

# Overview and Scrutiny Management Board Agenda



**Date:** Monday, 12 February 2018

**Time:** 5.00 pm

**Venue:** The Writing Room - City Hall, College Green,  
Bristol, BS1 5TR

## **Distribution:**

**Councillors:** Geoff Gollop (Chair), Charlie Bolton, Tom Brook, Jude English, Gill Kirk, Brenda Massey, Graham Morris, Anthony Negus, Estella Tincknell, Donald Alexander and Steve Pearce

**Copies to:** Alison Comley (Executive Director: Communities), Colin Molton (Interim Executive Director: Growth and Regeneration) Shahzia Daya (Service Director - Legal and Democratic Services), Andrea Dell (Service Manager Democratic Engagement), Lucy Fleming (Democratic and Scrutiny Manager), Jacqui Jensen (Head of Paid Service), Denise Murray (Acting Executive Director: Resources),

**Issued by:** Andrea Dell, Democratic Services

City Hall, PO Box 3167, Bristol, BS3 9FS

Tel: 0117 92 222000

E-mail: [democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk)

**Date:** Friday, 2 February 2018



# Agenda

## 1. Welcome, Introductions and Safety Information

(Pages 4 - 5)

## 2. Apologies for absence.

## 3. Declarations of Interest

To note any declarations of interest from the Councillors. They are asked to indicate the relevant agenda item, the nature of the interest and in particular whether it is a **disclosable pecuniary interest**.

Any declarations of interest made at the meeting which is not on the register of interests should be notified to the Monitoring Officer for inclusion.

## 4. Minutes and actions of the previous meetings

- 7<sup>th</sup> December 17
- 18<sup>th</sup> December 17 – to follow with exempt appendix
- 11<sup>th</sup> January 18 – to follow with exempt appendix
- 18<sup>th</sup> January 18
- 22<sup>nd</sup> January 18

(Pages 6 - 29)

## 5. Chair's Business

To note any announcements from the Chair

## 6. Public Forum

Up to 30 minutes is allowed for this item

Any member of the public or Councillor may participate in Public Forum. The detailed arrangements for so doing are set out in the Public Information Sheet at the back of this agenda. Public Forum items should be emailed to [democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk) and please note that the following deadlines will apply in relation to this meeting:-

Questions - Written questions must be received 3 clear working days prior to the meeting. For this meeting, this means that your question(s) must be received in this office at the latest by 5 pm on Tuesday 6<sup>th</sup> February.



Petitions and Statements - Petitions and statements must be received on the working day prior to the meeting. For this meeting this means that your submission must be received in this office at the latest by 12.00 noon on Friday 9<sup>th</sup> February.

- 7. Scrutiny Ways of Working** (Pages 30 - 53)
- 8. The Arena - Scrutiny activity** (Pages 54 - 55)
- 9. Libraries Task and Finish Update** (Pages 56 - 58)
- 10. Task and Finish Groups - Updates from Chairs** (Pages 59 - 62)
- 11. Work Programme**  
To note the work programme (Pages 63 - 66)
- 12. Information Only Item: Mayor's Forward Plan** (Pages 67 - 75)



# Public Information Sheet

Inspection of Papers - Local Government  
(Access to Information) Act 1985

You can find papers for all our meetings on our website at [www.bristol.gov.uk](http://www.bristol.gov.uk).

You can also inspect papers at the City Hall Reception, College Green, Bristol, BS1 5TR.

Other formats and languages and assistance  
For those with hearing impairment

You can get committee papers in other formats (e.g. large print, audio tape, braille etc) or in community languages by contacting the Democratic Services Officer. Please give as much notice as possible. We cannot guarantee re-formatting or translation of papers before the date of a particular meeting.

Committee rooms are fitted with induction loops to assist people with hearing impairment. If you require any assistance with this please speak to the Democratic Services Officer.

## Public Forum

Members of the public may make a written statement ask a question or present a petition to most meetings. Your statement or question will be sent to the Committee and be available in the meeting room one hour before the meeting. Please submit it to [democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk) or Democratic Services Section, Brunel House St Georges Road Bristol BS1 5UY. The following requirements apply:

- The statement is received no later than **12.00 noon on the working day before the meeting** and is about a matter which is the responsibility of the committee concerned.
- The question is received no later than **three clear working days before the meeting**.

Please see [www.bristol.gov.uk](http://www.bristol.gov.uk) and the '[How to Have Your Say](#)' pdf for the parameters of each individual Committee and what will happen to your submission.

Any statement submitted should be no longer than one side of A4 paper. If the statement is longer than this, then for reasons of cost, only the first sheet will be copied and made available at the meeting. For copyright reasons, we are unable to reproduce or publish newspaper or magazine articles that may be attached to statements.

By participating in public forum business, we will assume that you have consented to your name and the details of your submission being recorded and circulated to the committee. This information will also be made available at the meeting to which it relates and placed in the official minute book as a public record (available from Democratic Services).



We will try to remove personal information such as contact details. However, because of time constraints we cannot guarantee this, and you may therefore wish to consider if your statement contains information that you would prefer not to be in the public domain. Public Forum statements will not be posted on the council's website. Other committee papers may be placed on the council's website and information in them may be searchable on the internet.

### **Process during the meeting:**

- Public Forum is normally one of the first items on the agenda, although statements and petitions that relate to specific items on the agenda may be taken just before the item concerned.
- There will be no debate on statements or petitions.
- The Chair will call each submission in turn. When you are invited to speak, please make sure that your presentation focuses on the key issues that you would like Members to consider. This will have the greatest impact.
- Your time allocation may have to be strictly limited if there are a lot of submissions.
- If there are a large number of submissions on one matter a representative may be requested to speak on the groups behalf.
- If you do not attend or speak at the meeting at which your public forum submission is being taken your statement will be noted by Members.

### Webcasting/ Recording of meetings

Members of the public attending meetings or taking part in Public forum are advised that all Full Council and Cabinet meetings and some other committee meetings are now filmed for live or subsequent broadcast via the council's [webcasting pages](#). The whole of the meeting is filmed (except where there are confidential or exempt items) and the footage will be available for two years. If you ask a question or make a representation, then you are likely to be filmed and will be deemed to have given your consent to this. If you do not wish to be filmed you need to make yourself known to the webcasting staff. However, the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014 now means that persons attending meetings may take photographs, film and audio record the proceedings and report on the meeting (Oral commentary is not permitted during the meeting as it would be disruptive). Members of the public should therefore be aware that they may be filmed by others attending and that is not within the council's control.





7<sup>th</sup> December 2017 at 5pm

## DISCLAIMER

The attached Minutes are DRAFT. Whilst every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of the information and statements and decisions recorded in them, their status will remain that of a draft until such time as they are confirmed as a correct record at the subsequent meeting

---

### **Members Present;**

Councillors Don Alexander, Charlie Bolton, Tom Brook, Gill Kirk (in part), Jude English, Geoff Gollop (in the Chair), John Goulandris, Anthony Negus (in part), Steve Pearce and Jo Sergeant.

### **Officers in Attendance (in full or part);**

Alison Comely, Strategic Director, Neighbourhoods; John Readman, Strategic Director, People; Denise Murray - Service Director, Finance; Shahzia Daya – Service Director, Legal and Democratic Services, Andrea Dell - Head of Democratic Engagement; Lucy Fleming – Democratic and Scrutiny Manager; Mike Pilcher, Business Partner, Finance; and Becky Lewis, Joint Unit Business Manager.

### **Also in attendance (in part);**

Louise Lawton, Chair of the Safeguarding Adults Board  
Sally Booth, Chair of the Safeguarding Children Board

## **1. Welcome, Introductions and Safety Information**

The Chair welcomed all those in attendance.

## **2. Apologies for Absence;**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Brenda Massey (who was substituted by Councillor Jo Sergeant and Councillor Graham Morris (who was substituted by Councillor John Goulandris).

Members were advised that Councillor Anthony Negus would be arriving at 6pm and Councillor Kirk leaving at 7.30pm.



It was noted that Councillor Anna Keen had resigned following her appointment to the Cabinet and therefore there was currently a Vice Chair vacancy. Councillor Gollop moved that Councillor Don Alexander be elected as Vice Chair and was seconded by Councillor English. On being put to the vote there was unanimous support. It was therefore;

**RESOLVED: That following the resignation of Councillor Keen, Councillor Don Alexander be elected Vice Chair of OSM**

### **3. Declarations of Interest;**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **4. Minutes of the Previous Meeting;**

The minutes of the meeting on 1<sup>st</sup> November 17 were agreed to be a correct record.

**RESOLVED; That the minutes of the meetings 1<sup>st</sup> November be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.**

### **5. Chair's Business**

The Chair raised a number of matters, which could be summarised as follows;

- Members were asked to consider the best mechanism for future scrutiny of the Metrobus project, with suggestions to be emailed to the Service Manager, Democratic Engagement.
- Regarding the pilot of new ways of working in Scrutiny, the party leads had been considering the best approach going forward and would bring back some proposals for consideration by OSM in February 18.
- An extraordinary OSM meeting would take place at 5pm on 18<sup>th</sup> December 17 to consider the business plans for the Holding Company and Waste Company as well as the report following the Companies governance review. The Party Group Leaders (or a substitute) would also be invited to attend. Most of the meeting would be held in exempt session due to commercial confidentiality.
- Two additional extraordinary OSM meetings would be arranged in January 2018 to enable scrutiny of the budget proposals. The Board approved the suggested slots of 5pm on 18<sup>th</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> January.

**RESOLVED; That**

- 1. That additional meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board take place at 5pm on 18<sup>th</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2018 to consider the budget proposals.**



## 6. Public Forum

Members received the following public forum business, a copy of which can be found in the minute book;

Statements;

No.	Name	Subject
1.	Philippa Bungard	Bristol Community Ferryboats
2.	David Redgewell	Bristol Temple Meads Station
3.	David Redgewell	Various
4.	Stewart Phelps	Cycle Ambition

Questions;

No.	Name	Subject
1.	Philippa Bungard	Bristol Community Ferryboats

Members noted, and shared, concerns raised by Mr Redgewell regarding the response that had been provided to him following his last statement to OSMB in relation to disabled access at the temporary bus stops near to Temple Meads station. It was agreed that the Strategic Director, Neighbourhoods would be asked to look into this with a revised response, which better reflected the Council's commitment to equalities issues, to be provided as soon as possible.

**RESOLVED;**

**That a revised response to the public forum statement submitted at the last meeting from David Redgewell, regarding disabled access to the temporary bus stops near Temple Meads, be provided as soon as possible.**

## 7. Budget Consultation

The budget consultation timeline was noted. The Chair suggested that Members submitted questions for officers in advance of the scrutiny sessions to enable them to prepare.

**RESOLVED; That the budget consultation timeline be noted.**

## 8. Council Tax Base Report 18/19

Following a brief introduction from officers Members went on to consider and comment on the information provided. The key points were as follows;



- Students were legally exempt from paying Council Tax but Bristol, in conjunction with the other Core Cities, were in discussion with the Department for Communities and Local Government to raise the issue. It should be noted, however, that there were also significant benefits to the city from attracting students particularly in their support to local businesses. It was agreed that a separate report setting out the numbers of students within the city (and projected future increases), and the implications for Council Tax would be provided.
- The City Council had in the past been accused of being too risk averse in terms of setting the Council tax base so the report for 18/19 had tried to set a more realistic picture.
- The Council Tax discounts available to single persons were being monitored due to dishonest declarations, which was an issue at national level.
- The implications of Brexit on the city population, and therefore the income from Council Tax, were being assessed and a reserve had been put in place until the picture was more certain.

**RESOLVED:**

**That the update be noted and a report setting out the situation in relation to the numbers of students within the city (and projected future increases), and the implications for Council Tax be provided.**

**9. Collection Fund Surplus/Deficit Report 2017/18**

Officers presented the report and responded to questions from Members. The salient points were as follows;

- A deficit of £37k was projected for the Collection Fund in 17/18, which was relatively low considering the total budget of £2m.
- Following the review of Business Rate levels there were a number of appeals outstanding with the government recommending that 4.7% of the Council's net budget be set aside to meet potential costs. In addition, some NHS Trusts were applying for charitable status which, if successful, would have significant repercussions for the Council (with costs of up to £35m). A further aggravating factor was that businesses could delay their appeals for some years in order to maximise the amount owed to them and some companies were offering to pursue these cases on a 'no win, no fee' basis. The City Council was making representations to the Government to challenge the situation in conjunction with the West of England Combined Authorities and the Core Cities.

**RESOLVED; That the update be noted.**

*Councillor Kirk left the meeting.*

*Councillor Negus arrived at the meeting.*

**RESOLVED:**



## 9. Safeguarding Adults and Safeguarding Children Board's Annual Reports

Members received a presentation from Louise Lawton Chair of the Safeguarding Adults Board and Sally Booth, Chair of the Safeguarding Children's Board a copy of which is appended to these minutes at Appendix A.

Following the presentation, Members went on to comment on the information provided and ask for additional information in a number of areas. The main points were as follows;

- Key issues affecting adults in Bristol included modern slavery (a particular problem in large cities) and the rise of homelessness and sexual exploitation.
- Funding levels around safeguarding were currently being negotiated and unlikely to significantly reduce. However, the Safeguarding Boards wished to refresh their Strategic Plans to improve provision so increased efficiencies were being considered.
- The Adults Safeguarding Board were making valuable contributions to help to reduce the number of suicides within universities. They were also to be commended for their partnership working around 'hoarders,' which could lead to significant costs in relation to re-housing etc.
- The Boards had excellent working relationships with the Police, although Avon and Somerset Constabulary was going through a time of significant change which had resulted in the loss of some key personnel.
- Avon and Somerset Constabulary's finger nail campaign to highlight modern slavery had received some negative media attention but had led to a significant increase in the number of reports from the public.
- A national review (the Wood Review) of Safeguarding arrangements had recently taken place (involving Ofsted style inspections) and more than half had been assessed as 'good' or 'outstanding'.
- The Safeguarding Boards measured their effectiveness in a number of ways including regular monitoring of performance data. There were also internal audit procedures in place. The Boards took a proactive approach to training and development to increase performance where appropriate.
- Bristol's Youth Select Committee were campaigning to make PHSE training mandatory within schools. The Children's Safeguarding Board could support this via their Education Sub Group who were doing a lot of work around 'educate and celebrate' to promote social inclusion.

**RESOLVED: That the update be noted and the 17/18 annual reports be added to the Scrutiny Work Programme for 12 months' time.**

## 10. The Arena – position paper

Members the noted update paper that had been provided and went on to comment as follows;

- Scrutiny should be provided with more details of the financial aspects of the Arena project and also the costs of the KPMG review which would be considered by the Cabinet on 23rd January 18.



- All aspects of the KPMG review would be made public unless there were commercial sensitivities. OSM requested that confidential material be redacted where possible (so that reports could at least be published in part).

It was agreed that OSM should scrutinise the Arena proposals following publication of the KPMG Value for Money review, possibly as the subject of a future Task and Finish Group.

**RESOLVED; that the update be noted and future scrutiny of the Arena be programmed to take place following publication of the KPMG Value for Money Review.**

### **11. Scrutiny Work Programme – Including Arising Items**

The update was noted.

### **12. Ways of Working (feedback) – Verbal Item**

There was no discussion on this item.

### **13. Budget Monitor Report**

The budget monitor report was noted.

### **14. Mayor's Forward Plan**

The update was noted.

### **15. Information Item – Scrutiny Dates 17/18**

The dates were noted.

### **16. Standing Item: Task and Finish Group Reports**

The following matters were discussed;

- Chairing vacancies had arisen on the Children's Centres and Council Assets Task and Finish Groups. Expressions of interest for these positions were encouraged else the Whips would be asked to fill the positions at their meeting on 15th December 17.
- The Youth Council were seeking assistance with their manifesto pledge to campaign for the Personal Social and Health Education (PSHE) curriculum to be rolled out across all schools but discussions were underway regarding the best way the Councillors could support this.
- The Parks Task & Finish Group that would be meeting on 11<sup>th</sup> December would be considering the outcomes of the Your Neighbourhoods Consultation. Members noted that a recent meeting had been cancelled at short notice and asked that their dissatisfaction be recorded.



- Members were reminded that Task and Finish Groups were free to conduct their meetings as they saw fit, which included inviting guests or holding sessions in public as appropriate.
- Consideration was being given regarding the timetable for the second phase of the Libraries Task and Finish Group that was initially proposed (in order to assist with recommendations around the delivery of any new model for the library service).

**RESOLVED; That the updates be noted.**

The meeting ended at 8pm.

**CHAIR** \_\_\_\_\_

**Appendix A – Presentation from the Chairs of the Safeguarding Children and Adults Boards.**





Agenda	Title of Report/Description	Action and Deadline	Responsible Officer	Action Taken
4.	Chair's Business	Members to email Andrea Dell with their views about next steps for Scrutinising Metrobus	All	In progress
Page 13	"	Members of PGL to be invited to attend the OSM meeting on 18 <sup>th</sup> December where they would be looking at matters related to the Companies	Lucy Fleming	Complete
	"	Budget Scrutiny sessions to take place at 5pm on 18 <sup>th</sup> and 22 <sup>nd</sup> December	Lucy Fleming	Complete
5.	Public Forum	A revised response to the public forum statement submitted to the last meeting from David Redgewell regarding disabled access to the temporary bus stops near Temple Meads is to be provided as equalities factors had not been adequately addressed.	Alison Comely	In progress

8.	Council Tax Base Report 18/19	A report to be brought back the Board setting out the numbers of students within the city and projected future increases, and the implications for Council Tax.	Denise Murray	To be scheduled
11	Arena Position Paper	Cabinet report setting out findings of the Value for Money Review to be considered by OSM in due course (target early 2018)	Lucy Fleming/Stuart Woods	To be scheduled
13.	Task and Finish Groups – Updates from Chairs	Members interested in taking the vacant chairs on the Children’s Centres and Community Assets Task and Finish Groups, or the lead on the work with the Youth Council, to advise Lucy Fleming/Andrea Dell. Nominations to be discussed at Whips meeting on 15 <sup>th</sup> December	All/Lucy Fleming/Andrea Dell	In progress  Paula O Rourke to be chair of Council Assets Task and Finish Group. Other appointments TBC.

Outstanding Actions from the meeting on 1<sup>st</sup> November 17

Agenda Item	Title of Report/ Description	Action and Deadline	Responsible officer	Action taken
5.	Chair’s Business	That the cancelled Mayor’s Question Time session of 1 <sup>st</sup> November 17 be replaced with an informal discussion either to take place on 7 <sup>th</sup> December 17 or at an alternative mutually convenient time.	Andrea Dell/Lucy Fleming	Complete
6.	Public Forum	That South Gloucestershire Council be asked to bring forward the next ‘meeting in common’ to a date as soon as possible to review changes at Bristol Hospital for Children following the	Lucy Fleming/Louise de Cordova	Complete

		Benjamin Condon case, with an update on the outcomes to be provided to OSM as soon possible thereafter.		
"	"	That all of the statements received in relation to Benjamin Condon be carried over to the additional meeting in common.	Lucy Fleming	Complete
"	"	That the party leads be asked to consider the suggestion that a new standing Health Scrutiny Commission be established, formed of the Bristol Members who currently sat on the Joint Health and Overview Scrutiny Commission and report back in due course.	Councillors English, Gollop, Keen and Negus	In progress
Page 15	Scrutiny of the Budget	Budget Scrutiny session to be arranged to take place on 7th December with additional sessions to be arranged for asap	Lucy Fleming/Andrea Dell	Complete
	"	Councillors Brook and Keen to discuss the budget consultation exercise with the Youth Council	Councillors Brook and Keen	In progress
10.	Waste Company Update	That an extraordinary meeting of the OSM be arranged for December 17 in order to consider the Companies' Business Plans.	Lucy Fleming/Andrea Dell	Complete
11.	Standing Item: Task and Finish Group reports	The Lead Members to prepare a list of potential new Task and Finish topics for consideration at a future meeting.	Councillors English, Gollop, Keen and Negus	In progress
"	"	Consideration should be given to programming the regular monitoring reports such as the Risk Registers and performance reports.	Councillors English, Gollop, Keen and Negus	In progress
"	"	Update from the Member Development Steering Group to be provided at the OSM	Andrea Dell	In progress

		meeting on 7 <sup>th</sup> December 17.		
--	--	---	--	--

7.	"	Establish mechanism for OSMB to have access to all consultations as information items and discuss if members think it suitable	Andrea Dell	All of the consultation exercises are available online at the following link;  <a href="https://bristol.citizenspace.com/">https://bristol.citizenspace.com/</a>
13.	"	Request a member of Cabinet (any) to attend OSMB meetings regularly. This happened under previous administration. Useful for Cabinet Members to understand issues	Lucy Fleming	Complete



**18<sup>th</sup> January 2018 at 5pm**

**DISCLAIMER**

The attached Minutes are DRAFT. Whilst every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of the information and statements and decisions recorded in them, their status will remain that of a draft until such time as they are confirmed as a correct record at the subsequent meeting

---

**Members Present;**

Councillors Don Alexander, Charlie Bolton, Tom Brook, Craig Cheney; Asher Craig; Jude English, Geoff Gollop (in the Chair), Gill Kirk, Brenda Massey, Graham Morris, Anthony Negus, Steve Pearce, Clive Stevens and Estella Tinknell.

**Officers in Attendance (in full or part);**

Tim Borret, Director, Policy, Strategy and ICT (interim); Gemma Dando, Director of Neighbourhoods and Communities (interim); Andrea Dell - Head of Democratic Engagement; Shahzia Daya – Service Director, Legal and Democratic Services; Lucy Fleming – Democratic and Scrutiny Manager; Chis Holme, Head of Finance; Jacqui Jenson, Acting Executive Director Care and Safeguarding; Denise Murray - Service Director, Finance; Mike Pilcher, Business Partner, Finance; Steve Somerfield, Director of ICT (Interim); and Zoe Wilcox, Director, Planning.

**1. Welcome, Introductions and Safety Information**

The Chair welcomed all those in attendance.

**2. Apologies for Absence;**

There were no apologies for absence.

**3. Declarations of Interest;**

There were no declarations of interest.

**4. Chair's Business**

The Chair advised that due to the scale of the budget proposals scrutiny would be split between two sessions with the Resources and People directorates and Corporate Risk Register being considered initially, and the Place and Neighbourhoods directorates plus Capital Programme and Treasury Management following at the meeting at 5pm on 22<sup>nd</sup> January 18.



## 5. Public Forum

There were no items of public forum business.

## 6. MTFP Task and Finish Group

Councillor Morris, Chair of the Medium Term Financial Plan Task and Finish (MTFP T&F) Group provided a presentation setting out their key findings, a copy of which can be found at Appendix A. During the ensuing discussion the following matters were discussed;

- The MTFP T&F Group recognised the importance of the MTFP and suggested that it should ideally cover more than 5 years and continually be reviewed to ensure it remained fit for purpose.
- The work of the MTFP T&F Group had been very robust and was a significant improvement on scrutiny of the budget from recent years. The strength of the T&F Group was largely due to the fact that meetings were not public, which meant confidential matters could be freely discussed, and also that the membership was relatively tight (at 5 Members) which increased expertise and ownership.
- In future it would be prudent to strengthen the budget scrutiny process by starting earlier and drilling down into pressure points (e.g. Adult Social Care) in more detail. Key Performance Indicators could play more of a role in budget scrutiny going forward as would provide an easy way in which to measure progress.

Members and officers who supported the work of the MTFP Task and Finish Group were thanked for their contributions and it was agreed that the process would be replicated for future years.

### RESOLVED:

**That the findings of the MTFP T&F Group be noted and inform the ensuing Scrutiny of the budget proposals for 18/19; and**

**That the MTFP T&F Group process for budget scrutiny be rolled out for 18/19 and beyond.**

## 7. Bristol City Council 2018-19 Budget Proposals

Following a brief introduction from officers, Members went on to scrutinise the budget proposals for the Resources and People Directorates, as well as the Corporate Risk Register. The key points were as follows;

- BE6 - Plans were in place to make savings by freezing incremental pay rises for senior managers.
- BE43 – The Council was owed a substantial sum from outstanding debts, mainly in relation to Adult Social Care. The payments would be recovered sensitively and more cohesive systems would be introduced going forward. It was agreed that additional details of the scheme would be provided in due course.
- FP01 – The proposal to save £4.4m from the Neighbourhood’s budget by introducing efficiencies would be delivered by reducing support to some external organisations (as approved 3 years ago) and seeking better value for money from contracts. The savings for 18/19 had already been identified. Any surplus from Bristol Waste Company would be reviewed towards the end of the period.
- FP14 – The proposal to establish an in-house debt collection service would aim to make the process more ethical and reduce stress for families, whilst also reducing costs by seeking solutions and requiring



fewer house visits.

- FP32 – The budget to assist families with ‘no recourse to public funds’ was being reduced, however, the intention was that more money would be reclaimed from the Home Office so the level of service provision would not be affected. A policy for the future was being prepared and would be circulated to Members for comment.
- FP33/37 – It was right to look at ways to enable people to stay in their own homes whilst reducing costs, but not if there were knock on effects on other services such as the NHS. Within the last 6 months there were 60 fewer users in residential care.
- RS02 – The road maintenance budget included provision for tree pollarding and reduction of epicormic growth during 18/19, after which the longer term plan for trees would be agreed.
- RS14 – The closure of all Citizen Service Points bar that at Temple Street may inconvenience some residents although the Customer Service Call Centre could assist in most instances.
- RS15 – The outcomes around the consultation re the proposal to remove discretionary rate relief on business rates for charities, voluntary groups and not for profit organisations would be available in late January 18. The suggestion was that rate relief be withdrawn for organisations with turnover of £100k or more but a Cabinet paper setting out the details of the policy would be prepared in due course.
- IN25 – The plans to increase the admission fees at Red Lodge and the Georgian House Museum had led to concerns being raised that visitor numbers would reduce, which would be counterproductive, although the Cabinet Member was confident the savings could be delivered.
- IN30 – The Bristol Platform to increase use of volunteers across the city was in the early stages but it could potentially bring in significant income (e.g. York were raising £90k a year for a similar scheme).
- PE02 – The additional funding identified to support the Special Educational Needs programme was not due to commence until 19/20.

#### **Risk Matrix**

- BR9/10 – Work was underway to assess the steps that needed to be taken to better protect the city from flooding and funds had been set aside for any necessary works. This would include improvements to the Chocolate Path. It was suggested that Flood Risk could be the focus of a potential Scrutiny Task and Finish Group.
- BR14 – The introduction of the General Data Protection Regulations was being managed to minimise the risk to the organisation.
- BR19 – the Council had in the past experienced issues with delivery of major projects on time and within budget so now a more cautious position would be adopted based on the assumption that additional investment would be required. ‘Health checks’ would also be conducted during large scale schemes so that issues could be spotted earlier.
- BR20 – Joint working was taking place with the Core Cities to increase understanding of the impact of Brexit. A report to summarise the findings would be provided in due course.
- BR21/22 – The Council was planning to increase its investment in ‘spend to save’ initiatives.

#### **RESOLVED;**

**That the Scrutiny comments on the 18/19 budget proposals detailed above be referred to the Cabinet for their consideration.**

The Meeting ended at 18.57



**CHAIR** \_\_\_\_\_

Appendix A – Presentation from the Scrutiny Medium Financial Plan Task and Finish Group.





Agenda	Title of Report/Description	Action and Deadline	Responsible Officer	Action Taken
7.	Budget Proposals 18/19	That additional details of the Council's proposed debt recovery scheme be brought to Scrutiny in due course.	Lucy Fleming	To be scheduled
"	"	Scrutiny comments on the 18/19 budget proposals be referred to Cabinet	Lucy Fleming	Complete
"	"	That the City Council was doing work to assess the impact of Brexit and detailed findings would be provided to Scrutiny in due course	Tim Borrett/Lucy Fleming	To be scheduled



**22<sup>nd</sup> January 2018 at 4pm**

**DISCLAIMER**

The attached Minutes are DRAFT. Whilst every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of the information and statements and decisions recorded in them, their status will remain that of a draft until such time as they are confirmed as a correct record at the subsequent meeting

---

**Minutes of Overview and Scrutiny Management Board**  
**4.00 p.m. 22 January 2018**

**Board members present:**

CLRs Geoff Gollop (Chair), Charlie Bolton, Tom Brook, Jude English, Gill Kirk, Brenda Massey, Graham Morris, Anthony Negus, Estella Tincknell and Donald Alexander

**Cabinet members in attendance:**

CLr Craig Cheney, Deputy Mayor - Finance, Governance and Performance  
CLr Asher Craig, Deputy Mayor - Communities  
CLr Kye Dudd, Cabinet Member - Energy, Waste and Regulatory Services  
CLr Helen Holland, Cabinet Member - Adult Social Care  
CLr Mhairi Threlfall, Cabinet Member - Transport and Connectivity

**Officers present:**

Denise Murray, Acting Executive Director: Resources  
Colin Molton, Interim Executive Director: Growth and Regeneration  
Chris Holme, Interim Director: Finance  
Shahzia Daya, Service Director: Legal & Democratic Services  
Peter Mann, Service Director: Transport  
Tim Borrett, Interim Director: Policy, Strategy & ICT  
Terry Dafter, Interim Director: Adult Social Care

**Also in attendance:**

CLRs Tony Carey, Harriet Clough, Steve Pearce and Clive Stevens

**1. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, APOLOGIES AND SAFETY INFORMATION**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and attendees introduced themselves.



The Chair drew attention to the safety information as detailed on the agenda.

## **2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

None.

## **3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None.

## **4. CHAIR'S BUSINESS**

### **Mayor's Forward Plan - Key decision item for Cabinet on 23 January 2018 - urgent decision taken under APR16 - WECA Strategic Transport Feasibility:**

The Chair raised his concern over the very short notice given of this urgent item, to be considered at the 23 January Cabinet meeting.

#### **Following discussion, OSMB**

#### **RESOLVED –**

#### **That their comments, as set out below, should be referred to the 23 January Cabinet meeting:**

OSMB was disappointed that an item could be added to the Cabinet agenda less than 24 hours before the meeting in such a way that most members and interested parties would not even have the opportunity to read the paper, let alone to scrutinise it.

OSMB has repeatedly asked for the Forward Plan to be made more relevant, and yet here was an item that was in the plan which had to be brought forward at extremely short notice.

OSMB's view is that surely a Forward Plan is only published when there is a reasonable anticipation that the meetings referred to in it will happen. For scrutiny and public accountability to happen, there has to be an opportunity for the review of documentation, and, if appropriate, scrutiny of the document.

In this case, the only reason the item was deemed urgent was because no-one planned for the possible cancellation of the 6 February Cabinet meeting until 2 working days before the 23 January Cabinet meeting.

OSMB recognised that they do not have enough knowledge or information to comment on the proposals themselves within these papers but wish to highlight that those that do would not have been aware of them.

In addition, the Chair commented that he felt he could not have refused to let this item go forward for decision at this short notice, but also felt that it could set a precedent for items bypassing scrutiny in the future. In the circumstances, the Mayor should be asked to give a categorical assurance that he was committed to making the Forward Plan fit for use and that he recognised the importance of ensuring that no decision was excluded from the possibility of being scrutinised.

## **5. PUBLIC FORUM**

OSMB noted the content of 2 public forum statements received, as follows:

1. Cllr Charlie Bolton – subject: items for future scrutiny.
2. David Redgewell – subject: Bristol Arena.



## 6. BRISTOL ARENA UPDATE

The committee considered an update report due to be considered at the 23 January Cabinet meeting.

### Following discussion, OSMB

#### RESOLVED -

**That their comments, as set out below, should be referred to the 23 January Cabinet meeting:**

At today's meeting (22 January 2018) OSMB has received an update report on the Bristol Arena.

Members were advised that the outcome of the value for money report and the subsequent decision on the Arena project was to be scheduled for the April 2018 Cabinet meeting.

OSMB members have significant concerns that this timing is unlikely to permit any meaningful scrutiny activity (either OSMB and/or Task and Finish work) and specifically that members in wards adjoining either site and/or on transport routes to either site will not have any opportunity to contribute to the decision making process or bring forward the views of their constituents despite the significant impact of the decision upon their communities.

OSMB Members were keen to highlight that, whilst they strongly feel the need for scrutiny on this item, it is acknowledged that due to the commercial nature of the project this may have to be done in way that respects commercial sensitivity\* and also does not further delay decision making.

OSMB members therefore seek assurance from the Mayor that he will work with officers to enable meaningful scrutiny on this item prior to the publication of the Cabinet reports for the April meeting.

\*\*

*\*It was noted that a full review of the exempt procedures process needs to be carried out and that this should be informed by the government's Select Committee into Scrutiny and recent guidance from the CfPS.*

*\*\*It was noted that consideration will need to be given to the Easter Holidays and the possible moving of the Cabinet date to later in April.*

## 7. 2018/19 BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS TO FULL COUNCIL AND ASSOCIATED EXECUTIVE DECISIONS

The committee considered the 2018-19 budget proposals as detailed in the report to be considered by the Cabinet on 23 January 2018.

### Following discussion, OSMB

#### RESOLVED -

**That their comments, as set out below, should be referred to the 23 January Cabinet meeting:**

#### Consultation Report Overview and Corporate Strategy

The following summarises the discussion:

- The responses received as part of the consultation were relatively low compared to the population (with around 600 respondents). Concerns were raised that that the results of the consultation were therefore not representative, which could be partly due to fatigue, although it was noted that with sample sizes of 500 and over the data was more reliable.
- Increasing public engagement remained a priority although there were some challenges around resources and timing. Furthermore, caution should be exercised when targeting particular groups to participate which could skew the findings. One solution would be to improve engagement when



ideas were in the formative stages.

- Plans were in place to co-ordinate all of the consultation/engagement that was taking place citywide in order to better share data and learning.
- Many of the procedures relating to recent City Council consultation exercises have been queried by Members. A Scrutiny Task and Finish Group could be established to enable Member to shape the process and improve engagement.

### **Capital programme (Appendix A2 to the Budget Report)**

The following key points were raised by OSMB and discussed with the Executive and relevant officers:

- Funding for Temple Meads Masterplan - it was noted that funding appears to reduce over the five year programme. Officers confirmed that this is due to the expectation that further into the programme, external funding sources should come forward. The total is £2m (with WECA) with the levering in of £1.5m of Network Rail funding to undertake the Masterplan for the station and surround. It was noted that this work will be extensive requiring this level of budget envelope.
- Members were pleased to see capital investment in the People Directorate. The focus of this was confirmed as extra care (enabling independent living) as opposed to residential care. It was noted that Bristol has an over-reliance on residential care and that this needs to be addressed alongside the city's affordable homes and under-occupation strategies. It was noted that a Business Plan is not yet written for this work and that further work is required to engage with service users and providers to develop this.
- Housing Revenue Account (HRA) – it was clarified that the HRA is still facing significant challenges. From 2020, councils will have the ability to increase rents but this is offset by the reducing housing stock due to Right to Buy. The current assumptions indicate that capital will run out by year 7/8 of the business plan and that the HRA will be in deficit in 16 years' time. Significantly more work is required to address the future HRA business plan position in 2018/19. A series of member briefings on the HRA are to be organised to focus on the debt cap, borrowing assumptions and the reserves required to support the HRA. It was noted that this budget position will begin to impact upon provision of service (e.g. reduced letting standards and provision of planned programme) in the future. It was noted that the Housing Company may be able to contribute to tackling the issue of social housing and members requested that details be provided on this at an appropriate point in the development.
- Members requested a break-down of what is included within the £14m corporate expenditure and it was agreed that this would be circulated by finance officers.
- Capital Programme – it was noted that there is not a significant amount of change in the budget envelope from 17/18 to 18/19. Members questioned as to why most capital expenditure is front-loaded in the programme. It was noted that this is standard practice regarding capital projects and the programme budget sets the overarching budget and borrowing envelope and that more projects/programmes are likely to be put forward/developed in coming years. It was noted that a



contingency fund is always available to manage project time delays/over-spends and other emerging pressures including the Council's liabilities. The MTFP principles are to ensure that these are contained within the borrowing and budget envelope set. Any draw down from the contingency budget will require a key decision and Cabinet approval and thus be available for scrutiny.

### Place Budget Proposals

The following key points were raised by OSMB and discussed with the Executive and relevant officers:

- BE57 - The Property division had repeatedly had issues with its budget although there were plans in place to increase efficiencies by reorganising the team; reviewing the asset management policy; and improving IT systems.
  - The Council's property strategy had last been reviewed in 2011/12 and was now due to be significantly revised following a full stock take of assets (including categorising facilities into type eg housing/investment portfolio/community asset etc); a rent review; rationalisation of the estate; and adopting more commercial approach. Steps were being taken to bring in the right expertise and the project was expected to be completed within 18 months although early findings would be available in June 18.
  - Particular care should be given around the community asset aspects of any property disposal and discussions were underway with the relevant organisations.
  - Concerns were raised regarding the significant delays to this piece of work, and also that the Council Assets Scrutiny Task and Finish Group had been established to assist with this project but to date had been underutilised.
- IN22 – the £1M of savings identified would come from a combination of inflation but also rebasing fees and charges.
- IN07 – The decision to reintroduce Sunday parking charges was not expected to result in a significant decline in visitors because the fees were relatively modest.
- RS02 – Plans were in place to improve the quality of road maintenance works in order to increase their longevity as well as to work more effectively by targeting works to where they were most needed.
- PL10a – The City Council was working in conjunction with the West of England Combined Authority to make savings around transport which had led to a £900k reduction per annum from supported bus services. WECA were developing a Bus Strategy which would set out the plan for the region and help to develop a more efficient bus network.
- IN24 – The Planning service was currently running without revenue support and income would be raised in the future by offering a deluxe service but that could only be rolled out if sufficient staff were in place.



- BE43 – A series of work streams were planned to improve debt management arrangements such as reviewing single persons Council Tax discounts.

### **Neighbourhoods Budget Proposals**

The following key points were raised by OSMB and discussed with the Executive and relevant officers:

- FP01 - It was confirmed that savings for third party payments were documented in each directorate budget schedule, not just in Neighbourhoods. Members were advised that there is a council wide 10% savings target on all external contracts when they are up for renewal.
- BE55 – concerns were raised about the ending of the Neighbourhood Partnerships and reduction in community focused officers and specifically how information on networks and community resources etc. will be available to residents and groups going forward. It was advised that work is underway regarding VOSCUR's role within this. It was also confirmed that a new structure for this area is still in development and will be shared with members at an appropriate stage.
- FP40 – it was clarified that this saving relates to bringing together programmes such as smoking and weight-loss into one service thereby making savings on contract spend. It was noted that there is a double-edged sword when making such savings in terms of the impact on BCC staffing vs impact on employment in the city and that changes should not be done in isolation.
- RS04- it was confirmed that the library savings are year two of a total of £1.5million of two years.
- FP02 – it was noted that there are two figures for parks savings. It was confirmed this is due to savings in support functions to the parks service. It was agreed that a breakdown would be produced.
- BW02 – it was noted that the Bristol Waste Company is one area where the budget appears to have increased. Officers advised that the Waste Company is looking to expand its commercial income in the future whereas currently the majority of income is from council services and so at this stage there is limited income and this is not shown within the budget savings.

### **Treasury Management Strategy (Appendix A4 to the Budget Report)**

The following key points were raised by OSMB and discussed with the Executive and relevant officers:

- Members questioned what assumptions and what stress testing had been done on potential changes to interest rates. Officers confirmed that external advice from a range of sources is used to inform their assumptions and they are in line with Her Majesty's Treasury (HMT) assumptions. Sensitivity tests are carried out and scenarios consider an approximate 3% increase.

CHAIR \_\_\_\_\_







Agenda	Title of Report/Description	Action and Deadline	Responsible Officer	Action Taken
	Chair's Business	Scrutiny statement on the Forward Plan and use of APR15/16 items	Andrea Dell	Complete
6	Arena	Scrutiny statement on the Arena to be referred to Cabinet	Andrea Dell	Complete
6	Arena	The council's exempt procedures to be reviewed following the Government's Select Committee review of Overview and Scrutiny	Andrea Dell / Nancy Rollason	Ongoing
7	18/19 Budget	Scrutiny comments on the 18/19 budget proposals be referred to Cabinet	Andrea Dell	Complete

# Overview and Scrutiny Management Board Meeting

12<sup>th</sup> February 2018



**Report of:** Service Manager, Democratic Engagement

**Title:** Review of Scrutiny Ways of Working (trial period) and Proposals for the Way Forward

**Ward:** Citywide

**Officer Presenting Report:** Andrea Dell

**Contact Telephone Number:**

**Please this report was commissioned by the OSMB political leads as an information report. Appendix D sets out the minutes of the OSMB Planning meeting on the 29<sup>th</sup> January which discussed this paper.**

## 1. Recommendations

- a. That members consider the merits of the four respective models outlined in this paper, and provide a steer to officers on the way forward.
- b. That members consider whether they wish to identify preferred option(s) for further consideration at the workshop, or whether they wish all options to go forward.
- c. That members decide whether they wish to put forward any other models/options for further consideration

## 2. Summary

On February 22<sup>nd</sup> 2018 a workshop will be held for members to review the current ways of working, and to consider and develop options for the future scrutiny structure.

In preparation for the workshop this paper reviews the advantages and disadvantages of the new ways of working, and puts forward a number of options for the future operation of scrutiny, including a recommended way forward. The report highlights some of the difficulties that have been encountered and why these may have occurred.

The paper has been produced by the Scrutiny Team, and is based on the Team's experience of working with both the new ways of working and previous systems, and also on the views of members as expressed informally throughout the course of the last few months.

### 3. Policy

Bristol City Council is required to establish an Overview and Scrutiny function and discharge its duties in accordance with the following legislation - Local Government Act 2000, Health and Social Care Act 2001, NHS Act 2006, Police and Justice Act 2006, Flood and Water Management Act 2010, Localism Act 2011, Health and Social Care Act 2012.

### 4. Context

From September last year, a new scrutiny system has been trialled in response to feedback from members across groups that scrutiny was not delivering effective scrutiny, quality outcomes, nor making the best use of resources including councillor time. After a series of workshops to review the structure and ways of working, Members concluded that the purpose and role of Scrutiny was *'To make a positive difference for the citizens of Bristol and deliver the right outcomes, by helping Bristol City Council make better decisions'* and they would achieve this by *i) holding the executive to account, ii) developing and amending policy, iii) influencing decision making, iv) representing the citizens of Bristol and v) driving out value for money.*

The member-led trial of the new system has moved away from the previous departmentally aligned scrutiny commissions towards more informal and flexible ways of working, with OSMB commissioning a number of task and finish groups according to agreed work programme priorities.

When the new ways of working were agreed by members, a commitment was given that a review would be carried out in February 2018 to gauge members' views, to assess progress, and to collectively determine a way forward.

There are a number of items which scrutiny either has a statutory duty to scrutinise, or that it is highly recommended to be retained within any future work programme. These are as follows:

#### 4.1 Statutory requirements in relation to scrutiny:

- a. Health Scrutiny - Where an overview and scrutiny committee is exercising its functions in relation to the planning, provision or operation of local health services, a local NHS body must provide it with any such information as the scrutiny commission may require in accordance with the Local Authority (Overview and Scrutiny Committees Health Scrutiny Functions) Regulations 2002 or any legislation that supersedes it. (previously the remit of the People Scrutiny Commission) - often referred to as the Health and Overview Scrutiny committee (HOSC) **\*see note below**
- b. Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (JHOSC) – Health bodies have a duty to consult Health Scrutiny Commissions on proposals to substantially vary or develop the health service. If the proposal affects more than one Local Authority area a Joint Health Scrutiny Committee is legally required.
- c. Scrutiny of Crime and Disorder - This refers to the power to review and scrutinise decisions of the Council and other “responsible bodies” such as the police, in respect of crime and disorder functions, and to make reports and recommendations to such bodies, and for these bodies to

have regard to the scrutiny report or recommendations when carrying out their functions. (This function was previously the remit of the Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Commission.)

- d. Scrutiny of Flood Risk - Under the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, Bristol City Council, as Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA), has a statutory duty to maintain the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy, (LFRMS). A risk management authority must comply with a request made by an overview and scrutiny committee for information and have regard to reports and recommendations of an overview and scrutiny committee. (previously the remit of Place Scrutiny Commission)
- e. Education - Scrutiny Commissions that cover Education are required to co-opt from governing bodies, which includes parent-governor and diocesan representation in respect of voluntary aided faith schools. (previously the remit of the People Scrutiny Commission)

**\*Please note** - In respect of Health Scrutiny it is worth stating that the JHOSC was constituted in May 2017 with the specific purpose of scrutinising the Bristol North Somerset and South Gloucestershire Sustainability Transformation Partnership (STP), and the three local authorities have committed to holding at least three meetings per year on a rotating basis. However, outside of the STP process (which looks at services that are being strategically planned and commissioned across the three local authority areas), individual Health Overview and Scrutiny Committees in North Somerset and South Gloucestershire both have the option to scrutinise more locally focussed health services provided within their respective areas, which Bristol does not easily have the option to do due to a lack of standing Health Committee.

After the last meeting of JHOSC in October 2017, the Bristol members submitted a statement to the Health and Wellbeing Board and the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board to recommend that they become the standing HOSC for Bristol health and social care services which would include responsibility for oversight of the Bristol Health and Wellbeing Board Programme and enable members to develop a specialism for more effective scrutiny.

#### 4.2 Highly Recommended Areas for Scrutiny

It is highly recommended that regular scrutiny or a watching brief is maintained on a number of discretionary topics previously considered by Scrutiny Commissions, some of which involved key external partners and can be found in the table below:

Discretionary Topics	Possible Activity
Care and Support – Adults	- Scrutinise the Annual Safeguarding Adult’s Report
Care and Support - Children and Families	- Scrutinise the Annual Safeguarding Children's Report
Education and Skills	- Scrutinise Annual Education Performance – All Key Stages - Scrutinise The Learning City Board work programme
Health Scrutiny	- Scrutinise The Health and Wellbeing Board Work Programme - Scrutinise Health Providers - Quality Account Reports

Corporate Strategy, Budget and the Medium Term Financial Plan	- Scrutinise and oversight of the Council’s financial governance processes and budgets. - Monitor and scrutinise the implementation of Budget proposals
Corporate Risk Register	- Scrutinise and investigate underlying causes of serious risks and oversight of mitigation implementation
Performance	- Negotiate and agree KPIs with Mayor and Executive to monitor and scrutinise performance of MTFP, Corporate Strategy and Executive priorities
Scrutiny Reports/Recommendations	- Monitor progress/outcomes of Scrutiny activity e.g. School Admissions, Libraries
Companies	- Monitor and scrutinise shareholder group decisions, annual business plans, governance
Issues of public interest/ concern/ relevance/ impact	- Monitor and scrutinise Arena, Metrobus, Temple Meads, JSP, Clean Air Action Plan, Health and Social Care integration
Mayor’s Forward Plan	- Monitor and scrutinise impending key decisions

#### 4.3 Additional Key Considerations

- The issue of SRAs cannot be resolved until the structure is agreed and the Independent Remuneration Council has made its recommendations.
- The resources available to support the scrutiny function now consist of 2.6 FTE officers plus a degree of additional limited time from two managers. An overview and comparison of the resource Implications for both formal commission meetings and task and finish groups is provided as Appendix C.
- Senior officer structure is considerably changed and there is a generally reduced officer corps.
- There are no longer annual elections which has a positive impact on the ability to forward plan and continuity of work.
- We have moved from an Executive model with 4 Cabinet members, to 10 Cabinet members. This will need to be taken into account when thinking about lines of accountability and logistics of Cabinet members attending Scrutiny meetings.
- One of the Scrutiny hothouses held in 2017 drew up a list of considerations and risks for any future scrutiny model. This is attached at Appendix A.

#### *Previous and current information and guidance:*

- *Bundred Review* - The February 2017 review of financial management at Bristol City Council by Bundred made a number of references to scrutiny and members involvement in decision making. Members are advised to pay due regard to the good practice recommended in the Bundred report when considering the review of scrutiny.
- *The Parliamentary Communities and Local Government Select Committee* on “Effectiveness of Local Authority Overview and Scrutiny Committees” has made a number of

recommendations, and has called on both the government and local authorities to take action on a variety of issues.

- *Centre for Public Scrutiny* - The CfPS carried out a review of Bristol scrutiny in 2015 and made a number of recommendations. The full report can be found here [CfPS Review Feb 2015](#)

## 5. Review of the Current System

On February 22nd 2018, a workshop will be held to enable members to review the current ways of working and to consider options for the future scrutiny structure.

The experience of Scrutiny Advisors is that on the whole the current system has much potential, with more informal, agile working and the ability to be geared to reflect members’ specific concerns, and which also offers members a better opportunity to delve into issues more intensively. Against this must be balanced the fact that scrutiny is operating in a less transparent manner with less public awareness of and engagement with its work. The balance between the task and finish groups and OSMB is also an issue of concern, both in terms of control, work programme and responsibilities.

However it must be recognised that this structure has not strictly operated in the way originally intended; for example, membership of the task and finish groups have become much larger, more cumbersome and therefore less able to respond or convene quickly when required. Continuity of membership has also been an issue. It was anticipated that the trial period would be an evolutionary process; however at times decisions have been made that have meant that the process has not always developed as was envisioned.

Members may wish to consider whether task and finish groups run under any future scrutiny system should be more structured and methodical.

The table below is a summary of the advantages and disadvantages of the current trial, pulled together by the Scrutiny Advisors from their observations, experiences and informal feedback received from Members. Members will be invited to conduct a similar exercise at the member workshop in February.

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Member led topic selection process</li> <li>- Significantly less administration (planning meetings for each formal meeting, requirements of Access to Information regulations, publishing papers to website, formal minutes)</li> <li>- More informal - constructive /more cooperative working</li> <li>- Better use of senior staff time</li> <li>- More flexible, agile working</li> <li>- In-depth scrutiny allows greater potential for</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Currently no constitutional framework</li> <li>- Perception of less public awareness &amp; involvement in scrutiny work                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Less transparency</li> <li>▪ Lower external / public prominence</li> <li>▪ Less internal prominence including officer awareness</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Flexibility                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Membership of task and finish groups continually changing, issues regarding continuum of learning and consensus of</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<p>more policy development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Outcomes more deliverable as the group can timetable its own work</li> <li>- Deeper dives into issues</li> <li>- Best practice as recommended by CfPS i.e. doing less but doing it better</li> <li>- More sharing of and access to information and increased knowledge and expertise</li> <li>- More focussed agendas and ability to focus agendas on what the group wants to achieve</li> <li>- Potential for both development of members and officers in delivering new model</li> <li>- Building better relationships with officers and stakeholders</li> </ul>	<p>direction, extra sessions needed to bring new Members up-to-speed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Difficult to coordinate large groups of members diaries at short notice (T&amp;F model requires agility)</li> <li>- Currently blurred lines regarding Executive Member involvement</li> <li>- Inconsistent communication between T&amp;F members and a) their political groups, and b) OSMB</li> <li>- Disjointed relationship between OSMB and T&amp;F work and lack of clarity around ownership</li> <li>- OSMB now the only remaining place to bring everything else             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ has become too big</li> <li>▪ too much control</li> <li>▪ too concentrated / small number of members</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Less holding to account</li> <li>- No formal overview work of the departments</li> <li>- Some priority topics are not at the right stage for scrutiny task and finish work</li> </ul>
--	--

## 6. Proposed Options

Considering the issues outlined above and the findings of the trial period, the following suggested options for the future operation of scrutiny are set out for the consideration of members.

### Option A – Cross-cutting model (Recommended Model)

<p>OSMB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4 meetings per year</li> <li>• Has 1 x Budget/MTFP related T&amp;F Group</li> <li>• Responsibility includes Corporate Risk Register and Performance</li> <li>• Responsibility for overall scrutiny work programme</li> </ul>		
<p>Scrutiny Committee A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4 meetings per year</li> <li>• Commissions its own T&amp;F group/s</li> <li>• Could be logical grouping of topics covered</li> </ul>	<p>Scrutiny Committee B</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4 meetings per year</li> <li>• Commissions its own T&amp;F group/s</li> <li>• Could be logical grouping of topics covered</li> </ul>	<p>Scrutiny Committee C</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Covers Health only (carries out the statutory health scrutiny function)</li> <li>• 4 meetings per year</li> <li>• Could include Joint Health Scrutiny</li> </ul>

		committee
--	--	-----------

**Key features:**

- 16 formal meetings
- Up to 7 T&Fs over the course of the year (including Budget/ MTFP) to be commissioned between OSMB/Committee A/Committee B (\*\*See note after option D)
- If it's decided that topics are NOT to be grouped then a 'cab rank' principle should apply – i.e. work gets allocated to first available committee (A or B) by OSMB
- Regular public scrutiny
- Formal public scrutiny shared between four committees, not solely with OSMB

**Issues for further consideration:**

- Groupings of topics between Committee A and B – how much the remit of each committee is defined would be a member decision
- Scrutiny support resources for Joint Health committee are not accounted for

**Risks/Mitigations - Option A:**

- *Risk: Potential lack of clarity/overlap between work of Committees A and B.* Mitigation: Each committee's remit to be broadly defined, allowing for flexibility to take issues arising. Chairs of Committees A and B to work closely together with Chair of OSMB.
- *Risk: Lack of cohesion of single scrutiny work programme and co-ordination role of OSMB diluted.* Mitigation: For this model to work effectively it would be essential for the Chair of OSMB to work closely with the other 3 chairs and reach consensus on the overall work programme.
- *Risk: Cross-cutting model more onerous and confusing for officers, members and the public:* Mitigation: Essential that the work programme is published regularly and made available to officers and members to help embed the new system.
- *Risk of overloading agendas:* could be a temptation for committees to try and cover all services within each committee's remit resulting in overloaded agendas and subsequent superficial scrutiny. Mitigation: Committees will need to exercise self-restraint and prioritise areas for focus

**Option B – Thematic model (based on Corporate Strategy Strategic Themes)**

OSMB
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4 meetings per year</li> <li>• Has 1 x Budget/MTFP related T&amp;F Group</li> <li>• Responsibility includes Corporate Risk Register and Performance</li> <li>• Responsibility for overall scrutiny work programme</li> </ul>

<p>Scrutiny Committee (Themes: Empowering &amp; Caring, Fair &amp; Inclusive)*</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4 meetings per year</li> <li>• Commissions its own T&amp;F group/s</li> <li>• Grouping of topics covered according to theme</li> </ul>	<p>Scrutiny Committee (Themes: Well Connected; Wellbeing)*</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4 meetings per year</li> <li>• Commissions its own T&amp;F group/s</li> <li>• Logical grouping of topics covered according to theme</li> </ul>	<p>Health Scrutiny Committee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Covers Health only (carries out the statutory health scrutiny function)</li> <li>• 4 meetings per year</li> <li>• Could include Joint Health Scrutiny Committee</li> </ul>
--	--	--

\* Grouping of themes is for example only and is open to amendment

**Key features:**

- 16 formal meetings
- Up to 7 T&Fs over the course of the year (including Budget/ MTFP) to be commissioned between OSMB and the 2 Scrutiny Committees (*\*\*See note after option D*)
- Regular public scrutiny
- Formal public scrutiny shared between four committees, not solely with OSMB

**Issues for further consideration:**

- Scrutiny support resources for Joint Health Committee need to be accounted for

**Risks/Mitigations - Option B**

- *Risk: Potential lack of clarity/overlap between work of the two Scrutiny Committees*  
Mitigation: Each committee's remit to be defined according to Corporate Strategic themes. Chairs of Committees A and B to work closely together especially where a theme cuts across a service area.
- *Risk: Lack of cohesion of single scrutiny work programme and co-ordination role of OSMB diluted:* Mitigation: For this model to work effectively it would be essential for the 4 chairs to work closely together and reach consensus on the overall work programme.
- *Thematic model more onerous and confusing for officers, members and the public:* Mitigation: Essential that the work programme is published regularly and made available to officers and members to help embed the new system.
- *Risk of overloading agendas:* could be a temptation for committees to try and cover all services within each committee's remit resulting in overloaded agendas and subsequent superficial scrutiny. Mitigation: Committees will need to exercise self-restraint and prioritise areas for focus

**Option C – Departmental Alignment (based on the new draft staff structure)**

OSMB

- 4 meetings per year
- Has 1 x Budget/MTFP related T&F Group
- Responsibility includes Corporate Risk Register and Performance

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Responsibility for overall scrutiny work programme</li> </ul>			
<b>Growth &amp; Regeneration Scrutiny Committee</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4 meetings per year</li> <li>Commissions its own T&amp;F group/s</li> </ul>	<b>Communities Scrutiny Committee</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4 meetings per year</li> <li>Commissions its own T&amp;F group/s</li> </ul>	<b>Care &amp; Safeguarding Scrutiny Committee</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4 meetings per year</li> <li>Health Sub-committee meets 4 times per year</li> <li>Commissions its own T&amp;F group/s</li> </ul>	<b>Resources Committee</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2 meetings per year</li> </ul>

**Key features:**

- 22 formal meetings
- Up to 5 T&Fs over the course of the year (including Budget/MTFP) to be commissioned between OSMB, Growth & Regeneration Committee, Communities Committee and Care & Safeguarding Committee (*\*\*See note after option D*)
- Mechanisms included for Children and Safeguarding issues (via Care & Safeguarding Committee)
- Regular public scrutiny
- Formal public scrutiny shared between six committees, not solely with OSMB

**Issues for further consideration:**

- Joint Health committee resources issues remains unresolved

**Risks/Mitigations - Option C:**

- Risk: Balance of work between the four committees may be wrong.* Mitigation: If this model was adopted, the 5 chairs would need to monitor the balance of work. It is important to bear in mind that a new departmental structure will impact on Council departments as well as scrutiny, and scrutiny chairs will need to reassess progress against the scrutiny work programme to ensure that the balance of meetings matches the requirements of the workload.
- Risk: Overloaded agendas:* could be a temptation for committees to try and cover all services within each department resulting in overloaded agendas and subsequent superficial scrutiny. Mitigation: Committees will need to exercise self-restraint and prioritise areas for focus
- Risk: Silo working:* could result in focus of scrutiny being shifted from Executive and onto officers. Mitigation: Regular attendance and involvement from Cabinet Members.

**Option D – The Status Quo / The Current System**

OSMB
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>15/16 meetings per year (12 plus extraordinary meetings)</li> <li>Responsibility for overall scrutiny work programme</li> </ul>

<p><b>Task &amp; Finish Groups</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 8 currently running (additional to start throughout year as capacity arises `</li> </ul>	<p><b>Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bristol is committed to host 1 of 3 three meetings per year on a rotating basis.</li> </ul>
--	---

**Key features:**

- 15/16 formal meetings
- Up to 12 T&Fs over the course of the year (including Budget/ MTFP) commissioned by OSMB (\*\*See note after option D)
- Regular public scrutiny by OSMB

**Issues for further consideration:**

- Joint Health Committee/Stand-alone health committee issue remains unresolved.

**Risks/Mitigations - Option D:**

- see "Review of Current System "earlier in this report

*\*\* Note: Smaller versions of Inquiry Days or workshops could be used instead of T&F groups, depending on the requirements of the work involved.*

**7. Previous Scrutiny Structure**

The previous scrutiny structure, which was aligned to the departmental structures, is outlined below as an aide memoir for members. It is not being included as a formal option as it is not deliverable under current resources.

<p><b>OSMB</b></p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Officially 4 meetings per year (plus extraordinary meetings)</li> <li>• Overview of Corporate Risk Register and Performance (with Commissions taking responsibility for their area)</li> <li>• Approves deep dive/one-off pieces of scrutiny on request from the Commissions</li> </ul>			
<p><b>Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Commission</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10 scrutiny "occurrences" per year</li> </ul>	<p><b>People Scrutiny Commission</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10 scrutiny "occurrences" per year</li> <li>• Holds the statutory health scrutiny remit</li> <li>• Includes Joint Health Scrutiny Committee</li> </ul>	<p><b>Place Scrutiny Commission</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10 scrutiny "occurrences" per year</li> </ul>	<p><b>Resources Scrutiny Commission</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10 scrutiny "occurrences" per year</li> </ul>

**Key features:**

- Up to 44 formal meetings as specified in Constitution
- Regular public scrutiny
- Formal public scrutiny shared between five committees
- Commissions have flexibility to decide methods of scrutiny within the resource envelope
- Potential greater public awareness of scrutiny due to number of public meetings

### **Risks/Mitigations**

- *Reduced resources for scrutiny support means that this model is not deliverable:* This model was delivered from a larger support structure and with administrative support from Democratic Services. The scrutiny resource is now smaller and the Democratic Services resource is not available.

## **8. Officer Recommendation**

Option A is the officer recommendation as it allows a significant degree of flexibility for members to “bundle” topics as they see fit. It incorporates regular formal public scrutiny meetings, without reverting to the administrative burden of the previous system where the large number of public meetings was unsustainable. It also moves away from the departmental silos and may therefore be more comprehensible to members of the public, in the same way of operation as Development Control Committees A and B.

However this method does depend on close working and good communication between the four chairs, and it is also important that the workload stays within the support resource (although it is true to say that this is the case for all the models). It is also important that members’ expectations are managed within this system, and chairs will play a significant role in this.

As a reasonable alternative, Option C could be considered. It would in any case be no less viable than Option B, as the departmental structure gives it a more immediate definition.

## **9. Proposed Next Steps**

The proposed next steps are as follows:

- 22 February - All Member Workshop to review scrutiny ways of working and recommend options to OSMB
- 8 March - OSMB to consider recommendations from Workshop. If the decision is taken to change the structure of Scrutiny then the amendments would ideally be taken forward as part of the review of the constitution that is likely to be considered at the annual Full Council meeting in May 2018.

It is therefore suggested that once the recommendations have been agreed, they would then be referred to the Constitution Working Group and onto Full Council.

At the series of workshops referred to in Section 4, a number of Key Considerations and Risks relevant to scrutiny were identified by members, most of which still require consideration and these are

included in Appendix A for information. It is strongly recommended that once the future scrutiny structure is determined, that these issues are looked at again by members.

**Appendices:**

Appendix A – Minutes of the OSMB Political Leads meeting on 29<sup>th</sup> January 2018.

Appendix B - Key Considerations and Risks (from 2017 Scrutiny Hothouse)

Appendix C - Scrutiny New Ways of Working FAQs

Appendix D - An Overview of Resource Implications for Scrutiny

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985**

Background Papers: None.

## Key Considerations and Risks (from 2017 Scrutiny Hothouse)

Whilst significant progress was made during the Hothouse event and a direction of travel beginning to be shaped, there are still a number of issues that need to be addressed before a final structure can be agreed. They include:-

### Communication;

- A. How to establish better lines of communication between the Executive and Scrutiny i.e. should more structured interaction be adopted?
- B. How to maintain formal reporting from the Executive Members to Scrutiny, particularly in view of the Constitution Working Group's intention to reinstate six monthly formal updates.

### The Work Programme;

- C. The need to implement a robust selection process for topics for the Scrutiny Work Programme to ensure that activity aligns with the Mayor's priorities, and also the issues that are important to the residents of Bristol
- D. How to avoid duplicating Scrutiny activities with other Mayoral policy development work streams e.g. the Congestion Charging Working Group
- E. The importance of ensuring that an appropriate amount of time is dedicated to statutory matters (such as some services relating to health)

### Resources;

- F. Helping Members to understand that the resources available to Scrutiny have reduced and therefore choices need to be made about priorities
- G. The need to identify a fair way to remunerate Members for the responsibilities associated with Chairing, including any 'Task and Finish' Group

### Governance

- H. Finding the balance between enabling Scrutiny to operate in a transparent way versus needing to be nimble and responsive
- I. Further consideration of the role of call-in in the decision making process
- J. The sequencing of Scrutiny meetings in relation to Cabinet and the role of 'Call In' i.e. if a Scrutiny meeting took place within 5 days of every Cabinet meeting to review Key Decisions and potentially call them in, could pre-decision scrutiny reports be largely dispensed with
- K. The external Review of the 2016/17 Forecast Budget Deficit which highlighted several areas of concern in relation to Scrutiny, most notably;
  - The information flow between officers and Members
  - The frequency and quality of reports to Members, including scrutiny
  - The need for robust governance arrangements, particularly around finance

- L. Whether all Scrutiny bodies, including task and finish, need to be politically proportionate. OSMB Members were of the view that proportionality should be suspended for task and finish groups although it was acknowledged that the decision was a matter for the Whips.
- M. The timetable for agreeing Scrutiny changes. If no agreement can be reached prior to annual Council should the existing Commissions continue into 17/18 or should OSMB pick up all Scrutiny activity until arrangements can be agreed?

## Scrutiny New Ways of Working - FAQs

This document brings together the majority of questions raised by members and officers regarding the new ways of working for scrutiny. It is however not exhaustive and so we anticipate that this will grow and be refined as the new ways of working are trialled through-out the year.

### OVERVIEW

#### Why are you reviewing scrutiny?

The feedback from a number of Elected Members and endorsed by the Mayor and Party Group Leaders was that the model of Scrutiny in Bristol was not delivering the best outcomes for residents and was not functioning effectively or efficiently. OSMB agreed to undertake a review of Scrutiny but were not clear on how best to progress. The proposed model emerged from a series of hot-houses and OSMB meetings held from February to July 2017. The key issues emerging from the hot-house were:

- Scrutiny only being involved right at the end of the process, with limited ability to influence
- Doing too much with too little detail – box ticking
- Scrutiny activity being taken up with briefings / information sharing rather than scrutiny work
- Lack of Forward Plan making scrutiny planning complicated
- Need to consider the best use of decreasing resources across the organisation

#### In summary, what are the key parts of the model being trialled?

- The work programme is to be set by OSMB using a prioritisation exercise to ensure activity will deliver outcome focused scrutiny
- Scrutiny activity to use task and finish groups work combined with formal OSMB meetings to be able to a) respond quickly to arising issues (form task and finish groups quickly), b) be able to carry out in-depth policy development work at the early stages of policy formation, c) be able to deep dive into areas of concern/risk swiftly
- The topic to shape the type of scrutiny activity required, which could include formal public meetings, informal meetings, working groups, select committees or inquiry days – this will be decided by the members of each group, supported by Scrutiny Advisors
- All non-executive members are able to be part of the task and finish groups with the level of meetings, duration etc. being shaped by members in conjunction with Scrutiny Advisors - the level of interest will determine how each group will operate. A pro-forma has been developed to help ensure that all meetings contribute to the agreed objectives and outcomes.
- The work programme priority areas to be constantly assessed (formally at each OSMB meeting) and there will be a live list of topics (raised by members and officers) reviewed at every leads meeting, and at every OSMB meeting as a standing item (with resources redistributed accordingly)
- Monthly OSMB to receive update reports on all task and finish activity, these reports to form a monthly e-briefing to all Members, and published on the website
- There is no change to the mechanisms for scrutiny to be able to summon Members of the Executive and Senior Officers to give account (as set out in the Constitution) and to make referrals/reports to Cabinet. There is also no change to the call-in process and scrutiny call-in procedures.

#### How has the new approach been communicated to officers and members?

- The members of OSMB have been the main communicators with their groups on the changes and should have been regularly talking to key group officers and other members
- 2x Member Briefings were held in July (24 members attended) and the slide deck issued to all members.
- Mayor and Party Group Leaders (PGL), Whips and OSMB members, as well as any other interested members, were invited to attend all the hot-house sessions and also had an open

- invitation to attend any OSMB meetings.
- Mayor and PGL received a briefing on the development of the procedures in May 2017 and also on 5<sup>th</sup> September where they agreed to support the roll out of the new ways of working on a trial basis.
- Update emails have been regularly issued to Strategic Leadership Team (SLT), Service Directors and relevant Service Managers. SLT have not participated in the development of the new ways of working as this is a member-led process.
- Members have also worked closely with relevant Service Directors (or their nominated representatives) to develop the T&F scopes, however further work is required to ensure awareness across the officer group.
- The Mayor and Deputy Mayor have had periodic briefings from the Chair of OSMB and Statutory Scrutiny Officer.

## TASK AND FINISH - HOW WILL THIS WORK?

### **How will the Task and Finish (T&F) groups operate?**

This area is expected to evolve rapidly as this is tested through September and October 2017. This is a member-led process and each T&F will be shaped by the members of that group and also the topic being explored.

- When a topic is agreed for a task and finish group a chair will be confirmed. The chair will work to develop a scope with Scrutiny Advisors and other interested members.
- All non-executive members will have the opportunity to express an interest in joining a T&F group, although it's important that the Task and Finish groups remain of a manageable size in order to work effectively.
- Once membership has been confirmed, the Scrutiny team will work with members to set up the most appropriate structure of meetings / scrutiny activity (working group / inquiry day etc.). In some cases this could be a very short-term piece of work (e.g. one meeting to examine an arising issue).
- Meetings will be informal (not public) unless otherwise agreed by members of the group and will not have formally published papers or minutes.
- Relevant departmental officers will be asked to attend meetings when appropriate. Expert witnesses may be invited to attend meetings depending on the context. Members may wish to invite other stakeholders and/or interested parties (e.g. representatives of local service user groups) to attend and participate in meetings.
- Regular monthly updates will be i) reported to OSMB ii) uploaded to the Council webpage and iii) provided via an all member e-briefing
- A pro-forma has been developed to enable this to be structured and to help keep all meetings productive and within scope.
- All final reports/recommendations of the groups will be reported to OSMB, as the commissioning scrutiny body, before submission to Cabinet or appropriate forum, and will be substantive items at OSMB.
- The aim is that T&F groups run for as long as required to make recommendations

### **How have the current scopes for the T&F groups been developed and evolved?**

The high-level scopes for the first set of T&F groups have been drafted by members, in discussion with service leads and agreed by OSMB. Any significant changes to these must be brought back to OSMB for approval. Each scope has been developed to achieve specific outcomes. The scope may evolve as the work of the group progresses however the group must always link back to the terms of reference and demonstrate the outcomes achieved against these.

## HOW WILL WORK BE PRIORITISED FOR SCRUTINY ACTIVITY?

**How will OSMB choose and prioritise issues for the 'short list'?**

- OSMB may wish to use a prioritisation tool to help determine how items are prioritised for scrutiny activity.
- Every month OSMB will review the 'live' list of all items and reprioritise and reallocate resources accordingly. If an agreement via discussion can be made then a vote will be taken and the majority view will be carried.
- At the beginning of each municipal year it is proposed that a canvass of all members and potentially other stakeholders (youth council etc.) be carried out to create a long list of items. All non-executive members will then have the opportunity to digitally vote for the items they think should be a priority for scrutiny activity. This process aims to try and bring as many members as possible into the process of deciding the priority areas of scrutiny.

### **Where will subjects such as performance information and risk registers now be published and scrutinised, how will we know if we are missing something?**

It is proposed that for each OSMB meeting a set of standing information papers be included. This could include items such as:

- Mayor's Forward Plan, latest budget forecast report, latest performance reports, latest consultation reports and risks registers, Mayor's Cabinet portfolio's etc.

Members will then be able to see if there any areas that should be flagged for potential scrutiny activity. Periodically these items will be substantive items on the OSMB agenda to enable more detailed review and scrutiny.

### **What is the process for reporting back from OSMB to ensure all members are kept abreast of progress on the task and finish group work?**

- There will be a monthly written update to OSMB (published with the OSMB papers) from the chairs of the T&F groups supported by Scrutiny Advisors. The update will also be circulated to all Members.
- Chairs (or their nominated reps) will be required to verbally present their update at each OSMB meeting.
- Final reports and recommendations from task and finish groups are to be substantive OSMB agenda items prior to submission to Cabinet or appropriate forum. The relevant Cabinet Member will be requested to attend for the presentation of the recommendations.
- All reports are to be checked by the Scrutiny team who will liaise with legal/finance etc.

### **What is the process for urgent/arising issues (from officers and members) for consideration by Scrutiny?**

Members can flag urgent/arising issues via

- a) Email to [scrutiny@bristol.gov.uk](mailto:scrutiny@bristol.gov.uk) and the Scrutiny team will ensure this is circulated to OSMB members
- b) Contacting any of the members of OSMB who will pass this to the Scrutiny team
- c) Raising the topic at an OSMB meeting

There is to be a standing agenda slot for arising items at each OSMB meeting. OSMB can then a) agree that the item is of such priority to set up a T&F group immediately b) to include this on the list for the monthly review of the work programme c) ask the Scrutiny Advisors to undertake research into the item raised and bring this back to the next OSMB meeting for further consideration by OSMB.

The Scrutiny team maintain a 'live' list of topics. This includes all topics raised as part of the work programme setting but also any topics that are raised by members and officers. This list will be circulated each month as part of the OSMB papers.

### **How will the proposals make up for the loss of breadth of scrutiny topics that we had under the previous system?**

There was general view from members across the board that the number of topics coming to scrutiny over the previous year (over 177 items) did not allow for in depth analysis. In addition, the Local Government Association (LGA) and the Centre for Public Scrutiny (CfPS) advise that it is

more effective to focus on fewer topics in more depth in order to improve outcomes and add value.

**CHAIRING AND MEMBERSHIP OF GROUPS**

**Choosing members for Scrutiny Groups – how will this work?**

Initially OSMB were keen to open out the membership as wide as possible and then respond to the level of interest and evolve the process from there.

- An email has gone to all members requesting expressions of interest in the T&F groups
- Although political proportionality is not required it is important that there is political balance. It is important that everybody is aware that T&F groups are not party political methods of operation and indeed, their strength is that they harness the abilities and the experience of members across the political spectrum.
- Scrutiny Officers will talk to individual members about their availability and work with them and the chairs of the groups to set up appropriate structures.
- Where there is significant interest in a topic and a large number of Members come forward, then a discussion will take place involving the Whips and OSMB members, with support from the Scrutiny Advisors. Please note that this approach was not possible for some of the early Task and Finish Groups due to time constraints, but will be addressed in the future.
- If a situation arose where no members came forward for a group then this will be escalated to the party group Whips for their views.

**Is it expected that once task group volunteers are found the expected members' time resource will be similar to before – i.e. 5 scrutiny bodies' meetings and inquiry days etc. is still expected?**

Time resource will be dependent on the nature of the work, which will vary greatly between topics. However each task group will need to set its timeframe according to member's capacity and any time constraints.

**What about duplication of work/skills already carried out by Scrutiny Commissions?**

The Scrutiny team have access to all background work previously carried out by the Scrutiny Commissions and all reports are stored on Modern.Gov. Any T&F groups would be supplied with any previous work to avoid duplication. It is hoped that those members who were members of scrutiny commissions and were engaged in specific areas would be members likely to be interested in being members of the T&F group.

**How will the chairing of the groups be decided?**

The role of chair will first be offered to the current chairs and vice-chairs of Scrutiny who receive a Special Responsibility Allowance (SRA) for these roles. This has been endorsed by the Mayor and PGL and the Party Whips.

When there is more T&F activity than chairs available members of OSMB and other interested members can put themselves forward however this is with full knowledge that they will not receive an SRA for this work.

It is formally recognised that there are differences in the SRA rate between Chairs and Vice-Chairs however this cannot be changed until such time as the Independent Remuneration Panel has reviewed this and their recommendations have been debated at Full Council.

The chairs for the first set of T&F work are set out below.

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Key: C = Chair, VC = Vice Chair, OSMB = OSMB member</b>
Air Quality	Cllr Carey (VC)

Children's Centres	Cllr Keen (VC)
Council Assets (property)	Cllr English (C)
Council Commissioning and Contracts	Cllr S Clarke (VC)
Cribbs Patchway New Neighbourhoods	Cllr Brooke (OSMB)
Fire Safety in tower blocks	Cllr Charlie Bolton (OSMB)
Libraries	Cllr Negus (C)
MTFP & budget	Cllr Morris (C)
Parks	Cllr Johnson (VC)
Reducing Demand on Social Services – Adults	Cllr Brenda Massey (C)
Reducing Demand on Social Services – Children	Cllr Clare Campion-Smith (VC)
Youth Council	Cllr Keen (VC) and Cllr Brooke (OSMB)

**Costs – How will the changes affect the budget? What about the SRAs budgeted for scrutiny? Will the new model be deliverable within the current budget envelope?**

- For the current year it's proposed that those already in receipt of a scrutiny SRA i.e. Commission Chairs and Vice Chairs, will now Chair the Task and Finish Groups and thus there will be no change to the SRAs or budget position.
- With regards to the required officer time between the different ways of working this will be actively monitored by the Scrutiny team and shared as part of the work to evaluate the trial through-out 2107/18.

**OFFICER SUPPORT**

**What support will be provided by Scrutiny Advisors for Task Groups?**

The scrutiny team is formed of 2.6x Scrutiny Advisors – Johanna Holmes, Louise DeCordova and Romayne De Fonseca. They are responsible for the following:

- To set up, coordinate and support task and finish groups
- To liaise with officers and members to plan agendas and ensure delivery of work in a structured way
- Provide professional and impartial guidance and advice on best course of action in accordance with good scrutiny principles and within the groups terms of reference and the Council's constitutional framework
- Carry out desktop and other research as required
- Maintain a watching brief on milestones and relevant time constraints to achieve best outcomes
- Liaison with internal and external colleagues, including assisting members to identify appropriate expert witnesses where relevant and arranging for these to provide information to the group
- To manage all communications on behalf of the group which includes monthly updates to OSMB, updating of Council webpage and issue of an all member e-briefing
- Maintain a 'live' list of items raised by member and officers for potential scrutiny activity
- Identify dates for meetings, confirm diary appointments and book meeting rooms

**Officers have stated that after the changes there will be the same amount of scrutiny team time resource as before. Is this live officer time with members? Or background work and admin?**

After the staffing restructure there are now 2.6 posts to provide direct support, including background work and administration for the Scrutiny function. This is the only dedicated resource

for the Scrutiny function. It should be noted that some background work will always be essential to ensure the successful facilitation of the live work. The new Scrutiny way of working aims to make the maximum use of this resource and to minimise the amount of time on administration.

The Scrutiny team will be regularly reviewing the resource implications of the new model and feeding this into the feedback process.

**Can you clarify the role of the Executive and Senior Officers in relation to Scrutiny? Is there anything that prevents them from refusing to answer questions or provide information?**

The statutory position is set out in the constitution /including under access to information rules and this is not subject to change. Scrutiny maintains the ability to 'summon' the Executive (including the Mayor) and Senior Officers to give account in accordance with the deadlines in the Constitution to OSMB. There is no change in the procedures and processes for 'call-in' and for the hearing of call-in by scrutiny.

All Cabinet Members have a standing invitation to attend OSMB as an observer at all times and a member of SLT is required to be present at all times (SLT includes the Head of Paid Services, Strategic Directors, S151 officer and Monitoring Officer).

In the Constitution the Mayor is required to attend for four OSMB Mayor's Question times however it is proposed that this time be used for an informal discussion with the Mayor on key topics of interest as the question time has not been well utilised.

**How will members be brought up to speed on the current policy context?**

As part of the formation of the T&F group all core members of the T&F will be required to attend a policy briefing on the latest legal, finance and Bristol City Council framework for the topic being scrutinised. This is to provide context and also ensure all members have the same level of knowledge and understanding of the topic in question.

NB. This may not always be necessary or feasible depending on the topic in question and any timing issues

**Will there be any training and support provided for scrutiny members and chairs?**

Yes. Peer training is being offered by the LGA and it is provisionally intended this be set up for Autumn/Winter 2017/18. The Scrutiny team are also there to provide support to the members and chairs.

**EVALUATING THE NEW WAYS OF WORKING**

**How will this 'trial' be evaluated? And how long will it last?**

- There will be a standing item at the end of each OSMB agenda to report progress on how the new ways of working are operating
- Arising issues will be tracked by the Scrutiny team and kept on a log that can be available on request
- It is proposed that this continue through-out the municipal year 2017/18 and reviewed in March in time for any necessary constitutional changes to occur at the Full Council Annual General Meeting in May 2018.

**Is this change fully agreed and formalised?**

OSMB agreed to trial the new ways of working, until the end of the municipal year 17/18, to assess if the new model would work for Bristol. Initially it was proposed that no changes be made to the constitution until such time as the trial has concluded. However the delegation of functions for scrutiny is from Full Council and therefore it is proposed that, to ensure that scrutiny has the appropriate delegation of authority, a report goes to Full Council at the earliest opportunity to provide the necessary constitutional provisions to formalise the trial.

### **So does this mean the Commission meetings are stopping?**

Members of OSMB in the majority expressed a desire to focus resources upon task and finish work and meetings rather than commission meetings. A formal dissolution of the commissions however can only happen via changes to the Constitution (Responsibility for functions) so at this time Commission meetings can be called if it is felt to be necessary. The officer resource however will only be able to support a limited number of activities and resource will be taken from task and finish to support a commission meeting.

## **MINUTES AND PUBLIC FORUM**

### **Minutes - how will contributions to background debate and points raised be formally recorded?**

- Task group discussions are informal meetings and therefore not formally minuted. Members of the task groups may wish to report progress back within their groups. The key issues raised within the task group will feed into the final report/recommendations which will be a public document. Monthly updates on the progress of each task group will be provided to OSMB via formal written update and a verbal update in the meeting. This will then be available on the webpage and circulated to all members as an e-briefing.
- OSMB is web-cast and actions notes are captured and published for this meeting.

### **How will this impact upon Public Forum?**

OSMB will be the primary mechanism for receiving public forum. This is a reduction from 5 public forum sessions to one however it is felt that by labelling and promoting this as Scrutiny Public Forum will make it easier for the public to submit Public Forum rather than having to navigate the structure of directorate commissions. It is proposed that improved guidance on all public forum opportunities be made available to the public.

As requested the records held by Democratic Services for the amount of public forum received in 2016-17 are set below:

<b>Neighbourhoods</b>	10
<b>People</b>	2
<b>Place</b>	10
<b>Resources</b>	0
<b>OSMB</b>	6

## An Overview of Resource Implications

Previous Scrutiny System (Commission Meetings )	New Trial System (T&F Groups)
Planning meetings included a Member of SLT and report authors to attend	No planning meetings. Planning undertaken informally with relevant officers
Formal commission meetings required a member of SLT, numerous Service Directors and Service Managers attending each meeting	<p>Less officer time required in general. T&amp;Fs can focus their agendas so target invitations to specific officers</p> <p>Relevant departmental officers are only asked to attend meetings as and when appropriate. Rarely necessary for SLT Member to attend as the operational officers are more better acquainted with the details of individual the services</p>
<p>Scrutiny Commission meetings require many formal reports to be written and signed-off by various officers across the council.</p> <p>Publish all meeting papers on Mod.Gov (Scrutiny Officers)</p> <p>Administration of Public Forum including dealing with Questions, providing hard copies etc. (Scrutiny Advisor)</p> <p>Minutes taken, written up and published (Scrutiny Advisor)</p>	<p>Few formal reports required for informal meetings. Materials for meetings are sometimes already produced for other meetings i.e. information included in cabinet reports or consultation documents</p> <p>Producing information is less onerous as this information doesn't need to be made public and can be discussed in an informal setting</p> <p>No formal minutes, any notes or action points are sent to attendees only (Scrutiny Advisor)</p>
<b><i>Higher levels of officer time, administration and preparation required</i></b>	<b><i>Less officer time, administration and preparation required</i></b>

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD – COMMENTS TO OSM RE WAYS OF WORKING REPORT**

**Summary**

Councillors Gollop, Alexander, English and Negus, as the lead Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, met on 29<sup>th</sup> January 2018 to consider the draft Ways of Working report and agree areas of consensus. Their detailed findings are listed below, but the headline recommendations are as follows;

- 1. That ‘Option C’ in the attached Ways of Working report be the recommended model with the exception that scrutiny of the budget/MTFP be passed from OSM to the Resources Committee. The revised model is set out below.**

*Option C – Departmental Alignment (based on the new draft staff structure)*

<p><b>OSMB</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4 meetings per year</li> <li>• Responsibility includes Corporate Risk Register and Performance</li> <li>• Responsibility for overall scrutiny work programme</li> </ul>			
<p><b>Growth &amp; Regeneration Scrutiny Committee</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 4 meetings per year</li> <li>- Commissions its own T&amp;F group/s</li> </ul>	<p><b>Communities Scrutiny Committee</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 4 meetings per year</li> <li>- Commissions its own T&amp;F group/s</li> </ul>	<p><b>Care &amp; Safeguarding Scrutiny Committee</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 4 meetings per year</li> <li>- Health Sub-committee meets 4 times per year</li> <li>- Commissions its own T&amp;F group/s</li> </ul>	<p><b>Resources Committee</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2 meetings per year</li> <li>- Has 1 x Budget/MTFP related T&amp;F Group</li> </ul>

**Key features:**

- 22 formal meetings
- Up to 5 T&Fs over the course of the year (including Budget/MTFP) to be commissioned between OSMB, Growth & Regeneration Committee, Communities Committee and Care & Safeguarding Committee (\*\*See note after option D)
- Mechanisms included for Children and Safeguarding issues (via Care & Safeguarding Committee)
- Regular public scrutiny
- Formal public scrutiny shared between six committees, not solely with OSMB

## **Key Findings of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board Lead Members;**

1. The Task and Finish pilot had led to some effective scrutiny, particularly by enabling deep dives into particular subject areas, however, this had led to a reduction in overview type scrutiny activity which would need to be addressed in any model operating in the longer term.
2. Scrutiny (and the Council as a whole) was operating with reduced resources and that needed to be reflected in the chosen model going forward.
3. The primary purpose of Scrutiny was to hold the Executive to account, but the current Cabinet structure could not be effectively mirrored due to the cross nature of portfolios and any potential changes to Cabinet responsibilities. It would make more sense for Scrutiny to base its model on the City Council directorates.
4. Scrutiny of the budget and MTFP should sit with the Resources Scrutiny Commission since those Members had the appropriate financial expertise, which would bring added value.
5. Monitoring the performance of the Council was an important function of Scrutiny and therefore additional consideration should be given to the appropriate mechanism for this, including the selection of Key Performance Indicators etc. A workshop specifically to review this area was recommended.
6. OSM should retain control of the Scrutiny Work Programme but the Commission/Task and Finish Chairs should have more of a role in managing priorities and this would be best enabled through regular informal meetings (i.e. 'Leads meetings'). The existing arrangement of Scrutiny Commission/Task and Finish chairs sitting on OSM should be continued.
7. The fluid approach to membership of the Scrutiny Task and Finish Groups had presented challenges. In future Task and Finish Group membership should be politically proportionate with appointments made by the Whips.
8. The situation regarding remuneration for Scrutiny Commission/Task and Finish Groups Chairs/Vice Chairs needed to be considered by the Independent Remuneration Panel once the final Scrutiny structure had been agreed.
9. Members had an important role in keeping a 'watching brief' on relevant areas, but Scrutiny should not be used as a way of briefing Members thus taking up valuable time in meetings and often excluding other Members who could be interested.
10. Any future Task and Finish Groups should be carefully planned before commencement so that the objectives and timetable were clear; only those that had a tight remit and purpose should be taken forward with other topics taking a more traditional scrutiny route. Some of the Task and Finish Groups selected for the pilot had ill-defined remits and were therefore never likely to deliver significant outcomes.

## Overview and Scrutiny Management Board 12th February 2018



**Report of:** Andrea Dell, Statutory Scrutiny Officer

**Title:** OSMB Statement on the Arena

**Ward:** City Wide

**Officer Presenting Report:** Andrea Dell, Statutory Scrutiny Officer

**Contact Telephone Number:** 0117 9222483

### Recommendation

1. That the Board note the submission to Cabinet on 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2018.
2. That the Board agree next steps for the scrutiny of this item ahead of the April 2018 Cabinet meeting.

### Summary

The Board submitted the below statement to 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2018 Cabinet.

At the 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2018 OSMB meeting Members were advised that the outcome of the value for money study into the arena and the subsequent decision will be presented to Cabinet in April 2018.

OSMB Members resolved that that scrutiny of this item will be required prior to April 2018. The Members are asked to consider and agree the most appropriate method of scrutiny (e.g. Task and Finish and/or formal meeting and/or workshop etc.). Consideration should be given to the timescales and potentially commercially sensitive information. It should be noted that the next OSMB meeting is scheduled for Thursday 8<sup>th</sup> March 2018.

**Referral to 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2018 Cabinet**

At today's meeting (22 January 2018) OSMB has received an update report on the Bristol Arena. Members were advised that the outcome of the value for money report and the subsequent decision on the Arena project was to be scheduled for the April 2018 Cabinet meeting.

OSMB members have significant concerns that this timing is unlikely to permit any meaningful scrutiny activity (either OSMB and/or Task and Finish work) and specifically that members in wards adjoining either site and/or on transport routes to either site will not have any opportunity to contribute to the decision making process or bring forward the views of their constituents despite the significant impact of the decision upon their communities.

OSMB Members were keen to highlight that, whilst they strongly feel the need for scrutiny on this item, it is acknowledged that due to the commercial nature of the project this may have to be done in way that respects commercial sensitivity\* and also does not further delay decision making.

OSMB members therefore seek assurance from the Mayor that he will work with officers to enable meaningful scrutiny on this item prior to the publication of the Cabinet reports for the April meeting.

\*\*

*\*It was noted that a full review of the exempt procedures process needs to be carried out and that this should be informed by the government's Select Committee into Scrutiny and recent guidance from the CfPS.*

*\*\*It was noted that consideration will need to be given to the Easter Holidays and the possible moving of the Cabinet date to later in April.*

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985**

Background Papers: None.

## Overview and Scrutiny Management Board 12th February 2018



**Report of:** Andrea Dell, Statutory Scrutiny Officer

**Title:** Libraries Task and Finish Group Update

**Ward:** City Wide

**Officer Presenting Report:** N/A

**Contact Telephone Number:** 0117 9222483

### **Recommendation**

That the Board note the update from the Libraries Task and Finish group which is to be provided following a workshop scheduled for 7<sup>th</sup> February 2018.

### **Summary**

OSMB submitted the Libraries Task and Finish group report to Cabinet on 4<sup>th</sup> December 2017. This update from the group is to set out the activity that has occurred following the report's presentation to OMSB on 1<sup>st</sup> November.

Links are included to the full OSMB report and the Full Council motion on libraries in November 2017 for supporting information.



**BACKGROUND****OSMB – November 2017**

OSMB received the report of the Libraries Task and Finish groups on 1<sup>st</sup> November 2017 and this is available here:

<https://democracy.bristol.gov.uk/documents/s16976/Libraries%20Cover%20Report%20for%20OSMB%20011117.pdf>

**FULL COUNCIL - November 2017**

Details of the motion debated at Full Council on Thursday 14<sup>th</sup> November can be found here:

<https://democracy.bristol.gov.uk/mgAi.aspx?ID=9528>

Following debate, upon being put to the vote, the motion was CARRIED (32 members voting in favour, 31 against, with 1 abstention), and it was then RESOLVED:

Council notes the proposals by the Mayor to reduce the amount of libraries in Bristol from 27 to 10 libraries.

Council understands the difficult financial situation that Bristol City Council faces and the need to reduce costs during a time of reducing budgets and increasing demographic demand.

Council welcomes the petition by Love Bristol Libraries, various other library groups and campaigners, and believes there is strong public support for maintaining Bristol's library provision.

Council notes the report from the Libraries Task and Finish Scrutiny Group, notes that it had input from all political parties and that the recommendations have the support of councillors from Conservative, Green, Labour and Liberal Democrat parties. The report also received the endorsement of OSMB.

Council endorses the central proposal to begin work on creating a mutual model for delivery of a comprehensive library service that will be professionally led, volunteer supported and ensures a network of branch libraries is maintained across the city. These proposals will also guarantee the jobs of professional library staff providing them with a secure future working alongside volunteers.

Council calls on the Mayor to bring forward new proposals based on the long term future of Libraries, an important principle for the ambitions of a Learning City. This new proposal to have a strategic approach that delivers a professionally led mutual model that embraces volunteers and secures the future of the library network.

**CABINET - December 2017**

The report was submitted to Cabinet on 4<sup>th</sup> December 2017 and this is available here:

<https://democracy.bristol.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=135&MId=2560&Ver=4>

The following response was provided by the Mayor in the Cabinet meeting:

*As you know, a decision on the future of Bristol's library service is not being made today and the service will remain as it is until a further review is completed.*

*Following the results of the consultation, which saw a large number of respondents reject all three options and comment ‘none of the above’, the council has decided to continue the conversation, and explore other options.*

*We have secured money from Department of Culture, Media and Sport enabling us to commission a consultant to assess whether an alternative delivery model – for example a mutual, trust or commercial provider - could be appropriate for the future service. This is obviously closely aligned to the Libraries Task and Finish Group’s report recommendation 1.2.2 to pursue a dialogue with community minded organisations, such as Universities etc.*

*We will wait until the conclusion of this review, before making a final decision.*

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985**

Background Papers: None.

Scrutiny Task and Finish - Progress Updates and Next Steps (February 2018)

	Group Title	Progress update and next steps
1	<p><b>Parks</b>  <i>Scrutiny Advisor:</i>  <i>Romayne de Fonseca</i></p>	<p>The Group met on 11<sup>th</sup> December and focussed on the revised financial situation since the removal of the requirement to become cost-neutral by 2020, also an update on the ongoing public consultation. Discussion also centred around the merits of alternative models of service delivery. Representatives from the Parks Forum attended the meeting and partook in the discussion. The next meeting will be on 6<sup>th</sup> February and will include the Parks Forum briefing members on the details of the impending Nesta bid (“Rethinking Parks”) which is being made jointly by the Parks Forum and BCC.</p>
2	<p><b>Council Commissioning &amp; Contracts</b>  <i>Scrutiny Advisor:</i>  <i>Louise deCordova</i></p>	<p>The Contracts and Commissioning task group met on 13 December and considered an annual review of the council’s application of the Social Value Policy Toolkit in procurement, which included stakeholder feedback and expert evidence from the voluntary sector (VOSCUR) and the Federation of Small Business (FSB). In addition, the group discussed the concept of using public services, through ‘anchor institutions’, to build better local economies. From the discussion, two work streams emerged:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A refresh of the Social Value Policy Toolkit <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To improve the understanding and the engagement of micro and small businesses with the Council’s procurement processes e.g. through plain English guidance, sample case studies, and a ‘bidder’s event’.</li> <li>• To share and develop the consideration of social value policy in procurement with other public sector ‘anchor’ institutions and city partners.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Make the case for collaborative procurement and encourage procurement-in-line-with-values in the city through Anchor Institutions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To facilitate a process of consultation and engagement with the Mayor and Cabinet, anchor institutions and city stakeholders to consider the benefits of, and make the case for, collaborative procurement to build a better city economy.</li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p>Members will hold a joint session on 7 February, with the Adults and Children’s Social Services Task Groups to consider how elected members can have earlier engagement in the procurement and commissioning process. The session will be a dialogue with commissioners, considering lessons learned from previous commissioning processes and propose recommendations for future councillor engagement.</p> <p>Future meeting dates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 7/2/18 (joint session with the Adults and Children’s Social Care task groups)</li> </ul>
3a	<p><b>Demand on Social Services (Adults)</b>  <i>Scrutiny Advisor:</i></p>	<p>Members agreed a joint session with Children’s Social Services and the Contracts and Commissioning Task and Finish Groups to consider how elected members can have earlier engagement in the procurement and commissioning process.</p>

	Group Title	Progress update and next steps
	<i>Louise deCordova</i>	<p>Future meetings will discuss Delayed Transfers of Care, consider social prescribing and explore the potential for use of assistive technology to transform services and save resources.</p> <p>Future meeting dates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 7/2/18 (joint session)</li> <li>• 19/02/18</li> <li>• 26/02/18 (rescheduled from 22/1/18)</li> <li>• 19/03/18</li> </ul>
<b>3b</b>	<b>Demand on Social Services (Children)</b> <i>Scrutiny Advisor:</i> <i>Louise deCordova</i>	<p>Members agreed a joint session with the Adult Social Services and the Contracts and Commissioning Task and Finish Groups to consider how elected members can have earlier engagement in the procurement and commissioning process.</p> <p>Future meetings will seek to carry out stakeholder activity with young people to understand how to prevent children and young people going into care; and develop subject knowledge/expertise.</p> <p>Future meeting dates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 7/2/18 (joint session)</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>Council Assets</b> <i>Scrutiny Advisor:</i> <i>Jo Holmes</i>	<p>The Council Assets Group is now Chaired by Cllr O'Rourke. They met on the 26/01/18 at which the Interim Head of Asset Management provided an overview presentation on Asset Management, Best Practice, Developing a Property Strategy and what this means for Bristol City Council and the City.</p> <p>The aim of the meeting was to ensure that all members of the group are at a consistent level of understanding and reach a consensus of opinion on the direction and focus moving forward. The discussions focused on the approach being taken, what type of council Bristol aspires to be in the future. There was general agreement amongst members that for the time being the group would take a strategic view and follow the developmental process with property officers and then when the time is right they will likely select a specific strand of property to focus their attention on.</p> <p>The next meeting is currently being arranged for February where Colin Molton (Interim Executive Director: Growth and Regeneration) and Cllr Cheney (Cabinet Member for Finance, Governance and Performance) will also attend.</p>
<b>5</b>	<b>Cribbs Patchway New Neighbourhood</b> <i>Scrutiny Advisor: Jo Holmes</i>	<p>The group last met on the 11<sup>th</sup> January. This was a single agenda item meeting where Transport Officers briefed Members of the group on the current developments and outcome of the Network Rail report with regards to the options for the new Henbury train station.</p>

	Group Title	Progress update and next steps
		<p>Transport Officers have said that the modelling scenario information / results for the main transport corridors still isn't yet available. They are currently looking at ways to begin some of the outline preparation work in advance so that they can present this to Members fairly soon.</p> <p>The Scrutiny Advisor is regularly asking Transport Officers when they will be ready to take this forward with the group. Date of next meeting is TBC</p>
6	<b>Air Quality &amp; Pollution</b> <i>Scrutiny Advisor: Jo Holmes</i>	<p>A meeting was held on the 8<sup>th</sup> January where Members were taken through content of the forthcoming February Cabinet Report which included the technical work undertaken for options for the development of a 'Clean Air Plan for Bristol'. This meeting was carried out with Members in advance of the Cabinet Report being published so that the Task and Finish Group's views could be taken into account and also included in the Cabinet report as 'feedback from Scrutiny'.</p> <p>Date of the next meeting and the details are yet TBC</p>
7	<b>Children's Centres</b> <i>Scrutiny Advisor: Romayne de Fonseca</i>	<p>An initial briefing with the Service Manager is to be arranged, to bring members up to speed on the new model currently under implementation and to agree what the outcome measures of the new model will be. Following this, the Group will start work in the early autumn to allow the new structure time to bed in.</p>
8	<b>Libraries</b> <i>Scrutiny Advisor: Romayne de Fonseca</i>	<p>The Conclusions of the T&amp;F Group went to Cabinet on 4<sup>th</sup> December and a formal response was provided by the Mayor. This concludes Phase 1 of the Group's work, which now moves on to Phase 2. An engagement workshop for members led by Mutual Ventures consultants is planned for 7<sup>th</sup> February, subject to the agreement of the Chair. The T&amp;F Group will decide about future meeting dates.</p>
9	<b>Fire Safety in Council-owned High Rise Buildings</b> <i>Scrutiny Advisor: Romayne de Fonseca</i>	<p>Proposed that this would take place after the government recommendations have been issued. The timescale for this is unclear at the present time.</p>
10	<b>Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) / Budget</b> <i>Scrutiny Advisor: Louise deCordova</i>	<p>Members held a meeting on the 5/1/18 and 16/1/18 to review the work of the group to date and consider the published Budget.</p> <p>Public meetings took place with OSMB on 18<sup>th</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2018 to review the corporate strategy and budget consultation documents and proposals, and contribute to recommendations and comments to Cabinet.</p> <p>Future meeting dates to be considered in due course.</p>
11	<b>Youth Council</b>	<p>There are no further up-dates since the previous one which is that Bristol City Youth Council (BCYC) have said that they</p>

	<b>Group Title</b>	<b>Progress update and next steps</b>
	<i>Scrutiny Advisor: Jo Holmes</i>	would welcome some support towards their priority of 'Education for Life - Current PSHE curriculum'. Details of what this is, how and when it will happen will be discussed and agreed at a meeting on Monday 5 <sup>th</sup> February (postponed from 8 <sup>th</sup> January).

## Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme 2017 / 2018 – Potential Topics

### September 17

#### Standing Items;

- Scrutiny Work Programme – including arising items
- Task and Finish Groups – updates from Chairs
- Ways of Working – Feedback (verbal items)
- Budget Monitor Report
- Mayor’s Forward Plan

### November 17

- Budget Scrutiny approach including update from MTFP group
- OSM referral to Mayor
- Libraries T&F Report
- Flood Risk Strategy
- Waste Company update

#### Standing Items;

- Scrutiny Work Programme – including arising items
- Task and Finish Groups – updates from Chairs
- Ways of Working – Feedback (verbal items)
- Budget Monitor Report
- Mayor’s Forward Plan

### December 17 – 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting (7<sup>th</sup> December)

- Safeguarding Adults and Safeguarding Children Boards Annual Reports 16-17
- Budget Scrutiny Timeline
- Council Tax Base
- Collection Fund
- The Arena – position paper
- Senior Officer Restructure Timetable

#### Standing Items;

- Scrutiny Work Programme – including arising items

- Task and Finish Groups – updates from Chairs
- Ways of Working – Feedback (verbal items)
- Budget Monitor Report
- Mayor’s Forward Plan

### **December 17 – 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting (18<sup>th</sup> December)**

#### **Extraordinary meeting;**

- Companies Update –Bristol Holding and Bristol Waste (exempt session)

### **January 18 - 1<sup>st</sup> meeting (11<sup>th</sup> January)**

- **Mayor’s Question time –informal discussion time with Mayor**
- **Bristol Energy (exempt session)**

#### **Standing Items;**

- Page 64
- Scrutiny Work Programme – including arising items
  - Task and Finish Groups – updates from Chairs
  - Ways of Working – Feedback (verbal items)
  - Budget Monitor Report
  - Mayor’s Forward Plan

### **January 18 - 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting (18<sup>th</sup> January)**

#### **Extraordinary meeting (s);**

- Feedback from MTFP working group
- Budget Scrutiny

### **January 18 – 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting (22<sup>nd</sup> January)**

#### **Extraordinary meeting (s);**

- Arena
- Budget Scrutiny
-

## February 18

- Update from Libraries proposals (provisional)
- Update re Arena (provisional)
- Scrutiny Ways of Working Proposals

### Standing Items;

- Scrutiny Work Programme – including arising items
- Task and Finish Groups – updates from Chairs
- Ways of Working – Feedback (verbal items)
- Budget Monitor Report
- Mayor's Forward Plan

## March 18

- Quality of Life Survey Outcomes (plus potential discussion re KPIs)

### Potential Item;

- The Arena (prior to April 18 Cabinet Decision)

### Standing Items;

- Scrutiny Work Programme – including arising items
- Task and Finish Groups – updates from Chairs
- Ways of Working – Feedback (verbal items)
- Budget Monitor Report
- Mayor's Forward Plan

## April 18

- Risk Register (date TBC)

### Standing Items;

- Scrutiny Work Programme – including arising items
- Task and Finish Groups – updates from Chairs
- Ways of Working – Feedback (verbal items)
- Budget Monitor Report

- Mayor's Forward Plan

**Potential Items to be scheduled – regular updates etc;**

- Corporate Parenting Panel Annual Report (**previously Nov 2016**)
- Education and Skills - Annual Education Performance – All Key Stages (**previously Jan 2017**)
- The Learning City Board work programme
- Health Scrutiny – joint with the Neighbourhoods Scrutiny commission - The Health and Wellbeing Board Work Programme
- Health Scrutiny Health Providers - Quality Account Reports
- School Admissions Annual Report - update due late May/early June so observations can be included in the comments section of the Office of the Schools Adjudicator (OSA) Annual Report
- Crime and Disorder Report
- Risk Register (date TBC)
- Performance report (date TBC)
- Update on the HRA (date TBC – possibly 18/19)

Overview and Scrutiny Management Board  
12th February 2018



**Report of:** Shahzia Daya, Service Director, Legal and Democratic Services

**Title:** Mayor's Forward Plan (Standing Item)

**Ward:** City Wide

**Officer Presenting Report:** Lucy Fleming, Democratic and Scrutiny Manager

**Contact Telephone Number:** 0117 9222483

**Recommendation**

That the Board receive the current edition of the Mayor's Forward Plan of Key Decisions to help inform the Scrutiny Work Programme for 2017/18 and beyond.

**Summary**

The report provides the latest version of the Mayor's Forward Plan

**The significant issues in the report are:**

The Board will wish to identify any forthcoming Key Decisions that will require input from Scrutiny.



## **Background**

1. The Mayor's Forward Plan is published monthly to give notice of key decisions that will be considered by the Cabinet, Health & Wellbeing Board or Learning City Partnership Board. A key decision is defined as one which;

- Will result in expenditure of £500K or over
- Will result in savings of £500K or over
- Be significant in terms of its effects on communities living or working in two or more wards in the city

2. The Overview and Scrutiny Management Board (OSMB) will wish to review the list of forthcoming Key Decisions to ensure any relevant items can be considered by Scrutiny.

The latest version of the report can be found at appendix A.

## **LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985**

Background Papers: None.

Appendix A – Mayor's Forward Plan

# Forward plan



THIS DOCUMENT GIVES NOTICE OF  
ANTICIPATED KEY DECISIONS TO BE TAKEN  
AT CABINET AND OTHER MEETINGS

This update published 25 January 2018

Democratic Services

Contact: Sam Wilcock, Democratic Services Officer, email: [sam.wilcock@bristol.gov.uk](mailto:sam.wilcock@bristol.gov.uk)

Tel: 0117 92 23846

## BRISTOL CITY COUNCIL - FORWARD PLAN INDEX OF PROPOSED KEY DECISIONS

The Forward Plan gives notice of anticipated key decisions to be taken at Cabinet, Health and Wellbeing Board and Learning City Partnership Board meetings. It will be updated and published on the Council website [www.bristol.gov.uk](http://www.bristol.gov.uk) on a monthly basis.

### **Key Decision**

Under the Council's constitution, the definition of a key decision is a decision which is likely to:

- 1) Result in expenditure of £500,000 or over.
- 2) Result in savings of £500,000 or over.
- 3) Be significant in terms of its effects on communities living or working in two or more wards in the city.

### **Non-key Decision**

For additional information and completeness the Forward Plan also contains those items which are outside the definition of a key decision.

### **Cabinet Meetings**

The Cabinet will normally meet on a Tuesday on a six weekly cycle. Meetings start at 4pm and are currently held at City Hall, College Green Bristol, BS1 5TR. Meetings of the Cabinet are open to the public with the exception of discussion regarding reports which contain exempt/confidential, commercially sensitive or personal information which will be identified in the Mayor's Forward Plan).

Reports submitted to the Mayor and Cabinet will be available on the council's website 5 clear working days before the date the decision can be made. If you would like a copy by email please contact [democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk)

## Glossary:

HWB Health and Wellbeing Board

LCPB Learning City Partnership Board

APR15 Under the Council's Constitution if a key decision needs to be taken with less than 28 days' notice, it can still be taken under **APR15 – General Exception**, if it is impracticable to defer it until the next scheduled Cabinet meeting. The relevant Scrutiny Commission must be notified and the report published as part of the agenda 5 clear working days ahead of the Cabinet meeting

Description of Exempt Information :- England, Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the local Government Act 1972

1	Information relating to any individual.
2	Information which is likely to reveal the identity of an individual.
3	Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).
4	Information relating to any consultations or negotiations, or contemplated consultations or negotiations, with any labour relations matter arising between the authority or a Minister of the Crown and employees of, or office holders under the authority.
5	Information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings.
6	Information which reveals that the authority proposes (a) to give under any enactment a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person; Or  (b) to make an order or direction under any enactment.
7	Information relating to any action taken or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of a crime.

## **Cabinet Members**

- Marvin Rees (Lab) - Mayor of Bristol
- Cllr Craig Cheney (Lab) – Designated Deputy Mayor (with special responsibility for Finance, Governance and Performance)
- Cllr Asher Craig (Lab) – Deputy Mayor (with special responsibility for Communities - Public Health, Public Transport, Libraries, Parks, Events and Equalities)
- Cllr Nicola Beech – Cabinet Member for Spatial Planning and City Design
- Cllr Kye Dudd (Lab) – Cabinet Member for Energy, Waste and Regulatory Services
- Cllr Helen Godwin (Lab) – Cabinet Member for Children’s Services
- Cllr Helen Holland (Lab) – Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care
- Cllr Anna Keen (Lab) – Cabinet Member for Education and Skills
- Cllr Paul Smith (Lab) – Cabinet Member for Housing
- Cllr Mhairi Trelfall (Lab) – Cabinet Member for Transport and Connectivity

Lead Officer	Title and summary of Decision	Meeting date	Decision taker	Scrutiny Remit
Terry Dafter terry.dafter@bristol.gov.uk	<p><b>Bristol - becoming an Age-Friendly City</b> This report seeks approval to start the process for Bristol to become a World Health Organisation Age-Friendly City and to join the Global Network for Age-Friendly Cities and Communities.</p> <p>Open</p>	Cabinet 6 Mar 2018	Councillor Helen Holland	Overview and Scrutiny Management Board/ People Scrutiny Commission
Alex Minshull Alex.Minshull@bristol.gov.uk	<p><b>Improving Public Health - A Clean Air Plan for Bristol</b> This report seeks approval to proceed with the application and the acceptance of further grant funding from Defra to carry out the new statutory direction set by the Government in relation to a clean air action plan, according to the detailed guidance and timetable issued by Defra.</p> <p>Open</p>	Cabinet 6 Mar 2018	Councillor Mhairi Threlfall, Councillor Kye Dudd	Overview and Scrutiny Management Board/ Place Scrutiny Commission
Terry Dafter terry.dafter@bristol.gov.uk	<p><b>Better Lives Programme</b> A report to seek approval for the Better Lives programme approach and objectives, and the investment priorities for the Improved Better Care Fund (IBCF). Also to consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The procurement of a consultant</li> <li>2. The rollout of mobile technology to social work staff</li> <li>3. The increased rate for home care that has been applied since November 2017.</li> </ol> <p>Open</p>	Cabinet 6 Mar 2018	Councillor Helen Holland	Overview and Scrutiny Management Board/ People Scrutiny Commission

Lead Officer	Title and summary of Decision	Meeting date	Decision taker	Scrutiny Remit
Mark Halligan mark.halligan@bristol.gov.uk	<p><b>Lawrence Weston Health &amp; Community Hub</b> Report to consider the proposal to create a Health &amp; Community Hub in Lawrence Weston and agreement for the associated capital investment</p> <p>Open</p>	Cabinet 6 Mar 2018	Councillor Asher Craig	Overview and Scrutiny Management Board/ Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Commission
Patsy Mellor patsy.mellor@bristol.gov.uk	<p><b>Discretionary Business Rate Relief (DRR) for Charities, Not-For-Profit &amp; Voluntary Organisations</b> We will be undertaking a public consultation process on potential amendments to the existing policy for awarding this discretionary relief. The purpose of this report is to present the results of the consultation and to propose a revised policy for approval, and implementation in April 2018.</p> <p>Open</p>	Cabinet 6 Mar 2018	Councillor Craig Cheney	Overview and Scrutiny Management Board/ Resources Scrutiny Commission
Denise Murray denise.murray@bristol.gov.uk	<p><b>2017/18 Budget Monitoring Report - P9 (Non-key)</b> The Council approved budgets and directorate spending limits for the 2017/18 financial year on 21 February 2017. The purpose of this report is to inform Cabinet of the Council's overall financial performance against revenue and capital budgets as at the end of December 2017</p> <p>Open</p>	Cabinet 6 Mar 2018	Councillor Craig Cheney	Overview and Scrutiny Management Board/ Resources Scrutiny Commission

Lead Officer	Title and summary of Decision	Meeting date	Decision taker	Scrutiny Remit
Denise Murray denise.murray@bristol.gov.uk	<p><b>2017/18 Budget Monitoring Report - P10 (Non-key)</b></p> <p>The Council approved budgets and directorate spending limits for the 2017/18 financial year on 21 February 2017. The purpose of this report is to inform Cabinet of the Council's overall financial performance against revenue and capital budgets as at the end of January 2018</p> <p>Open</p>	Cabinet 3 Apr 2018	Councillor Craig Cheney	Overview and Scrutiny Management Board/ Resources Scrutiny Commission