Report Title - Update on the Local Area Agreement negotiation

Report Author - Kate Hargreaves – Programme Manager

Purpose of report: To update board members on progress towards establishing a LAA including feedback from GOL on the Story of Place

Report Recommendations

1) The Board notes the work of the LAA Task and Finish group
2) The Board notes the timeframe towards a final signed LAA in April 2008
3) The Board approves the shortlist of indicators for submission to GOL for Lambeth First as the ‘first cut’ LAA

Attachments:

i. Lambeth’s LAA ‘Story of place’
ii. Table showing goals, outcomes and first cut of LAA indicators (to be sent under separate cover)

Summary

1. Significant progress has been made towards developing a short term action plan for the SCS, in the form of a three-year LAA.
2. A ‘Story of place’ was produced to synthesise the views of residents and the partnership as well as the story told by data in the ‘evidence base’ (the State of the Borough report) in relation to the long term priorities in the borough. This is attached to this report.
3. GOL held the first of three feedback workshops with Lambeth on the ‘Story of Place’ in early January. Their views are set out below.
4. In response to concerns at the last meeting of the LSP Board about the level of involvement of the theme partnerships in the LAA process, a significant number of presentations and consultations are taking place on both the SCS and LAA at various theme partnership forums. Further, a dedicated cross-partnership LAA ‘Task and Finish’ group has been set up to determine the LAA indicators. Its work is described in more detail below.
5. A large-scale partnership workshop has also taken place to inform the LAA action plan and therefore the indicator set.
6. The first submission of indicators is due to GOL on 31 January although GOL needs to send an earlier submission to CLG on 25 January. The board’s feedback on the attached indicators will therefore only be effective for the first submission if it is expressed at the board meeting itself although feedback received any later will be used for the second submission.

The Story of Place and GOL’s feedback

7. The Story of Place highlights some of the complex and challenging issues facing residents of the borough and service providers. It tells the ‘story’ in Lambeth through the experience of a fictional character, Kemi, who faces a number of the challenges that some in the borough deal with on a day to day basis.
8. Kemi’s life chances, in terms of her employment and income prospects, her mother’s health her housing situation, and the physical environment where she lives and works are shown to improve over the lifetime of the SCS through a number of illustrative interventions.
9. GOL told us that they appreciated the formula of demonstrating the impact of the SCS/LAA through the experience of an individual. They felt that we are clear on the outcomes and strategy for the borough and that in this sense, we have told a ‘good story’.

10. However GOL are concerned that our Story is not evidenced sufficiently robustly with the hard data that they confront in their conversations with Whitehall departments and on which they are challenged in relation to Lambeth’s performance. They are concerned to understand in detail what and how Lambeth intends to deliver to achieve the desired outcomes.

11. GOL is aware that the question of how to deliver the LAA was always planned to be the focus of the team’s activities in January and continues into February and March in parallel with the SCS consultation.

12. The challenge for Lambeth will be to balance two potentially competing objectives: firstly maintaining the focused approach to the SCS on what the LSP can best deliver in partnership, as expressed in the LAA, while also responding to Whitehall’s concerns about other socio-economic indicators through core business at theme partnership level.

13. The next LAA submission to GOL will need to present a strong rationale for the positioning of some indicators within the LAA, with the enhanced governance and focus that implies, and the other indicators being delivered through core business.

The LAA Task and Finish group and Partnership workshop

14. This group was set up to act as a liaison point between the SCS/LAA project board and the theme partnerships in developing the LAA indicator set.

15. The group is comprised of 16 senior representatives from across the theme partnerships and is chaired by the Borough Commander, Sharon Rowe.

16. Its first meeting was in December and produced the LAA outcomes framework and the second meeting was on 18 January and produced the first cut of LAA indicators. The final meeting, to work on the second LAA submission (due date 6 March) will be on 14 February.

17. A further largescale LSP workshop took place on 16 January to identify current and possible future activities that contribute to LAA outcomes. The outputs of this workshop fed into the Task and Finish group.

CLG’s ‘Ministerial demonstration sites’

16. Lambeth was invited to participate as a demonstration site for LAAs, along with 10 other local authorities. The purpose of this is to give Ministers a closer look at the process of developing a LAA and to consider some of the cross-cutting issues faced at local level.

17. Lambeth took part in the launch event in December and our ‘Story’ was praised by Hazel Blears for its focus on an individual.

18. A series of workshops is planned with Ministers to consider issues such as worklessness and community engagement.

19. Alongside Westminster and Manchester, Lambeth is participating in the planning stages for the first of these workshops that considers at the impact on service planning and delivery of changing circumstances as illustrated through guns and gangs issues.

20. The programme is not yet well developed at CLG and Lambeth is a leading player in shaping this. It is an opportunity for us to showcase some of the good work and outcomes we are achieving as well as to influence Ministers.

Update on risks/issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigating action</th>
<th>Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We cannot agree on the priorities and compromise the focus of the action plan.</td>
<td>This will dilute our ‘story’, make it less compelling for Whitehall, more difficult to deliver, and more difficult for</td>
<td>Continuing working to ensure there is robust evidence to help decision making and prioritisation</td>
<td>The LSP signed off a focused set of SCS goals and appetite remains for a single</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
our residents to understand and therefore to support actively.

Whitehall delays: both in terms of agreeing the technical information underpinning the indicator set (such as baselines, methodology for measurement, reward criteria) and in responding to our submissions.

Such delays may compromise the timing of our SCS, lead to disengagement with the process and could disrupt ongoing project work where we are reliant on contract staff who may leave us if there is uncertainty about the future of the work.

Work closely with GOL as the intermediary to get early steer of Whitehall’s position to limit the number of surprises.

See Recommendation (iii) below.

This process will be dominated, as opposed to managed/facilitated by Council.

This will mean that we don’t take full advantage of the opportunity to collaborate as a partnership and there will not be a common sense of ownership for the outcomes.

Ensure sufficient opportunities organised well in advance for theme partnership involvement in the debate.

There have not been new delays from Whitehall but the tight timeframe is hard to manage alongside the SCS process and the desire to make sure this process is driven by the partnership.

NEW: Whitehall pressures to take on more indicators than we would like.

NEW: We cannot secure consensus on funding allocations.

NEW: Feedback on the SCS forces substantial review of the SCS goals and outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe to completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Timeframe for submissions to GOL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOL/Lambeth First LAA negotiation</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submission of priority outcomes to GOL</td>
<td>F 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback workshop on outcomes - GOL / Lambeth</td>
<td>W 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme partnership workshop to inform 1st cut</td>
<td>w/c 14th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of 1st cut LAA indicators</td>
<td>F 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of DCSF/CYP 16 indicators</td>
<td>th 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback workshop on 1st cut indicators- GOL / Lambeth</td>
<td>W 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme partnership workshop to inform 2nd cut</td>
<td>w/c 18th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of 2nd cut LAA indicators</td>
<td>Th 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback workshop on 2nd cut indicators- GOL / Lambeth</td>
<td>W 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery/Funding 'Summit' for Lambeth First</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final submission of LAA indicators to GOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalise DCSF/CYP 16 indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td>F 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign-off indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>