Children is a significant priority for the Devolution Agreement and reform across Greater Manchester.

1.2 At a national level this review is seen as a vital piece of work and was specifically cited within the 2015 Spending Review (below) alongside the commitment to develop new approaches to investing in prevention from 2017.

‘As a trailblazer for reform of the way that all services for children are delivered, the Government will support Greater Manchester Combined Authority to develop and implement an integrated approach to preventative services for children and young people by April 2017.’

1.3 This is against a backdrop of Government wishing to drive innovation amongst authorities with growing concern nationally that the quality of services for children requires improvement, even in ‘good’ authorities. It also recognises that there are significant barriers to ‘doing things differently, which may require a change in legislation. This reflects the importance of the review of services from a national perspective.

1.4 In Greater Manchester, the imperative to look at more radical approaches to the way services for Children are delivered is acknowledged by Directors for Children's Services who also recognise that devolution must be extended to all services for children if we are to deliver the best outcomes for children within the resources available. The review comes at an important time for Greater Manchester which is changing the way that Children's Services are delivered (and should therefore be complimentary) including:

- A relentless focus on achieving best outcomes for children as quickly as possible, whether that be with their birth, foster or adoptive families.
- Maximising the opportunities of devolution – going beyond what GM authorities could choose to do themselves.
- A financially sustainable system over the next 3-5 years that recognises the context of future challenges and opportunities, including further financial reductions.
• A greater focus on social work practice, not only for practitioners but also for those in supervisory and leadership roles.
• The development of new operating models designed to empower social workers to prioritise their time and caseloads.
• A need to be able to work more effectively and collaboratively with other public, voluntary, community sector partners - especially schools and health organisations.
• The ability to share data in a meaningful way and use high quality intelligence to make the best decisions for children.
• The need to evaluate ways of working, make best use of existing resources and generate economies of scale.

2.0 The Ambition

2.1 The ambition for the review is to deliver improved outcomes for children across GM by:

• Improving outcomes for children and families; supporting parents and carers to be the best they can be.
• Reducing, appropriately, the number of Looked after Children – setting a high level ambition, e.g. 20% reduction in LAC.
• Reducing, appropriately, the number of Children in Need and children with Child Protection Plans.
• Developing a safe system that is financially sustainable within 5 years through joint investment of resources to reduce future demand.
• Supporting more asset based interventions to promote resilience, confidence and wellbeing in families and local communities.
• Applying a more effective organisational system in order to make best use of resources and expertise.
• Increasing social worker capability and capacity, as part of wider workforce reform and development.
• Reduction of caseload so more time can be spent with the families. Less sickness time and fewer agency staff.
• Deepening commissioning arrangements and stimulating new models of early intervention, prevention and provision.
• Learning from best practice and building on existing innovation.

2.2 The ambition is to develop new approaches for GM services for children, significantly improving outcomes, reducing demand for high end targeted and specialist services and future pressure on a range of public service budgets. Recent GM analysis considered the implications (both financial and in terms of outcomes for children) of a range of different scenarios. This analysis makes a strong financial
case for looking at new approaches to the way we deliver services for children. It shows that, across GM, demographic and other pressures will place around £40m pressures on Children’s services budgets under ‘business as usual’ over the next 5 years. However, the analysis also demonstrates the potential of taking different approaches with four basic assumptions about reducing LAC numbers; reducing referrals, reducing external foster care spend, and reducing agency social worker spend, potentially saving £70m against the business case.

2.3 Members are asked to note that many areas in Greater Manchester have already developed plans to improve children’s services and reduce the number of children in care. This review will both help the implementation of their plans but also push the level of ambition.

3. Priority Workstreams & Feedback from Government

3.1 Since the announcement of the review in summer, Greater Manchester has been tasked with developing a programme of activity which will aim to deliver improved outcomes for children across the region. The work involves developing innovative proposals to re-configure services for children across all ten local authorities and key public service and other partners. This is likely to involve a fundamental change in collaboration, which could be across the whole of GM for some areas of work, or on a clustered basis.

3.2 Charlotte Ramsden, Director of Children’s Services for Salford City Council has responsibility for overseeing the Review reporting directly to Jim Taylor, as the lead GM Chief Executive. All the Directors of Children’s Services across the ten authorities are acting as Senior Responsibility Owners for the individual workstreams and since the review was announced have been tasked with leading the work to scope what might be included under each priority theme. The decision making has been driven by the following factors:

- Outcomes to be achieved for children, now and in five years time.
- Collective understanding of data and intelligence, plus the current resources invested in services for children across all authorities and the anticipated resource in five years time.
- The potential benefit of either efficiency with reduction in cost, improved quality of intervention, or increased effectiveness of outcomes for either the short or long term.
- Opportunities to build on existing best practice and collaboration across partners both nationally and in Greater Manchester.
- Consideration about where these themed areas link to opportunities that are emerging from other areas of devolution work, where current work programmes can or should be extended.
3.3 This has culminated in the identification of seven priority workstreams each led by an individual GM Director of Children’s Services. The workstreams are:

1) Youth Offending - led by John Pearce (Trafford)

2) Integrated health commissioning and delivery for children - led by Steph Butterworth (Tameside) and Chris Mcloughlin (Stockport)

3) Education – led by Mark Carriline (Bury)

4) Complex Dependency & Early Help – led by Maggie Kufeldt (Oldham) and James Winterbottom (Wigan)

5) Quality Assurance Functions in Statutory Children’s Services – led by Andrew Webb (Stockport)

6) Complex Safeguarding – led by Gail Hopper (Rochdale)

7) Looked After Children – led by John Daly (Bolton)

3.4 In addition to a focus on the seven theme areas, this work is being co-ordinated and linked to existing devolution work streams with the development of Greater Manchester principles and operating systems to enable the aspiration to be achieved. Directors have worked with colleagues in Greater Manchester who have expertise in these areas in order to scope key issues and opportunities that may exist in these seven areas. In scoping this work, Directors have also identified specific opportunities and ‘asks’ of Government. The main opportunities identified to date for each work stream are summarised in section four below, providing members with detail which will be explored as full business cases are developed.

3.5 A delegation from the GMCA attended a meeting with Government officials from both Departments for Education and Communities & Local Government on 21st December to present the full scope of the seven priority workstreams proposed to form part of the GM Services for Children review. The response from Government was extremely positive and the scope of all seven workstreams was agreed.

3.6 Of particular note from the meeting was the recognition by DfE of the need for the Regional Schools Commissioner and DfE education leads to work in partnership with GMCA to explore the strategic planning of school places, capital funding at GM level in addition to the role of schools in the early years agenda. A workshop is planned to develop this further. It was agreed that given the implications for the legislative framework, a joint workshop would be arranged with immediate effect around Complex Safeguarding and a session would be organised involving Ofsted to explore implications of the proposals within the Quality Assurance workstream.

3.7 Positively, it was also agreed that government would identify resources to support the review, most likely in the form of secondees from Department for Education and Communities and Local Government.
Given that there are likely to be implications around statutory accountability frameworks arising from the seven proposed workstreams, it was agreed that governance and accountability plans will need to be developed. A joint GM/DfE review meeting has therefore been established which will be scheduled to meet every three weeks.

4.0 Workstream Summaries

4.1 The table below is designed to provide members with a short summary of the lines of enquiry/potential models that have been identified as part of the initial scoping for the workstreams now to be developed into business cases over the next few months. It is recognised that there is significant interdependency between the workstreams, which will be factored how the review is managed as an programme of work.

4.2 Youth Offending

- Review pathways in and out of the existing Youth Offending Teams.
- Explore possibilities of moving to a single commissioned Youth Justice System.
- Consider different spatial delivery models (population and needs based).
- Scope out possible alternative models for community based provision.
- Develop a GM whole-system approach to an integrated youth support service offer
- Explore potential for non-custodial budgets to be devolved to a GM level

4.3 Integrated Health Commissioning and Delivery for Children

- Develop simpler alternative models for commissioning and service provision of Child & Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS), which can improve the quality of care, reducing delays and reduce cost.
- Development of early help pathways and support linked to an early help commissioning framework for use in localities and by schools.
- More prevention and resilience work delivered at scale, maximising the role of the third sector.
- Development of self-help pathways available to young people
- Explore how Perinatal Mental Health services could be improved either through greater co-ordination of providers or through structural consolidation and change.
- Undertake further analysis undertaken around transition to adult mental health and evaluate options for the redesigning service provision for young people in transition.
4.4 **Education**

- To develop an improved model for determining school improvement priorities across GM and to strategically align resources.
- Develop a strong ‘place based’ partnership with GM and the Regional Schools Commissioner regarding the future need for school places.
- Explore how the workforce across early years be better brought together to align resource to those children and families in most need and for a continued relationship with the child and parents up to the age of 16.
- Explore options for a multi disciplinary team to be led from within the school in order to bring the best co-ordinated care to children and families prior to starting school.

4.5 **Complex Dependency & Early Help**

- To develop an integrated, whole system, place-based model of early intervention and prevention as part of a consistent GM delivery framework for Complex Dependency and Early Help.
- Position individuals and community assets at the centre of effective early help models.
- Build on learning from the Troubled Families programme and scale up integrated, whole family approaches into mainstream delivery.
- Develop a workforce able to work holistically, build capacity and promote resilience in families to enable sustained change.
- Explore options for how Early Years models can be better integrated into a whole system early intervention and prevention model.
- To explore the role of universal services such as Schools and Health Visitors, in order to play an even greater role as a key point of contact with families.
- To ensure work & skills provision is integrated within a whole system response to complex dependency.

4.6 **Quality Assurance Functions in Statutory Children’s Services**

- Work with DfE and Government Inspectorates to review current approach to Quality Assurance (QA), with a focus on promoting innovation, improving the quality of services and delivering better outcomes for children and young people.
4.7 Complex Safeguarding

- Develop clearer pathway and referral protocols for complex safeguarding to be shared and communicated with all front line staff.
- Explore the potential for the development of a GMCA safeguarding ‘hub and spoke’ model for Complex Safeguarding.
- Consideration of how more integrated approaches with GMP and other partners (DWP, Community Safety, Immigration, etc.) might be achieved.
- Expansion of existing successful programmes such as Project Phoenix and Challenger, good practice which already exists across GM.
- Develop pan-GM quality standards to clarify and achieve consistency of response by partners at each stage.
- Develop the skills and the capacity of professional and communities to understand risk factors and identify them early.

4.8 Looked After Children

- Identify early interventions which have been demonstrated to work. Invest in proven early interventions on a consistent basis across Greater Manchester.
- Reduction on reliance on the external market for placements.
- Learn from other models with a strong evidence base and roll out consistently across Greater Manchester.
- Review the existing approach to service provision, with the aim of simplifying all aspects of the process, improving the quality of care and saving money.
- Develop and implement a Greater Manchester Looked After Children strategy
- Develop a cluster approach to in-house foster placement commissioning.

5.0 Next Steps

5.1 The following have been identified as immediate next steps for the review:

- Greater Manchester to identify resource to lead the day to day review of activity needed to support the review including a Programme Director and Finance Lead (January 2015).
• Establish a Greater Manchester Programme Board chaired by Jim Taylor to oversee the Review (February).

• Initiate work on a ‘Stock and Flow’ model in order that Greater Manchester better understand the financial impact as proposals are developed and implemented (February).

• Lead Directors of Children’s Services to develop detailed business cases for their workstreams (to be developed for April).

• Ongoing dialogue with government as proposals emerge (Ongoing).