

**Herefordshire Partnership  
Sub-group meeting  
Chairs of Policy and Delivery Groups  
Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> November 2009**

**Present:**

Chris Bull – Herefordshire Council & NHS Herefordshire  
Sharon Menghini – Children’s Trust  
Rob Garner – Environment Partnership  
Geoff Hughes – Stronger Communities Partnership  
Dr Akeem Ali – Health and Wellbeing Partnership  
Angela Smith – Economic Development Partnership  
Paul Baker - Safer Herefordshire and Supporting People Board  
Mark Turner - Safer Herefordshire

**In Attendance:**

Gabrielle Wright - WMP Strategic Partnership Manager  
Karen Morris - Herefordshire Council Resources Directorate  
Chris Bucknell – Herefordshire Partnership Support Team  
Philippa Lydford – Herefordshire Partnership Support Team

**Purpose of the meeting:**

To discuss and agree the methodology for commissioning Area Based Grant for 2010/11 and process for allocating LPSA Capital funding.

**The following papers had been circulated:**

- Briefing paper giving background information and modeled options for distributing ABG
- Synopsis of Herefordshire Partnership Commissioning Guidelines
- Report and outline capital proposals as presented to the HP Management Group in September 2009

**Key points and agreements:**

<b>Area Based Grants (ABG)</b>
--------------------------------

**Considerations**

- The need for timely commissioning for 2010/11 to inform budget setting and service planning process (process agreed and communicated by December 2009)
- Individual grant allocations to Herefordshire fluctuate between years.
- Acknowledgment that ABG is not new money and has existing commitments/contracts against it, including salaries.
- Grant allocations are indicated on the Communities and Local Government website, but are susceptible to revision by National Agencies and Central Government. Any agreements made will be subject to ongoing updates on grant levels.
- Role of the Supporting People Commissioning Board and the way this links to Policy and Delivery Groups needs to be considered.
- The need to ascertain whether projects funded from the flexible pot in 2009/10 had made an impact.

- Flexible pot should be used to add value, funding new work and avoiding duplication.
- In the final year of the LAA funding should be focused on areas where there is a risk to achievement of the targets.
- The percentage top slice should be high enough to make a significant difference and deliver real outcomes, whilst still considering the ongoing risk to existing services.
- Budgets likely to be tighter for all partners next year, so the percentage cannot be too big.
- Percentage top slice effectively takes larger sums off those partnerships with most grants, does this need to be factored in?
- The group needs to debate what is important and agree overall priorities rather than invite individual proposals against the flexible pot.
- Funding should be targeted on areas not funded anywhere else, new priorities or something that can only be delivered in partnership
- Other funding streams should be considered and there should not be an overreliance on ABG. There was a need to recognise that all partners' funding can impact on the LAA; a new mindset is needed rather than more money.
- Supporting People is an example of existing cross partnership working and a mechanism for making sure that funding was available across the relevant Policy and Delivery Groups needed to be devised.
- Funding should be prioritised to areas that show true partnership working, addressing LAA targets.
- Arrange an event next year saying what we are doing as a group and what difference the Area Based Grant has made.

### **Agreements**

- That the calculation should be based on Table 3 with the Environment and Economic Development Groups having their 2009/10 flexible allocation taken into account.
- That a 95% guarantee should be applied but this calculation should be made **after** the adjustment for the two Policy and Delivery groups mentioned above.
- That the Partnership Support Team would produce figures based on this methodology for discussion at the Management Group
- This methodology would be adopted unless grant values change radically in November, then the percentage would be re-assessed.
- A separate constructive report on Supporting people and how to move it forward to go to the Management group as soon as possible. Look at representation on Commissioning Board and opportunities to improve commissioning, including underspend.
- That the Partnership Support Team would work up some criteria for targeting the flexible allocation. Bidding needs innovation, not necessarily based on decommissioning.
- That the Partnership should move to a position of commissioning against identified priorities rather than merely inviting bids.

<b>Capital funding:</b>
-------------------------

### **Considerations**

- Capital funding available from the LPSA reward grant is approximately £1.3million although the second stage claim has still to be submitted and agreed.
- Funding is not time limited.

- The LPSA revenue funding was allocated to two specific areas. The principle had been agreed that this would be taken into account when the capital funding was allocated.
- There were various ways capital funding could be allocated. A significant amount could be allocated to one project to make a difference, or to various smaller projects. It was felt that there should not be too many small projects as the impact would not be recognized.
- Projects should have an impact countywide, addressing the needs of the whole community.
- The need for sustainability and revenue support in future years should be considered.
- Capital could be allocated around the same priorities as those identified for the Area Based Grant revenue funding.
- The Partnership as a whole should agree the priorities and then invite proposals.
- Consideration should be given to proposals that have the potential to create income that can be re-invested.
- Revenue through ABG is only for next year, so in principle any project with Partnership investment would need confirmation that funding was on-going.
- Consideration should be given to how large projects could enable cost reductions (efficiencies of scale).
- The Chair of the Health and Wellbeing Partnership offered to supply data around ambitions and identify what impact could be achieved.
- While the funding is not time limited, one project that came in through the expressions of interest (Grange Court) is time limited and will lose funding (approximately 1.9m) if match funding was not found. It was felt this was unfortunate but that it was not the responsibility of Herefordshire Partnership to fund projects just because another funding bid was unsuccessful.

### **Agreements**

- The principle that we do not support lots of small projects, but a limited number of large projects with demographic and geographic spread.
- That the Partnership should move to a position of commissioning against identified priorities rather than merely inviting bids.
- Any proposals should be linked to achievement of the LAA targets and cover areas where investing significant amounts of funding has the potential to make a real difference.
- Any process should take into account that areas have done a lot of work in developing existing bids.
- The Partnership Team would work out commissioning criteria, analyse data and identify priority areas. These discussions to include the Policy and Delivery Groups.
- The LAA should be analysed, identifying gaps based on performance and areas which could be fundable through capital.
- A background paper to go to the next Herefordshire Partnership Management Group on 27th November for discussion. Commissioning criteria to be developed at the meeting.