



Agenda Item No: 4 A

Bristol City Council Minutes of Overview and Scrutiny Management Board

Thursday 16 October 2014 at 6.00pm

Members Present:-

Councillor Pearce (Chair), Councillor Goulandris, Councillor Jama, Councillor Holland, Councillor Hopkins, Councillor Lovell, Councillor Malnick, Councillor Martin, Councillor Mongon.

Officers in Attendance:- Michele Farmer, Policy, Strategy and Communications, Lucy Fleming, Scrutiny Co-ordinator, Alex MinShull, Sustainable City and Climate Change Service Manager, Stephen Hilton, Service Director, Bristol Futures, Alison Mullis, Chief Internal Auditor.

Andrew Garrard, the Chair of the Green Capital Board was also in attendance.

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillors Alexander and Bailey.

2. Public Forum.

The following Statements were received and are held as a public record on the Minute Book.

- 01 - David Redgewell, South West Transport Network – Green Capital 2015;
- 02 - Julie Boston & Caroline Stevenson, Bristol Unite – Green Capital 2015 – Save 25 Bus;
- 03 - Lin Clark – Bristol Anti-Bedroom Tax Campaign;

RESOLVED –

1 – that Statements 01 & 02 be referred to Place Scrutiny Commission;

2 – that Statement 03 be referred to Business Resources Scrutiny Commission.

3. Declarations of Interest.

There was none.

4. A. Minutes of 17 July 2104.

These minutes were agreed as a correct record of the meeting.

RESOLVED – that the OSMB Minutes of the 17 July 2014 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

B. Action Sheet.

Councillor Holland referred to Item 7 A & B – outstanding actions from 20 March meeting. She reported that this action had been completed as Councillor Massey, the Deputy Mayor, had responded and the money had been spent.

RESOLVED – that the Action Sheet be noted.

5. Whipping.

There was no whipping.

6. Chair's Business.

There was none.

7. Green Capital.

Stephen Hilton, Service Director, Bristol Futures would respond to the questions as set out in the paper. Andrew Garrard and Alex MinShull, Sustainable City and Climate Change Service Manager would assist with responses.

Question 1 – How will Members and the citizens of Bristol be kept updated of future Green Capital developments ?

- There were regular face to face meetings taking place – the next one would be 11 November 2014;
- Written briefings were regularly sent out to Councillors;
- The 2015 Company now had a website which was still being developed;
- Updates were provided to 500 plus organisations including members of the Green Capital Partnership;
- The Cross-Party Working Group had requested us to consider non-digital communications but recognised that it would not be possible to print lots of material. Material would therefore be made available in libraries and community centres.

Question 2 – What are the governance arrangements for Green Capital following the departure of the former Chief Executive, Kris Donaldson ?

- The Board comprised 13 people and all but 1 was from Bristol. Nicola Yates had been appointed as the new CEO and would report to the Board;
- A Councillor reported that he had received an encouraging response from the CEO regarding members rights to look at what was happening with the company;
- It was noted that a report was being prepared for a forthcoming Audit Committee.

Question 3 – What are the details of the Green Capital programme, including information relating to the relevant finances and sponsorship ?

- On 10 October 2014 an outline programme was published. The details of further events will be added to the programme;
- Alex MinShull added that in Autumn a 'Warm up Bristol' scheme would begin with the aim of insulating 30,000 homes over the next few years;
- The TreePips project – this was a 3 year project for all primary school-aged children across Bristol to promote the benefits of trees. Communities and partners would work with Green Capital to get the trees planted in school grounds, green spaces, streets and front gardens.
- Filwood Green Business Park – this would provide economic opportunities in South Bristol;
- Regarding funding, the Audit Committee on 7 November would look at the following headline figures;-

- £1.2m from Bristol City Council;
 - £7m from central government;
 - £3.35m from partners – in cash and in kind support. Details of this were in the Audit Committee report and were commercially sensitive as there were still conversations taking place with potential partners;
- The 2013 Company was still actively seeking partnership;
 - Six companies made up the £3.35m funding;
 - An example of in kind support included KPMG who were providing people time and evaluation of the programme. This helped by saving money on things that would have come from funding;
 - A Councillor wished to know what the £7m would allow the Council to do that was not previously planned for as it read as the programme read as a list of work that the City Council was always going to do? What difference had Green Capital made to the plans for the City Council becoming a sustainable city? He asked that this kind of detail be included in the programme next time;
 - A Councillor shared this viewpoint, stating that the London Olympics had been about the legacy. She wanted to know what added legacy Green Capital would bring. She added that her ward was one of the most disadvantaged in the City and on the peripheral of the city and would therefore be unaffected by much of the content of the programme. There was a need to build in capacity in communities to draw down grants. To be game changing, it was vital to have an impact on people who had not previously been reached. She suggested a weighting system around prioritising applications from those areas;
 - A Councillor reported that the cross-party working group shared the weighting viewpoint ie. it should be geographical and not the usual suspects. With respect to governance issues, there would clearly be a significant cost to cancelling the events arranged by the previous Chief Executive. It was imperative that the Audit Committee be told of these costs as commission had been paid for the grants he had secured. He added that Neighbourhood Partnerships had recently been informed that new forms for small grants were to be imposed on small organisations which he understood would cause significant concern and was likely to put residents off the process;
 - The Chair of Audit Committee, who attended in the public gallery, was permitted to speak. He suggested that Board members who wished to ask financially sensitive questions, could submit them to Audit Committee for response in closed session.

Question 4 – What measures have been put in place to monitor the ongoing process of the Green Capital programme ?

- The City Director was now leading the overall monitoring with the Strategic Director – Place and the Service Director, Bristol Futures making up the internal management board and would bring capacity and co-ordination to the monitoring process. The Company had appointed someone to co-ordinate the overall programme. KPMG were working closely with all project leads to ensure that budgets and plans were regularly monitored.

Question 5 – What assurances can be provided that Green capital will be of benefit to residents city wide ?

- This was the largest ever environmental grants programme funding every part of the city. Councillors has all been briefed and asked to be involved in the process;
- Neighbourhood Partnerships had received a funding allocation;
- The small grants programme was administered by Quartet and was aimed at reaching a wide range of communities. 250 bid forms were received for 170 organisations. The grants programme had been published widely.

Question 6 – What will be happening about the community grants that will be available ? How will applications be determined and how will the public be advised of the details ?

- **There are 3 grants programmes. The Neighbourhood Partnership grants were to the value of £250,000. Grants teams were targeting communities not connected to the green agenda.**

Question 7 – What government engagement has taken place regarding the Green Capital programme to date and what is planned for the future?

- There was a recent party of 26 government officials who had visited Bristol on a fact finding tour and information sharing opportunity. There would be further opportunities for the government to engage with the City Council during 2015 and after. The Councillor Briefing No.4 has details of this.

Question 8 – How much did the new Green Capital website cost ?

- This was part of a wider programme and a digital platform that could engage the public in 2015 was one of many commitments to the European Commission;
- The development of the platform had cost £200,000; A Councillor remarked that Green Capital had been back to Place and the former Sustainable Development & Transport Scrutiny Commission a number of times and at this late stage it was important to ensure its success hence the need for members to be clear on the facts. He was unable to see any assurances regarding the concerns that the project would reach the outline area of Bristol. He also wished to see a breakdown of the £8.2m of taxpayers money to be used for each event. He was also concerned that the cancellation of contracts meant that money had had to be paid out. He expressed further concern that there were no elected members on any of the panels distributing money and asked if this had been an oversight. He had been told of commercial sensitivity some months ago and wished to know when members would be told the details. Finally, he asked what the Mayor's role was now that the City Director was involved and how much had been spent on the foreign delegates visiting the City. He was informed that the Mayor's position had not changed ie. he was a board member of the 2015 company. Councillors were consulted on grants through their Neighbourhood Partnerships. The technical appraisal of grants were first assessed on a geographic spread and then based on whether the application was strong. Strategic grants went before Cabinet for decision on 16 December 2014. The Green Capital programme was international with 3 primary objectives as follows:-
 - ◆ To share knowledge with other European cities and to become a role model for the green economy;
 - ◆ To showcase Bristol green businesses and develop more jobs;
 - ◆ To engage local people;
- The Chair of the Board added that it was important to recognise that they were not simply doing green projects but trying to celebrate technology and the innovation of Bristol. Bristol had a special set of businesses which it was vital to promote around the world which was our commitment. He emphasised the importance of getting the local grants to the right people and Quartet were a big part of the decision making. The website would be used for inclusion and become an umbrella organisation for green activists. He was

pleased to hear that members wished the project a success as he had been unsure;

At this point Councillor Holland left.

- A Councillor responded that she felt there was a disconnect between what Green Capital was looking to do and what local Councillors saw. She wondered how it was intended to engage the residents of Lawrence Hill. She felt that the NP grants were not equitable in how they were distributed as the demographic was different in different wards and there was a disparity of ward sizes and therefore the funding should be based . She felt it was vital to drive the theme home in wards such as Lawrence Hill, Hengrove and Hartcliffe if there was to be a legacy for the future. It was important to engage with adult learning centres as well as schools. She also suggested that Somali national TV, BCFM and Eugene radio were useful media outlets for sending out the Green Capital message. The Service Director replied that there was a standard allowance for NP grants so everyone would get some funding and there was an additional £110,000 fund for areas of greatest need. He reported there was a solid link in Lawrence Hill with an officer who come to the Neighbourhood Partnership and presented with Green Capital officers. It was agreed to feed in adult learning centres to the education programme. The Chair of the Board replied that it was just as important to do something in Clifton as much as Lawrence Hill and there were many ways to divide the funds and give all wards something. A Councillor stated that engagement with residents was critical and there should be a collective responsibility to engage the City;
- A Councillor remarked that it was important to build capacity in the Green Capital Partnership so that it could stand on its own two feet.

At this point, Councillors Lovell and Jama left.

8. Corporate Risk Register.

Alison Mullis, Chief Internal Auditor, made the following comments by way of introduction:-

- In 2013, it was identified that Strategic Risk Management Arrangements across the Council were not considered affective as they were not reflective of the Council's strategic risks and did not focus members and senior management on the detail;

- The Extended Leadership Team (ELT) worked to develop a philosophy and approach to risk management that would better equip them to understand and respond to the main risks the Council faces;
- ELT agreed a definition for what made a risk a corporate risk;
- A risk matrix which provided greater granularity using a 4 impact and 6 likelihood measures was agreed;
- The introduction of cause and effect analysis to better understand and articulate the real risk;
- There was now more clear and consistent language and clear guidance on the impact and likelihood measures;
- The use of more emotive and transparent language would help allow a better understanding of the risks and ensuring they were effectively managed;
- Effective risk management empowered management to take risks when opportunities arose and when formal risk assessment suggested that risks were worth taking.

The Board commented as follows:-

- The deliberate use of emotive language such as catastrophe could lead to some people getting over 'excited'. Some of the terminology could be re-examined;
- It was felt the Register should contain some narrative on what had changed dramatically and what was worse or better;
- It was proposed and agreed that the review of the Corporate Risk Register be delegated to Audit Committee but with the Board's recommendation that this be undertaken on a six-monthly basis as a minimum;
- It was proposed and agreed that the Directorate Risk Register be fully reviewed annually, with a 'sorethumbing' exercise undertaken six-monthly unless a significant change arose.

RESOLVED –

1 – The Board delegated the review of the Corporate Risk Register to Audit Committee and recommended that it be reviewed on a six-monthly basis as a minimum.

2 - The Board delegated the review of the Directorate Risk Register to the appropriate Scrutiny Commission and agreed that it be fully reviewed annually, with a 'sorethumbing' exercise undertaken six-monthly unless a significant change arose.

9. Outturn Performance 2013/14.

Michele Farmer introduced the report stating that the reporting style had been changed and now reflected the Corporate Plan, providing a narrative as well as data. It allowed members to see the exceptional data whether good or bad and also provided a general sense of how well this authority was doing.

The following comments were made:-

- Councillor Goulandris recommended that each Scrutiny Commission consider their appropriate indicators. He questioned whether the Business Change indicators were the right indicators to use;
- Councillor Malnick agreed that each Scrutiny Commission should receive their indicators and the Board should have an overview of all the indicators. He questioned whether there should be information included on how targets were created and the setting of the right level of target which was appropriate and realistic. Michele Farmer replied that the new style was more interactive as it highlighted issues and provided trend lines.

RESOLVED -

1 – that the outturn performance report for 2013/14 be noted;

2 - that the relevant indicators from future outturn performance reports be considered by each appropriate Scrutiny Commission and the Board have an overview of the whole set.

10. Review of the Scrutiny Work Programme.

Lucy Fleming reported that all changes that had been agreed with the Chair and other relevant Scrutiny Commission Chairs since the last meeting had been logged and could be tracked back.

She highlighted that Green Capital would now sit with OSMB and not Place. Councillor Martin, the Chair of Place stated that this was not the case and he had agreed to allow today's consideration of Green Capital only and it should then return to Place. It had been intended to receive a report in November to Place and this would prevent Place members in having their say. Councillor Hopkins concurred with these views.

The Chair stated that he had agreed to receive Green Capital on the OSMB work programme as it was cross-cutting and therefore sat with no particular Commission. The Chair referred the matter to the Proper Officer for a ruling.

RESOLVED – that the Proper Officer be asked to rule on the appropriate Commission for Green capital.

11. Date of next meeting.

It was noted as Thursday 26 February 2015 at 6pm.

END: 8.25PM

(Chair)