

Strategic Partnership Overview

Update report to the CBC Audit and Governance Committee, 25th October 2012

1 Summary

This paper sets out the current strategic partnerships with corporate significance and highlights those partnerships which link to the strategic risk register and require regular monitoring due to the finance, governance implications, statutory or risk scores.

The Audit and Governance Committee are requested to note the content of this report.

2 Detail

- 2.1 The partnerships are divided according to the local context: Copeland, West Cumbria, Cumbria, North England. This includes both the work undertaken by council officers and the outside bodies membership list agreed annually by Full Council.
- 2.2 The Council's Executive agreed to a partnership assessment tool based on CIPFA best practice. This is reproduced in appendix 2. This scores each partnership against 6 partnership significance factors and has been applied to the list of strategic partnerships the Council is currently engaged in. The scoring has been undertaken by officers working with the partnerships in the first instance and the scored list is attached as appendix 1.
- 2.3 We adapted the toolkit to consider local indicator assessment to ensure we had clarity on our role and capacity, value for money, effective and current terms of reference and implications of stopping.
- 2.4 There has in the past three years been a rationalisation exercise to greatly reduce the number of partnership activities within West Cumbria and Copeland. The operational partnership activities which underpin our service planning and delivery and meeting our corporate priorities are being assessed separately and will be linked to the change programme activity and reported on later in the year.
- 2.5 In assessing the strategic partnerships we are engaged with we have looked at the total and detailed significance factor scoring detail. Almost all of the partnerships have a significant or essential contribution to successful achievement of one or more corporate priorities.
 - a) The partnerships which have a total significance score of 50% or more.

75%, ie 30, of our 40 strategic partnerships, have scored 50% or more significance. We have one partnership with 100% and one with 90%, both of these relate to shared service partnership arrangements. 6 of the scored partnerships are over 60% and are related to partnerships with high reputational risk and corporate and financial risk factors. These 30 will be monitored quarterly within our corporate strategic risk reporting arrangements. The other 10 will be annually and by exception as issues arise.

b) Partnerships with major or high financial significance.

Four partnerships fall into this category with the council directly contributing or managing over £100,000 per annum into this partnership. Revs and Bens shared service partnership is in this category as are the Copeland North Country Leisure Copeland Board related to our largest contract arrangement, the Copeland Community Fund where we process the Fund grant payments (Cumbria County Council is the accountable body) and the West Cumbria Tourism Partnership where we act as the accountable body. The latter is a timed accountable body arrangement. Each of these four partnerships have active engagement from the council, terms of reference in place and are monitored on a value for money and risk basis within the contract or management arrangements.

All the locality partnerships have a moderate score linked to the resources provided by the council to assist the development and delivery of the localities as a co-ordinated approach under our Copeland Partnership arrangements.

c) Partnerships which have delegated governance from the Council.

Only two of our 41 partnerships take decisions on behalf of the council which are binding. These partnerships are the two shared service arrangements. The Copeland North Country Leisure, the Copeland Community Fund and the Energy Coast West Cumbria partnership and property Boards do not take decisions on behalf of the Council but representatives with decision making authority attend the partnership and agree to be bound by its decisions. Just under 20% of the 41 partnerships do not take decisions on behalf of the council but the council has a strong influencing role and input. In one quarter of our strategic partnerships the council representatives participating do not currently have a feedback role to the Council on the partnership. The feedback mechanisms and monitoring is an area for improvement required as part of strengthening our strategic risk management and monitoring.

d) Partnerships with an input into managing our corporate risk of major or high significance.

All of the partnerships with a corporate significance here contribute to our ongoing risk of getting best value from our resource input and partnership engagement and activity to meet our corporate priorities. The scoring matrix has highlighted twelve partnerships which contribute directly and indirectly to the management of a high priority corporate risk and 19 partnerships directly or indirectly contributing to the management of service risks. Our service planning process picks up partnership risk in delivering service objectives.

- e) Partnerships delivering a statutory or regulatory role for the council.

Just under a fifth of our strategic partnerships are arrangements we have to participate in either by law or to receive specific funding. These include the shared service partnership and the partnerships obtaining west Cumbria specific funding opportunities.

- 2.6 When assessing our current strategically significant partnerships we are happy to note that all have agreed terms of reference. We will now be ensuring that the paperwork is held centrally within the council's document management activity rather than individually within services and corporate teams. The assessment highlights that we are currently leading seven of our strategic partnerships and have self assessed that there is adequate capacity and resources currently within the council to service and/or participate in both those partnerships we have a leadership role in and those we are active partners in. All the partnerships on our strategic list have been assessed as having adequate partnership capacity and a priority plan for action within that partnership.

3 Future Partnership Review and Performance Management Activity

- 3.1 This report sets out an update on our current strategic partnership picture and highlights issues to be shared with the Audit and Governance Committee and Executive. The Council will through the Corporate Leadership Team be taking a quarterly performance review of the strategic partnerships paying attention to those scoring highly on finance, risk and corporate consequences. This will be reported by exception to the Executive and the Audit and Governance Committee. The annual review and outcome will be reported through the Council mechanisms to Full Council.
- 3.2 As the council moves through its change programme this Autumn our current strategic partnership position will be reviewed against the new council mission and operating model. Alongside this, the operational partnership scoring will be completed and highlighted issues analysed and relevant improvement action considered at service level. This operational partnership overview will then be challenged and assessed against the new priorities for the council and its future capacity arrangements to enable effective rationalisation against value for

money and corporate and service delivery requirements. Our new operating model will require strengthened operational partnership activity.

3.3 The partnership management timetable has two elements:

- a) To complete the current review and assess and amend against the new priorities and operating model for the council.

October	Sign off current strategic partnership position
November	Report on operational partnership review outcome
December	Assessment of partnership activity to deliver new priorities
February	Agree operational partnership priority, activity and capacity for 2013/14 – detailed in service plans
March	Agree strategic partnership priority, activity and capacity for 2013/14 – recommendations to Executive

- b) Moving into a structured annual partnership review cycle:

Quarterly	CLT overview of strategic partnership risk and outcomes - part of strategic risk register performance management Services report by exception on operational partnership risks and outcomes to CLT
November	Annual review of partnership using Copeland toolkit linked to corporate priority review, service planning and budget build processes
January	Report to CLT and informal executive
Jan-March	Report to Audit and Governance Committee
March	Executive report
May	Report at Full Council /Annual Meeting linked to current outside bodies list and representative approvals

Julie Betteridge
Head of Regeneration and Community
September 2012

	Level	Name of group / partnership.	Officer Liaison	Attending Officer.	Attending Member.	Partnership Significance						Impact Score	
						1	2	3	4	5	6		
	Copeland												
1	Copeland	Shared Service Partnership - Revs and Bens	Darienne Law		Gillian Troughton	5	5	5	5	5	5	100%	
2	Copeland	Shared Service Partnership - Audit	Darienne Law		Gillian Troughton	3	4	5	5	5	5	90%	
3	Copeland	North Country Leisure Board - Copeland	Julie Betteridge	as requested	Hugh Branney / John Jackson	5	5	5	4	1	3	77%	
4	Copeland	Copeland Community Fund	Julie Betteridge	Julie Betteridge	Elaine Woodburn & David Moore	5	4	5	4	5	1	80%	
5	Copeland	Copeland Partnership	Simon Walker	Paul Walker + open	Elaine Woodburn + open	1	3	3	3	5	2	57%	
6	Copeland	Home Housing Copeland Steering Group	Laurie Priebe	No	John Downie Alan Jacob	1	2	4	1	3	4	50%	
7	Copeland	CBC / Home strategic Liaison Meeting	Laurie Priebe	Laurie Priebe Julie Betteridge Paul Walker Pat Graham	George Clements	1	4.5	4	1	1	3.5	50%	
8	Copeland	Copeland Worklessness, skills and work Partnership	Chris Pickles	Chris Pickles	Officer group	3	5	3	2	1	3	57%	
9	Copeland	NE Copeland - NE Locality Partnership	Simon Walker	Simon Walker	All in area	3	5	3	2	1	2	53%	
10	Copeland	West Locality Partnership	Simon Walker	Simon Walker	All in area	3	5	3	2	1	2	53%	
11	Copeland	Mid Copeland Partnership	Simon Walker	Trudy Harrison	All in area	3	5	3	2	1	2	53%	
12	Copeland	Whitehaven Partnership	Simon Walker	Alan Hurton	All in area	3	5	3	2	1	2	53%	
13	Copeland	South Copeland Partnership	Simon Walker	Trudy Harrison	All in area	3	5	3	2	1	2	53%	
14	Copeland	Copeland Housing and sustainable communities partnership	Julie Betteridge	Laurie Priebe Debbie Cochrane Julie Betteridge	Officer group	1	4	3	2	1	3	47%	
15	Copeland	Phoenix Enterprises Ltd	Julie Betteridge	Sarah Mitchell	Officer group	2	3	3	1	1	3	43%	

	Level	Name of group / partnership.	Officer Liaison	Attending Officer.	Attending Member.	1	2	3	4	5	6	Impact Score	
16	Copeland	Copeland Coastal Initiative Board	Diane Ward	Julie Betteridge	Hugh Branney + Phil Greateorex	1	4	2	5	1	2	50%	
	Internal CBC												
17	Internal - Corporate	Moresby Site Occupiers Meeting	None	Janice Carrol, Martyn Morton, Susan Harrison and John Davies	Officer group	1	1	3	1	3	3	40%	
	West Cumbria												
18	West Cumbria Joint Working	Energy Coast West Cumbria Board (ECWC)	Paul Walker/Pat Graham/Julie Betteridge	Paul Walker	Elaine Woodburn	3	4	5	4	5	4	83%	
19	West Cumbria Joint Working	West Cumbria Strategic Forum Whitehall Group		Paul Walker	Elaine Woodburn	2	5	5	3	5	5	83%	
20	West Cumbria Joint Working	Community Safety Partnership Strategy Group	Julie Betteridge	Paul Walker	George Clements	1	5	5	3	5	5	80%	
21	West Cumbria	West Cumbria Tourism Partnership	Julie Betteridge	Julie Betteridge	Hugh Branney	4	4	4	2	1	3	60%	
22	West Cumbria Joint Working	West Cumbria Site Stakeholder Group	head of nuclear energy and planning	Head of Nuclear Energy and Planning	Elaine Woodburn Henry Wormstrup Dave Banks	1	4	4	2	3	4	60%	
23	West Cumbria	West Area District Delivery Group	Paul Walker	Paul Walker Chair	officer group	1	4	3	2	1	2	43%	
24	West Cumbria Joint Working	Child Poverty Action Group	Debbie Cochrane	Debbie Cochrane Alison Walton	Officer group	1	3	4	2	1	4	50%	
25	West Cumbria Joint Working	Energycoast Properties	Julie Betteridge	No	Elaine Woodburn	1	4	4	4	1	2	53%	
	Cumbria - County Level												
26	County Level	Cumbria Local Enterprise Partnership	Pat Graham/Julie Betteridge	none	Elaine Woodburn	1	5	5	3	1	3	60%	
27	County Level	Cumbria Leadership Forum	Paul Walker	Paul Walker	Elaine Woodburn	1	5	5	3	4	4	73%	
28	County Level	Chief Executives Group	Paul Walker	Paul Walker	Elaine Woodburn	1	5	5	3	1	3	60%	
29	County Level	joint district leaders board	Paul Walker	Paul Walker	Elaine Woodburn	1	5	3	3	1	4	57%	
30	County Level	Cumbria Resilience Forum			Elaine Woodburn	1	1	1	1	2	1	23%	
31	County Level	Cumbria Housing Executive	Laurie Priebe		George Clements	1	4	4	2	2	3.5	55%	

[illegible]

[illegible]

PARTNERSHIP SIGNIFICANCE ASSESSMENT SCOREBOARD

Partnership Name:

Please enter the score in the last column which most closely represents your partnership. Answer all applicable questions, using scores 1,2,3,4 or 5

Factor	Impact on Partnership	Measurement Method
Trust	High	Surveys, Interviews
Communication	Medium	Surveys, Interviews
Shared Values	High	Surveys, Interviews
Resource Allocation	Medium	Financial Statements, Interviews
Conflict Resolution	High	Surveys, Interviews
Market Understanding	Medium	Market Research, Interviews
Legal Framework	High	Legal Documents, Interviews
Industry Connections	Medium	Network Analysis, Interviews
Technological Innovation	High	Patent Filings, Interviews
Customer Satisfaction	Medium	Surveys, Interviews
Employee Engagement	High	Surveys, Interviews
Regulatory Compliance	High	Regulatory Filings, Interviews
Global Expansion	Medium	Market Research, Interviews
Sustainability Initiatives	High	Surveys, Interviews
Partnership Duration	Medium	Historical Data, Interviews
Geographical Proximity	Medium	Location Data, Interviews
Industry Reputation	High	Media Coverage, Interviews
Financial Stability	High	Financial Statements, Interviews
Human Capital	High	Employee Data, Interviews
Intellectual Property	High	Patent Filings, Interviews
Operational Efficiency	Medium	Process Maps, Interviews
Customer Retention	High	Surveys, Interviews
Supplier Relationships	Medium	Supplier Data, Interviews
Government Relations	High	Government Filings, Interviews
Academic Research	Medium	Research Papers, Interviews
Non-Profit Partnerships	High	Partnership Agreements, Interviews
Joint Ventures	High	Joint Venture Agreements, Interviews
Strategic Alliances	High	Strategic Alliance Agreements, Interviews
Franchise Models	High	Franchise Agreements, Interviews
Licensing Agreements	High	Licensing Agreements, Interviews
Joint Development	High	Joint Development Agreements, Interviews
Co-branding	High	Co-branding Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Exit Strategies	High	Exit Strategy Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Termination	High	Termination Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Renewal	High	Renewal Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Expansion	High	Expansion Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Diversification	High	Diversification Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Integration	High	Integration Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Synergy	High	Synergy Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Innovation	High	Innovation Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Growth	High	Growth Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Success	High	Success Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Failure	High	Failure Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Lessons Learned	High	Lessons Learned Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Best Practices	High	Best Practices Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Case Studies	High	Case Studies Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Research	High	Research Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Analysis	High	Analysis Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Evaluation	High	Evaluation Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Monitoring	High	Monitoring Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Reporting	High	Reporting Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Communication	High	Communication Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Collaboration	High	Collaboration Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Coordination	High	Coordination Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Organization	High	Organization Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Management	High	Management Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Leadership	High	Leadership Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Teamwork	High	Teamwork Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Accountability	High	Accountability Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Responsibility	High	Responsibility Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Commitment	High	Commitment Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Dedication	High	Dedication Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Passion	High	Passion Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Enthusiasm	High	Enthusiasm Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Energy	High	Energy Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Motivation	High	Motivation Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Inspiration	High	Inspiration Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Creativity	High	Creativity Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Innovation	High	Innovation Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Growth	High	Growth Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Success	High	Success Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Failure	High	Failure Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Lessons Learned	High	Lessons Learned Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Best Practices	High	Best Practices Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Case Studies	High	Case Studies Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Research	High	Research Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Analysis	High	Analysis Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Evaluation	High	Evaluation Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Monitoring	High	Monitoring Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Reporting	High	Reporting Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Communication	High	Communication Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Collaboration	High	Collaboration Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Coordination	High	Coordination Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Organization	High	Organization Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Management	High	Management Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Leadership	High	Leadership Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Teamwork	High	Teamwork Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Accountability	High	Accountability Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Responsibility	High	Responsibility Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Commitment	High	Commitment Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Dedication	High	Dedication Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Passion	High	Passion Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Enthusiasm	High	Enthusiasm Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Energy	High	Energy Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Motivation	High	Motivation Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Inspiration	High	Inspiration Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Creativity	High	Creativity Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Innovation	High	Innovation Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Growth	High	Growth Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Success	High	Success Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Failure	High	Failure Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Lessons Learned	High	Lessons Learned Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Best Practices	High	Best Practices Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Case Studies	High	Case Studies Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Research	High	Research Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Analysis	High	Analysis Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Evaluation	High	Evaluation Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Monitoring	High	Monitoring Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Reporting	High	Reporting Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Communication	High	Communication Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Collaboration	High	Collaboration Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Coordination	High	Coordination Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Organization	High	Organization Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Management	High	Management Agreements, Interviews
Partnership Leadership		

[illegible]

TABLE 2: LOCAL INDICATOR ASSESSMENT

Impact No	Description	Yes	No	Detail Comment	VFM Score
1	CBC led partnership				
2.	CBC Capacity and Resources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In service plan - Resources in budget - Staff capacity - Authorisation levels 				
3.	Partnership Capacity and Resources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Independent resources - Partnership Plan 				
4.	Value for Money <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benchmarking in place - Perf management - Responsibility mechanisms - Where meetings - Outputs - Outcomes and impact 				
5.	Current Partnership Agreement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Copy of any ToR/SLA etc - How is partnership reviewed 				
6.	Member Involvement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Authorisation (formal list) - How engage 				
7.	Officer Involvement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reporting arrangements - How engage 				
8.	Implications of stopping				

The matrix below uses the Significance Score to categorise your partnership.

Suggested Rigour Required	Assessed Impact	Limited Significance (0.5%)	Major Significance 50%
		Mandatory	Mandatory
The partnership needs to be approved by the Relevant Lead Officer and (if different) by the appropriate decision maker identified in the Council’s Constitution.			
The Governance Services Unit needs to Be informed of the partnership		Non Essential	Mandatory
Ensure application of all key aspects of Corporate partnership’s governance toolkit		Advisable	Mandatory

Assessed by: Title: Date:

Independent

Assessor : Title: Date:

PARTNERSHIP SIGNIFICANCE ASSESSMENT SCORECARD

Partnership Name: XYZ

Enter the score in the last column which most closely represents your partnership. Answer all applicable questions, using scores of 1,2,3,4 or 5

This table assesses the significance of your partnership / partnership you are proposing.

Impact No.	Description	Insignificant (Score 1)	Minor Significance (Score 2)	Moderate Significance (Score 3)	Major Significance (Score 4)	Highly Significant (Score 5)	Score
1	Partnership costs: The Council directly contributes money to the partnership, contributes resources (officer time/work done) or money is directed through the Council's accounts.	<£50k per annum	£50k to £75k per annum	£75k to £100k per annum	£100k to £500k per annum	>£500k per annum	3
2	Relationship to the Corporate Priorities: to what extent is the partnership's success critical to the achievement of a corporate priority?	Not linked to any divisional, departmental or corporate priorities.	Indirect links to successful achievement of a corporate priority.	Moderate contribution to successful achievement of a corporate priority.	Significant contribution to the successful achievement of a corporate priority.	Essential to successful achievement of more than 1 corporate priority.	3
3	What are the consequences (financial / reputational / liability / political) for the Council of failures within the partnership?	Insignificant consequences	Minor consequences	Moderate consequence	Major significance	Highly significant	3
4	The partnership takes decisions on behalf of or which are binding on the Council.	The partnership does not take decisions on behalf of the Council.	The partnership does not take decisions on behalf of the Council but Council representatives feed back / lobby the Council.	The partnership does not take decisions on behalf of the Council but Council representatives with decision making authority attend the partnership and consider and influence its recommendations.	The partnership does not take decisions on behalf of the Council but Council representatives with decision making authority attend the partnership and agree to be bound by its decisions.	The partnership has decision making responsibilities directly delegated to it from the Council / Executive.	5
5	Statutory of Regulatory Context: is the Council required to set up the partnership by law or is the Council required to set up the partnership in order to receive additional funding / meet a requirement of the assessment regime / statutory guidance.	Not required by law or for funding	Indirect links to successful achievement of funding or achievement in CPA.	Limited links to successful achievement of funding or achievement in CPA.	Direct links to successful achievement of funding or achievement in CPA.	The Council is required to participate in this partnership by law or to receive specific funding.	4
6	Risk: the partnership contributes to the management of risks identified on corporate or departmental risk registers.	The partnership does not contribute to the management of high priority risks identified on corporate or departmental risk registers.	The partnership indirectly contributes to the management of high priority risks identified on a departmental risk register.	The partnership directly contributes to the management of high priority risks identified on a departmental risk register.	The partnership indirectly contributes to the management of a high priority corporate risk.	The partnership directly contributes to the management of a high priority corporate risk.	4
TOTAL							22
HIGHEST POSSIBLE SCORE (No. of questions answered x 5)							30
IMPACT SCORE (TOTAL divided by HIGHEST POSSIBLE SCORE as a percentage)							73%

The significance score can influence the governance aspect.

Governance:	Assessed Impact	
	Limited Significance (0-50%)	Major Significance (50%+)
The Partnership needs to be approved by the relevant Lead Officer and (if different) by the appropriate decision maker identified in the Council's Constitution.	Mandatory	Mandatory
Risk management arrangements need to approved and monitored corporately.	Non-essential	Mandatory
Ensure application of all key aspects of corporate partnership's governance protocol and procedures.	Advisable	Mandatory