

LOCAL AREA AGREEMENT (LAA) DELIVERY FUND

Summary

1. This report presents Members with the outcome of the process to assess bids that were made to the LAA Delivery Fund and includes a list of the projects recommended for funding. The recommendations represent the deliberations of the Without Walls Executive Delivery Board and LAA Delivery Fund Assessment Panel, comprising representatives of the Without Walls delivery partnerships. Members are asked to support the recommendations of the Executive Delivery Board in funding the short listed projects.

Background

2. In July 2007 the Council's Executive agreed that the residual performance reward from the second round of Local Public Service Agreements should be used as a fund to support delivery of outcomes for York's LAA (2008/09 – 2010/11). The fund, was subsequently launched at the Without Walls conference in September 2008. Statutory organisations, community and voluntary groups, charities and community interest companies / social enterprises were eligible to apply. Applicants were requested to submit bids that benefited York residents and detailed expected outputs, outcomes, milestones and a project timetable.
3. The bidding process was promoted widely within the city, leading to the submission of 88 bids by the closing date of 30 January 2009. Of the 88 bids submitted, five were registered as ineligible and one bid was withdrawn by the applicant. The 82 remaining applications covered a wide range of partnership interests and LAA outcomes. There was also a healthy balance of bidders between the statutory and voluntary sectors.
4. The refreshed LAA for York was considered at the Executive at its meeting on 31st March and has been subsequently approved by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government under Section 112 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007. The Council's commitment to use the residual performance reward from the LPSA2 to support the LAA outcomes has been highlighted as good practice by the Government Office. This resource will assist in achieving LAA outcomes, particularly for those most in need in current challenging economic conditions. The available resource to support the LAA delivery fund is £664k. This is less than that announced at the launch as the LPSA2 target relating to young people not in employment, education or training (NEET) was not achieved; the NEET performance decreased at the point of the snapshot performance report for the target (as a result of the economic downturn and the cancellation of apprenticeships in the retail sector

and some work based learning opportunities). Nonetheless, York's NEET performance is still one of the best in the country.

LAA Delivery Fund – Evaluation Process

5. The group brought together to carry out the initial assessment of bids comprised officers of the Strategic Partnership Team and the Resources Grants and Partnership Team, with specialist input from City Development accountancy support. Their role involved:
 - Conducting an initial eligibility check on each bid to ensure compliance with the eligibility criteria stated in the application form e.g. submission of audited accounts, constitution and security of tenure, if applicable;
 - Notifying ineligible bidders regarding their unsuccessful application;
 - Producing an officer assessment report on each eligible bid that summarised anticipated impact of the scheme against LAA indicators, evidence of partnership working arrangements, need / demand for the scheme, beneficiaries, costs / financial stability and a general assessment of delivery, impact and value for money.
6. A sub group of the Without Walls Executive Delivery Board (the LAA Assessment Panel), comprising representatives of the Without Walls delivery partnerships, were recruited to consider all of the bids and to reach a collective view on those that should be recommended for funding. The partnerships represented were:
 - Healthy City Board
 - Learning City York
 - Safer York Partnership
 - YorOK
 - Inclusive York Forum
7. Each panel member was asked to review the assessment reports, and to clarify any queries about the bids if necessary, before ranking them in order of preference.
8. During the assessment process officers and panel members were expected to declare potential conflicts of interest in relation to applications that they had connections with. As a result, officers did not assess bids that they had knowledge or links with and the scores of panel members (relating to projects that they had declared an interest in) were replaced with averaged scores of the remaining panel members.
9. In parallel with the panel assessment process, the chairs of the eight strategic partnerships received summary information regarding bids received claiming to impact on the LAA indicators they had responsibility for. They were asked to feed in any contextual knowledge or expert opinion about the bids that would not otherwise be available to the assessment panel. Any comments submitted were added to the relevant assessment for each bid. In addition, CMT were asked to feed in the views of their Executive Member.
10. The ranked scores of the assessment panel for all 82 schemes are attached at **Annex A**. The bids were presented as A, B, C (i.e. A had received a panel

ranking of less than 80, B – between 80 and 170 and C – 171+). This schedule was used as the basis for discussion at the LAA Assessment Panel's joint decision making day.

11. The assessment panel met on 9 March to consider the overall scores and to jointly agree a prioritised list of bids that could be recommended to the Without Walls Executive Delivery Board by:
 - Agreeing the schemes categorised as 'C' following the panel member ranking process, promoting Cs to B if applicable;
 - Discussing the 'A' ranked schemes in detail and agreeing which of these should be recommended to receive funding;
 - Discussing the 'B' ranked schemes in detail to ascertain whether any of these schemes should be promoted for funding.
12. In coming to a view about the merits of each bid, panel members were asked to consider:
 - The anticipated impact of schemes on LAA indicators;
 - Strategic partnership input;
 - The overall range of indicators covered by selected projects;
 - Challenging the bids (e.g. costs, beneficiaries, sustainability of schemes);
 - Executive Delivery Board risk ratings (Red / Amber / Green assessment of indicator achievability as at 15 December 2008);
 - Whether alternative sources of funding were available for the project.
13. The final recommendations of the panel are presented at **Annex B**. This summary also highlights the range of partners involved in delivery of the project, the panel's view of the indicators most likely to be positively influenced by the scheme and the risk assessment of indicator achievability. In addition, a summary of project deliverables for each of the schemes recommended for funding are attached at **Annex C**. These project deliverables will be used to agree the terms and conditions of the grant and to monitor progress and delivery. Sixteen projects were selected in all totalling £610,732. A small amount of delivery fund was held back for appeals, should they arise. However, if these were not forthcoming the panel recommended that the remaining funding be allocated to the first of two reserve schemes (i.e. 25 - Castlegate Meeting Need).
14. The process of refining the bids into a set of funding recommendations involved individual consideration of all the factors identified above per project in order to reach a consensus view on the best overall balance of schemes. As identified at paragraphs 11 and 12 above, this required removing and adding to the 'A' list of schemes recommended for funding. The reasons for this included that:
 - Closer analysis of the scheme revealed that it was unlikely to deliver against the specified indicator(s);
 - If two strong bids were delivering similar schemes against the same indicator then a choice was made about which was most likely to have greatest impact;

- Schemes which had scored well on important areas, such as evidence of partnership working or match funding, but had not scored so well on delivery against indicators were demoted;
 - Closer analysis of the full application reassured panel members that concerns they had (e.g. deliverability, high costs, vfm) could be addressed and they felt able to give support to the scheme;
 - It was recognised that despite a few minor reservations a particular scheme was the only one received that could genuinely impact on a particular target;
 - The sum requested was small in comparison to the difference it could make and this compensated for other concerns.
15. The Without Walls Executive Delivery Board met on 1 April to discuss the Assessment Panel's views and reach consensus on the recommendations to be made to CYC Executive. All members agreed that a thorough process had been followed to arrive at the bids recommended for funding. The group then carried out a moderation exercise, whereby each of the recommended schemes was reviewed and discussed.
16. The Executive Delivery Board concluded that the list of schemes represented a broad spread of projects, which would tackle many issues classed as high risk by the delivery partnerships. As part of the moderation it was proposed that one of the short listed schemes, 39 – Taking action against graffiti, was an issue for the council to pursue. The Board agreed that this project should be withdrawn from the list and replaced with another anti-social behaviour focused scheme, 28 – Capable Guardian.
17. The Capable Guardian bid was for approximately the same amount of money (£50k), but would be directly linked to youth services providing the following additional activities:
- Increasing the amount of positive youth activities in the Westfield / Woodthorpe / Dringhouses area to young people aged 11-16. The majority of additional provision will run during school holidays i.e. provision then will be doubled from 12 hours a week to 24 hours.
 - Establishing a mentoring scheme for up to 40 young people who have been identified as being at risk or engaging in anti-social behaviour. Each young person will be linked with an adult mentor and will develop a six month action plan to work on together.
18. The Board also agreed that, as a condition of funding, Capable Guardian should be asked to extend geographic coverage of the scheme to include other areas across the city where hot spots of anti-social behaviour have been identified as a problem.
19. The next steps in allocating LAA Delivery Fund are to:
- Notify successful bidders of the decision and the terms and conditions under which grant funding is offered. This will incorporate performance monitoring arrangements and a provision to withhold funds if milestones are not met or expected results not achieved. See **Annex D** for sample letter and grant conditions.
 - Allocate each funded scheme with a CYC Chief Officer to act as a sponsor.

- Inform each thematic partnership of the projects that relate to LAA targets that they have a responsibility for and ensure that these are built in to ongoing performance monitoring cycles;
- Notify unsuccessful bidders and provide support to identify alternative funding sources (this will include reference to other known funding streams if applicable and offering support of the Grants and Partnerships Team).

Corporate Objectives

20. The LAA indicators and targets are an integral part of York's Sustainable Community Strategy. City of York Council's Corporate Strategy has been fully aligned with the Sustainable Community Strategy.
21. The LAA indicators are performance managed and reported via the CYC Corporate Performance Management system. In addition, the Without Walls Executive Delivery Board closely monitor performance and delivery and report progress to the wider Partnership on a regular basis.

Implications

22. **Financial** - LAA operational guidance states that 'in agreeing targets for inclusion in LAAs, partnerships will want to consider how they will resource delivery of these priorities. Individual partners may wish to pool their mainstream resources, where this is possible'. It also acknowledges that the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 emphasises the need for cooperation, including the possibility of shared commissioning across the different public service providers to better meet the expectation of citizens.
23. **Human Resources** – There are no direct human resource implications arising from this report. However, it can be confirmed that, where project funding is used to recruit staff, grant conditions will clearly state that funding is time limited and no adverse publicity would be generated when the grant period ends.
24. **Equalities** – Many of the bodies involved in LAA delivery are public bodies, and as such, have obligations under the Race Relations Act 1976. Specifically, whilst undertaking their role as stakeholders in LAAs, they must be mindful of the General Duty under the Act, which is: (a) to eliminate racial discrimination, (b) to promote equal opportunities and (c) to promote good relations between different racial groups.
25. In addition, the Race Relation Amendment Act, Disability Equality Duty, Gender Equality Duty and Equality Standard for Local Government also requires us to monitor the impact of our improvement activities in relation to all six equalities strands (gender, race, disability, age, sexual orientation, and religion and belief), where relevant. In the context of the LAA, Partners need to consider how delivery of LAA outcomes is impacting on different minority groups.
26. **Legal** – The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 placed a statutory requirement on the local authority to develop a Sustainable Community Strategy and LAA and duties on named partners to co-operate with the authority in this process.

27. **Crime and Disorder** – The LAA contains specific indicators in respect of the serious acquisitive crime rate, perceptions of anti-social behaviour, rate of proven re-offending by young offenders, re-offending rate of prolific and priority offenders and drug-related (Class A) offending rate. Two of the projects recommended for funding anticipate improvement against serious acquisitive crime, perception of anti-social behaviour and prolific and priority offending rates.
28. **Information Technology and Property** – There are no implications in these areas.

Risk Management

29. The potential risks in grant funding external bodies range from failure of the organisation to deliver the agreed service at the appropriate standard, to the closure of the organisation as a whole with consequential loss of funds. These types of risks have been considered and are dealt with through robust application, assessment and grant agreement arrangements. This includes financial assessment of the organisation and a requirement that successful applicants comply with strict terms and conditions and performance monitoring cycles.

Recommendations

30. Members are asked to support the Without Walls Executive Delivery Board's recommendation to:
- Award funding to the organisations set out in Annex B. The exception to this, as set out in paragraphs 16-18, would be that scheme 39 – Taking action against graffiti (£49,035) is replaced with scheme 28 – Capable Guardian (£50,000), in all totalling £611,697.
 - Allocate remaining funding to the first reserve scheme 25 – Castlegate Meeting Need (£46,984), should appeals not be forthcoming.
31. Reason: To ensure that a wide range of projects are instigated to support delivery of outcomes for York's LAA (2008/09 – 2010/11).

Author:

Denise Simms
Senior Partnership Support Officer
552027

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

Roger Ranson
Assistant Director – Economic Development and Partnerships
551614

Report Approved Date 15/4/09

Specialist Implications Officer(s)

Financial – Patrick Looker
Equalities – Evie Chandler
Others – Report Author

Wards Affected:

All

For further information please contact the author of the report

Annexes:

A – Re-ranked Assessment Panel Scores

B – Assessment Panel Recommendations

C – Project Deliverables

D – Sample letter and grant conditions