

**Manchester City Council  
Report for Information**

**Report to:** Audit Committee – 29 January 2015

**Subject:** Significant Partnerships Register

**Report of:** Deputy City Treasurer  
City Treasurer

---

**Summary**

This report contains the 2014 Register of Significant Partnerships. The format, and the review and assurance process associated with the register is outlined in this report, including an explanation of improvements made to the process. The Register is attached as Appendix two.

**Recommendations**

Audit Committee is requested to comment on and note the latest update of the Council's Register of Significant Partnerships.

**Wards Affected: All**

---

**Contact Officers:**

Name: Carol Culley  
Position: Deputy City Treasurer  
Telephone: 0161 234 3406  
E-mail: [carol.culley@manchester.gov.uk](mailto:carol.culley@manchester.gov.uk)

Name: Courtney Brightwell  
Position: Performance Lead (Core)  
Telephone: 0161 234 3770  
E-mail: [c.brightwell@manchester.gov.uk](mailto:c.brightwell@manchester.gov.uk)

Name: Sean Pratt  
Position: Performance and Intelligence Officer  
Telephone: 0161 234 1853  
E-mail: [s.pratt@manchester.gov.uk](mailto:s.pratt@manchester.gov.uk)

---

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1 In recognition of the need to ensure that all of the Council's partnerships continue to perform well, thereby delivering both value for money and supporting the achievement of the Council's strategic objectives on an on-going basis, a Partnership Governance Framework is in place. The framework was refreshed in 2013. This framework defines and standardises the Council's approach to managing its partnerships, in order to help strengthen accountability, manage risk and rationalise working arrangements.
- 1.2 In support of its application of this framework, the Council maintains a Register of Significant Partnerships (the Register), which has been in place since 2008. It lists all key partnership arrangements that are considered to be of the highest significance to the financial and reputational risk of the Council and to achieving the Council's objectives. These arrangements are not uniform, ranging from joint venture partnerships, statutory groups and PFIs. They reflect different governance structures depending on their legal status.
- 1.3 The Register is reviewed annually, which is an important aspect of the Council's processes for obtaining assurance over the robustness of its governance arrangements, and ensuring that any challenges that may need to be addressed are highlighted so that improvements can be made where appropriate.
- 1.4 Partnership working is an increasingly important way for the Council to meet its strategic objectives, especially in light of the financial challenges which continue to be presented by reductions in the funding available from local government finance settlements. The principles of ensuring the lawful conduct of its business, and that public money is safeguarded, accounted for and spent economically, efficiently and effectively apply equally to the Council's work with its partners. Therefore it is vital that the Council gains as much assurance as reasonably possible that there are clearly defined and effective governance arrangements in place for all partnership arrangements.
- 1.5 CIPFA guidance on delivering good governance in local government was refreshed in December 2012. The new guidance places greater emphasis on governance arrangements in partnerships and on the need for clear lines of accountability. More recently, in January 2014, Grant Thornton produced "*Responding to the challenge: alternative delivery models in local government*". This also highlights, in joint ventures, the importance of embedding robust governance arrangements from the start, and that the same quality is maintained throughout the duration of the arrangement. For new delivery models the report stresses the need for establishment of reporting, accountability and control mechanisms, so there is awareness of the risk profile of each model, and action can be taken to mitigate the risks. This is becoming increasingly relevant to the Council as more services, particularly those delivered as part of the Council's Public Service Reform programme, are delivered in partnership with other local services.

1.6 In light of these considerations improvements have been made to the annual assessment process, which have made it more rigorous. These include more in depth assessment questions, and a greater level of challenge where evidence to support a rating indicating a good level of assurance is insufficient. This makes it more likely that partnerships may be shown with a “Medium” or “High” risk rating than in previous years. It should be noted that this does not necessarily indicate lower levels of assurance generally across partnerships, but may be partly as a result of greater rigor in ensuring challenges are highlighted so they can be addressed as appropriate.

## **2. The process of producing the Register of Significant Partnerships**

2.1 The review process starts with an annual self-assessment proforma being completed. The proforma asks questions about aims and objectives, membership, decision making, finance, audit and risk management, conduct and behaviour, liability, performance, evaluation and review. This leads to an overall Self Assessment Rating Score of low, medium or high based on the robustness of the governance arrangements that the partnership has in place. A rating of “low” indicates a low risk level, and high level of assurance.

2.2 To provide an additional level of assurance to the process, a panel of Officers from Legal, Audit and Risk, Finance, HROD and Performance and Intelligence carry out an independent review of the completed assessments. The Group assesses whether sufficient evidence has been provided to support the proposed rating score, and if not, additional information and assurance is obtained. The outcome of this is a moderated rating, the Partnership Governance Risk Assessment, which is the rating proposed to be entered on the Register for each partnership.

2.3 Once all the self-assessments have been received and reviewed, the updated ratings are compiled to produce the refreshed draft Register (appendix 2). The Register contains a summary of information about each partnership, including;

- Class of Partnership;
  - Public public – All partners involved in the partnership are public organisations;
  - Public private – Partnership with one or more private sector companies;
  - LSP – Partnership is part of the Local Strategic Partnership family;
  - Academy – A school with Academy status
- Significance Rating Score – This indicates a partnership’s relative significance, and reflects aspects such as its contribution to corporate priorities and the level of associated financial, strategic and reputational risk. A high score signifies major significance.
- Partnership Governance Risk Assessment – This rating is based on an independent assessment of the information contained in the completed form made by the AGS Working Group. This is the rating that will be

included in the final version of the Register for each partnership. The rating is assigned using the same principles as the Self Assessment Rating Score.

### **3. Proposed Changes to Partnership details on the Register**

#### New Registrations

- 3.1 Manchester Life (entry 10). This is a joint venture company established between Abu Dhabi United Group and the Council, to deliver predominantly housing development. The first phase of the partnership will focus on the development of six sites within the Ancoats and New Islington neighbourhoods of the city which are in the ownership of the Council. The partnership is in the process of being established, so there will be a self-assessment carried out for the 2015 version of the Register.
- 3.2 Matrix Homes (entry 11). The Council and Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council have entered into a limited partnership, Matrix Homes Limited Partnership, for the purpose of developing five sites in the Manchester area building new homes for sale and market rent. *Significance Rating – High, Partnership Governance Risk Assessment – Low.*
- 3.3 Eastlands Strategic Development Company Ltd and Eastlands Development Company Ltd (entries 12, 13). The development company is a vehicle for investment into East Manchester and provides a formal partnership arrangement for the Council and Manchester City Football Club (MCFC) to leverage funding and investment in the area in line with the East Manchester Regeneration Framework. The strategic partnership sets the direction for the development company by providing a forum to decide how best to utilise the land surrounding the Etihad Stadium to encourage economic growth . *Significance Rating – High, Partnership Governance Risk Assessment – Low.*
- 3.4 Manchester Place (entry 43). This is a collaborative partnership between the Council and the Homes and Communities Agency to harness the land resources and market intelligence assets of both organisations, to support the delivery of the Residential Growth Prospectus. *Significance Rating – High, Partnership Governance Risk Assessment – Low.*
- 3.5 AVRO Hollows Tenant Management Organisation (entry 44). Tenant Management Organisations (TMOs) are set up under the Government's Right to Manage legislation. This company manages approximately 300 Council owned homes in Newton Heath, and is a contractual arrangement with a tenant management company. *Significance Rating – Medium, Partnership Governance Risk Assessment – Medium.*
- 3.6 The "Medium" rating reflects the fact that following an Internal Audit review of the TMO's management and governance, a number of required improvements have been identified, relating to financial record keeping and control. The Council is now working with the TMO to implement them.

- 3.7 SHOUT Tenant Management Organisation (entry 45). This company manages approximately 100 Council owned homes in Harpurhey, and is a contractual arrangement with a tenant management company. *Significance Rating – Low, Partnership Governance Risk Assessment – High.*
- 3.8 The “High” rating is due to the fact that there is a potential risk arising from limited availability of Council resources to monitor the performance or governance arrangements of the partnership. Auditing and monitoring of the partnership has not been prioritised previously due to the relatively low expenditure involved and the small amount of properties managed (100 out of nearly 17,000 owned by the Council). To address this, the Council will arrange for an officer to meet the Board of SHOUT in early 2015 to gain assurance that they are governing appropriately and that they have the relevant policies and procedures in place. If there are any areas of concern these will be managed via an improvement plan.
- 3.9 South Manchester Credit Union (entry 46). This is a not-for-profit financial co-operative serving people who live or work in the south, and parts of east Manchester. The Credit Union delivers Local Welfare Provision loans on behalf of the Council. Partners include DWP, Blue Orchid (a company providing free business start-up advice), Southway Housing and City South Housing. Reporting is to the union board. *Significance Rating – Medium, Partnership Governance Risk Assessment – Low.*
- 3.10 Strategic Education Partnership (entry 47). This partnership brings together the Council, schools and city partners such as Manchester Metropolitan University and the University of Manchester to agree and connect key educational, skills and employment priorities for Manchester. *Significance Rating – High, Partnership Governance Risk Assessment – Low.*
- 3.11 HOME (entry 48). This is a partnership between the Council and Greater Manchester Arts Centre (the trading name of HOME) to secure the funding, development and operation of HOME, to ensure it contributes to the city's economy, cultural ecology and delivers social impact for residents, visitors and workers in Manchester and beyond. *Significance Rating – High, Partnership Governance Risk Assessment – Low.*
- 3.12 Manchester Leaders' Forum (entry 49). The partnership provides strategic leadership for the Manchester Partnership. It is a wide forum with approximately forty members, and will lead on the adoption of a new strategy for the city, The Manchester Strategy, which will supersede the Community Strategy. *Significance Rating – High, Partnership Governance Risk Assessment – Low.*
- 3.13 Manchester Investment Board (entry 50). The Manchester Investment Board drives the delivery of the Community Strategy priorities and also leads the city's work on public service reform. *Significance Rating – Medium, Partnership Governance Risk Assessment – Low.*

- 3.14 Complex Dependency Partnership Board (entry 51). The role of the Board is to manage strategic risks and issues, provide leadership, coordination, communication and decision making across all partner agencies city wide in the delivery of the Complex Dependency Approach. Partners: GMP, NHS and Registered Social Landlords, DWP, Manchester College . The Board is accountable to the Manchester Investment Board. *Significance Rating – High, Partnership Governance Risk Assessment – Medium.*
- 3.15 The “Medium” rating for the new partnership is due to the governance and risk management arrangements still being in development. A review of the governance arrangements will take place in August 2015 when the board will have been established for almost 12 months. This will aim to identify any significant issues, challenges or areas for improvement in governance arrangements which may be required.
- 3.16 Greenwich Leisure Trust (entry 35). This new partnership is a contractual partnership with Greenwich Leisure Limited to manage and deliver the community leisure contract. The Trust will take over some of the functions of the Manchester Sports and Leisure Trust (entry 31) which is in the process of being wound up. As the partnership is new, a full self-assessment will be carried out for the 2015 version of the Register.
- 3.17 Children’s Improvement Board (entry 16). This partnership has been established as required by the Department for Education following on from the Ofsted report which was published in September 2014, where an “inadequate” judgement was given. It is a multi-agency board providing the strategic direction for delivering the required improvements for the Council and the Manchester Safeguarding Children’s Board. It will provide challenge and rigour to the process whilst collaborating to achieve and sustain continuous improvement in Children’s Services and across the partnership.
- 3.18 St John’s Partnership – Manchester Quays Ltd (entry 36). Manchester Quays Limited (MQL) is a joint venture between the Council and Allied London Properties Ltd set up to re-develop the former ITV site at Quay Street and Water Street. The partnership will drive and oversee the regeneration of the site, to produce a mixed used neighbourhood, in line with the emerging Strategic Regeneration Framework and master plan for the area. This will contribute to the Council’s objectives by enabling the site to reach its full potential in contributing to the economic growth of the city centre. It will also provide additional high-quality residential accommodation, in line with the Council’s residential strategy. A full self-assessment will be carried out for the 2015 version of the Register.

Partnerships where a different Risk Rating from the rating last year is proposed

- 3.19 Manchester Safeguarding Children's Board (entry 14). It is proposed that a Partnership Governance Risk rating is recorded as “High”, which is an increase from the “Medium” rating in 2013. The reasons for this are the Ofsted judgement from the July 2014 inspection that the functions of the Board were

inadequate, and the partnership's annual report which identified a number of significant governance improvements required. An example of the reasons leading to the Ofsted judgement was that the board had not been able to demonstrate sufficient awareness of whether children and families are being effectively safeguarded in Manchester, including the impact of high caseloads in social care and the overall quality of practice.

- 3.20 Health and Well Being Board (entry 15). It is proposed that an improved Partnership Governance Risk rating of "Low" is recorded, a change from "Medium" last year. Last year's "Medium" rating was due to the board not at the time having completed a full year as a statutory committee, and so had not yet reported back on outcomes relating to strategic priorities. The partnership's first annual report was presented to the Board in March 2014 and this stated that there were no significant governance issues or challenges.
- 3.21 Children's Board (entry 21). It is proposed that a revised Partnership Governance Risk rating of "Medium" is recorded, a change from "Low" last year. The increase in risk rating is due to the partnership being in transition with a change of Chair, and also being in the process of implementing improvement actions following Ofsted's safeguarding inspection in July 2014. The result of the inspection was that the overall system was inadequate, and that leadership and management were also found to be inadequate. The Children's Board will receive reports as improvement plans are developed, and will work with its statutory partner organisations (Health, GMP, and the voluntary and community sector) to improve the "early help" offer.
- 3.22 Manchester Safeguarding Adults Partnership Board (MSAB) (entry 31). It is proposed that a revised Partnership Governance Risk rating of "Medium" is recorded, a change from "Low" last year. The annual self-assessment identifies that the partnership needs to strengthen its governance structure and its ability to oversee core activity within the health and social care networks. It is acknowledged that performance reporting could be improved, to more effectively measure quality rather than volume of delivery. Currently the MSAB chair is a temporary appointment and longer term arrangements are needed. Essential support for Adult Safeguarding Reviews is also needed, as there are inadequate arrangements currently. As it is unknown when the next external (Care Quality Commission) inspection will take place, so to increase assurance, an external peer review by another authority will be arranged in the coming year. Also, new structures for the Board including an executive function are in the process of development.

Partnerships where Risk Rating remains "Medium" or "High" for 2014 following last year's assessment

- 3.23 Manchester Equipment and Adaptations (entry 27). It is proposed that the Partnership Governance Risk rating remains at "Medium" for this year. This score recognises that whilst there are risks around the on-going continuation of the partnership without a signed Service Level Agreement there are key factors in place to manage this. These include establishment of a partnership board, agreement of intent, and regular monitoring for financial arrangements.

The draft Service Level Agreement was agreed in principle, but both partners recognised that the outcome of the review by Contact Consultancy could offer opportunities to review and develop this further.

- 3.24 Manchester Mental Health and Social Care Trust (MMHSCT) (entry 29). It is proposed that the Partnership Governance Risk rating remains at “High” for this year. The MMHSCT is accountable to the National Trust Development Authority (TDA), who do not believe that the Trust will progress to become a Foundation Trust. Furthermore, the Trust is rated at an “escalation score 2” by the TDA on a scale of 1-5, which indicates a “material issue”. This is relating to the long term financial viability of the MMHSCT, and is the reason for the “High” risk rating. The Council is exploring options with the TDA about the future approach to the delivery of this service.
- 3.25 One Education (entry 56). It is proposed that the Partnership Governance Risk rating remains at “Medium” for this year. The partnership’s annual report highlights that there remains a continued need to ensure financial sustainability. One Education have carried out a full strategic review of the partnership, and a rating of “Medium” is considered appropriate.

#### Partnerships proposed for removal from the Register

- 3.26 Manchester Partnership (previously entry 28). All the constituent partnerships which make up the Manchester Partnership are now recorded on the Register. Therefore it would be a duplication to have an additional governance self-assessment of the Manchester Partnership, so this partnership has been removed.
- 3.27 Manchester Learning Disability Partnership (previously entry 25). There is no longer a formal partnership arrangement between the Council and Central Manchester University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust. Instead the Foundation Trust is commissioned by the Council to provide health services delivered for supported accommodation settings.
- 3.28 The Co-operative Academy of Manchester (previously entry 50). The Council is no longer a sponsor of the Academy, so this entry has been removed from the Register.

#### **4. Next Steps**

- 4.1 The annual refresh of the Register is part of the Council’s processes used to gain assurance over the robustness of its governance arrangements, and will be used to inform the production of the Annual Governance Statement (AGS) 2014/15. A draft of the AGS will be taken to Finance Scrutiny Committee in May 2015.



## **Appendix 1 - Manchester City Council's Register of Significant Partnerships Partnership Governance Arrangements Annual Self Assessment Form (for review in November 2014)**

### **NAME OF PARTNERSHIP**

#### **Significant Partnerships Definition**

A partnership is an agreement between Manchester City Council and one or more other organisations to work collectively to achieve an objective. Partnerships may:

- Agree to cooperate to achieve a common goal or shared objectives.
- Create a new organisational structure or process to achieve goals or objectives.
- Plan and implement a jointly agreed programme (often with jointly provided staff or resources).
- Provide joint investment and share the risks and rewards.

Manchester City Council's significant partnerships may include partnerships that are based on client and contractor relationships if the relationship is:

- Of strategic importance to the Council, critical to the delivery of the Council's key objectives or statutory obligations, and/or to the delivery of the Community Strategy.
- Critical to the reputation of the Council – failure of the partnership to deliver could damage the reputation of the Council.
- Responsible for spend of significant public investment.

#### **Completing the Self Assessment Form**

- Last year's completed form has been provided for your reference when completing this new form.
- Please indicate any answers or any narrative which represent a change from the position reported last year, by highlighting the text in **RED**.
- Refer to the Partnership Governance Framework for fuller details about each section.
- Contact Sean Pratt (s.pratt@manchester.gov.uk) if you need any assistance with this form.
- Return the completed form to Sean Pratt by email ([s.pratt@manchester.gov.uk](mailto:s.pratt@manchester.gov.uk)).
- Please note the deadline for completion: **31 October 2014**.

<b>Name of Partnership</b>	
<b>Responsible SMT Member</b>	
<b>Council service area and Head of Service Level Lead</b>	
<b>Link officer (responsible for completing annual review of the partnership's governance arrangements)</b>	
<b>Type of Partnership</b> <u>What best describes the status of the partnership?</u> <input type="checkbox"/> Limited Liability Partnership (LLP) <input type="checkbox"/> Joint Venture <input type="checkbox"/> Limited Company (with Council as majority shareholder) <input type="checkbox"/> Limited Company (with Council as minority shareholder) <input type="checkbox"/> Limited Company (acting as agent / provider for the Council) <input type="checkbox"/> Pooled Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Contractual Agreement <input type="checkbox"/> Manchester Partnership Board <input type="checkbox"/> Other – please describe	
<b>1. Aims and objectives</b>	
1.1	Where are the partnership's aims and objectives set out (please tick option that applies): <input type="checkbox"/> Legal contract <input type="checkbox"/> Service Level Agreement <input type="checkbox"/> Terms set out in grant funding agreement <input type="checkbox"/> Memorandum of understanding <input type="checkbox"/> Terms of Reference <input type="checkbox"/> Other – please provide brief details, including reference to relevant legislation where the partnership is a statutory partnership
<b>2. Membership</b>	
2.1	Who does the Partnership formally report to, and what Scrutiny reporting lines are in place? (Eg the Council, Manchester Partnership, Greater Manchester Combined Authority)? (include both officer and member groups)
2.2	Is there an appointed partnership board (or equivalent) chair? Y/N
2.3	Where are the roles and responsibilities of members of the partnership documented?
2.4	Does the Partnership provide formal support to Board Members in their role as representative of the Partnership?

	Yes/No																														
2.5	<p>Please list all other organisations involved in the partnership and their respective board representation?</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Name of Partner</th> <th>Board Representatives</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Manchester City Council</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Name of Partner	Board Representatives	Manchester City Council																											
Name of Partner	Board Representatives																														
Manchester City Council																															
2.6	Please provide details of any affiliated or subsidiary partnerships / companies to this partnership																														
<b>3. Decision making</b>																															
3.1	Is there a documented decision making and scrutiny process? Yes/No																														
3.2	Are the decisions made by the partnership recorded e.g. in minutes? Yes/No																														
3.3	Are recorded decisions communicated to all stakeholders on a regular and timely basis? Yes/No																														
<b>4. Finance</b>																															
4.1	<p>Who are the primary funders of the partnership and approximately what % of total partnership income does each represent?</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Name of Partner</th> <th>% of Total Income</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Manchester City Council</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Name of Partner	% of Total Income	Manchester City Council																											
Name of Partner	% of Total Income																														
Manchester City Council																															

4.2	What was the value of Council funding to/expenditure on the partnership in <b>2013/14 and budgeted for 2014/15?</b>
4.3	What was the % under / overspend against budget in 2013/14?
4.4	What is the nature of Council funding (where applicable) e.g. capital / revenue; grant; pooled funds; equity / debt / guarantee?
4.5	What financial regulations does the partnership operate under? e.g. Manchester City Council Financial Regulations.
4.6	Have these rules been communicated to all partnership stakeholders? Yes/No
4.7	What assurance/evidence is there that these rules are adhered to by the partnership?
4.8	Does the partnership produce an annual statement of accounts? Yes/No  If Yes, are they externally audited Yes/No  If Yes, please provide details of the external auditor  When was the last external audit opinion on the accounts issued?  Was the external auditor's opinion: Qualified / Modified / Unqualified?  If "Qualified" please state reason;
<b>5. Audit and Risk Management</b>	
5.1	Does the partnership have a process for the identification, assessment and management of risks? Yes/No  If Yes, does this process engage all partners? Yes/No  If partnership does not have a risk assessment and management

	process please state whether consideration has been given to one being developed. If this is not considered necessary / appropriate please briefly explain why:	
5.2	Does the partnership operate a risk register? Yes/No  If yes, when was the register last updated?	
5.3	Does the partnership have an internal audit or assurance function? Yes/No  If Yes, what was the last annual opinion of the Head of Internal Audit on the partnership's systems of governance, risk management and internal control?  Please provide details of Internal Audit service provider:  If No, please state whether consideration has been given to adding an Internal Audit function. If this is not considered necessary / appropriate please briefly explain why:	
5.4	Is partnership performance and activity in relation to risk management and audit (including implementation of recommendations) included within regular performance reports?  Yes/No	
<b>6. Conduct and behaviour</b>		
6.1	Does the partnership have any employees? Yes/No  If Yes, are effective employment policies and practices in place? Yes/No	
6.2	Does the Partnership have policies and procedures in place to deal with:	
	Standards of Conduct	Yes/No
	Declaration of interests	Yes/No
	Gifts / hospitality	Yes/No
	Complaints handling	Yes/No
	Whistleblowing or allegations of irregularity, fraud or corruption	Yes/No

<b>7. Liability</b>	
7.1	Are clearly documented rules and exit strategies in place if one party leaves the partnership?  Yes/No
7.2	What is the current limit of indemnity on the partnership's liability insurance?
<b>8. Performance, evaluation and review</b>	
8.1	Is performance information reported to stakeholders on a regular and timely basis?  Yes/No
8.2	Does the partnership produce an annual report that describes performance in the achievement of its aims and objectives? Yes/No  If Yes, does the report identify significant issues, challenges or areas for improvement in performance?
8.3	Does the partnership produce an annual report that describes performance against governance standards (for example through a statement on internal control or annual governance statement?)  Yes/No  If Yes, and the report identifies significant issues, challenges or areas for improvement in governance arrangements, please state what these are below:
8.4	In the past year, has the partnership been subject to any regular assessment, inspection or external review process?  Yes/No  If Yes, please provide details and summary outcome:
8.5	Does the lead Directorate have a process in place for assessing the value for money that the partnership provides?  Yes/No
8.6	In the past year, has the Partnership had any major change in circumstances? If yes please outline any changes below. Yes/No

**Considering the evidence from your question responses above, please now fully complete the Summary on the following page, including;**

- **RAG ratings for each element of the partnership's governance arrangements.**
- **An overall "Self Assessment Risk Rating Score"**
- **A record of key changes, developments, governance challenges and any planned improvements for the partnership.**

**Please note once completed the form is independently assessed by the Annual Governance Statement Working Group.**

**Performance and Intelligence will circulate a copy of relevant sections of the form to the partnership's SMT Lead, for their oversight and comment before a final entry is made in the 2014 Register for the partnership.**

### Partnership Assessment and Assurance Summary

Lead SMT Member:									
Partnership Name:									
Type of Partnership:									
Council represented in partnership by:									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> <li>•</li> <li>•</li> </ul>									
Governance	N/A	R	A	G	Risk and Assurance	N/A	R	A	G
Decision Making					External Audit Assurance				
Finance Reporting					Internal Audit Assurance				
AGS / SIC*					Inspectorate Assurance				
Performance Outcomes					Risk Management				
<b>Self Assessment Risk Rating Score:</b> (Link Officer to please complete) High / Medium / Low									
<b>Partnership Governance Risk Assessment Score:</b> (to be assessed by the AGS Working Group) High / Medium / Low									
Key changes, governance challenges, and developments within the partnership in the last 12 months:									
Key actions planned to support development of partnership governance in the next 12 months:									

\* Annual Governance Statement / Statement on Internal Control



2014 Register of Significant Partnerships

INCORPORATED BODIES (separate and distinct legal entities)						2014 Rating Scores		
No	Partnership Name	Short Description of Partnership	SMT Lead	Lead Officer	Class	Significance Rating Score	Partnership Governance Risk Assessment	Risk Assessment Trend
1	Enterprise Manchester Ltd	Waste and recycling collection services for all households and waste management for commercial businesses. Partners: Enterprise Managed Services Ltd. Reports to company board and shareholders.	Sara Todd	Fiona Worrall	Public Private	High	Low	↔
2	Manchester Central Convention	Manchester Central Convention Complex Ltd, wholly owned by the City Council. Owns the Convention Complex (formerly G-Mex). Reports to Manchester Central Board.	Richard Paver	Richard Paver	Public Public	Medium	Low	↔
3	Manchester Science Partnership (formerly Manchester Science Park)	Manages the Science Park and attracts science and technology investment into Manchester. Partners: University of Manchester, Salford CC, MMU and private sector. Reports to company board.	Sir Howard Bernstein	Angela Harrington	Public Private	Medium	Low	↔
4	Manchester Ship Canal Developments	The partnership has enabled the Council to develop land, that was previously considered not commercially viable. Partners: Peel Holdings. Reports to company board.	Sir Howard Bernstein	Eddie Smith	Public Private	Medium	Low	↔
<b>Key to Rating Scores (from Partnership Governance Framework definitions)</b>	<b>Low:</b> Low Risk. There is a sound system of governance designed to achieve the partnership's and the Council's objectives.							
	<b>Medium:</b> While there is a basically sound system of governance, there are areas for improvement, hence some of the partnership's and the Council's objectives may be at risk.							
	<b>High:</b> Controls are generally weak leaving the partnership's system open to significant error or abuse. It is expected that the partnership's and the Council's objectives will not be met.							

INCORPORATED BODIES (separate and distinct legal entities)						2014 Rating Scores		
No	Partnership Name	Short Description of Partnership	SMT Lead	Lead Officer	Class	Significance Rating Score	Partnership Governance Risk Assessment	Risk Assessment Trend
5	Manchester Working	Homes repair and maintenance joint venture. Partner: Morrison Facilities Service. Affiliated / Subsidiary partners: Northwards Housing Ltd, GMPTE, Warrington Council and Rotherham Council. Reports to Manchester Working Board.	Richard Paver	Patricia Bowen	Public Private	Medium	Low	↔
6	National Car Parks	Manages car parking facilities & CCTV under joint venture agreement with MCC. Reports to company board.	Richard Paver	Rachel Christie	Public Private	Medium	Low	↔
7	Piccadilly Triangle Developments	Manages the interests of the Council and GMPTE as the landowners in the Piccadilly Triangle. Partner: TfGM. Reports to MCC via relevant senior officers and senior elected members.	Sir Howard Bernstein	Steve Thorncroft	Public Private	Medium	Low	↔
8	Spinningfields	Secures the redevelopment and regeneration of the Spinningfields area. Partners: Allied London. Reports to company Board. Also to SMT and Executive when appropriate.	Sir Howard Bernstein	Pat Bartoli	Public Private	Medium	Low	↔
9	Corridor Manchester	Delivery vehicle for a strategic development framework within the Oxford Road Corridor area. Partners: University of Manchester, Manchester Metropolitan University, Central Manchester Foundation Trust. Reports to Corridor MCR Board.	Sara Todd	Angela Harrington	Public Private	Medium	Low	↔

INCORPORATED BODIES (separate and distinct legal entities)						2014 Rating Scores		
No	Partnership Name	Short Description of Partnership	SMT Lead	Lead Officer	Class	Significance Rating Score	Partnership Governance Risk Assessment	Risk Assessment Trend
10	Manchester Life	Joint venture company established between Abu Dhabi United Group and the City Council, to deliver predominantly housing development. The first phase of the partnership will focus on the development of 6 sites within the Ancoats and New Islington neighbourhoods of the city which are in the ownership of the Council.	Eddie Smith	Ian Slater	Public Private	High	New Entry	New Entry
11	Matrix Homes	The Council and Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council have entered into a limited partnership, Matrix Homes Limited Partnership, for the purpose of developing five sites in the Manchester area building new homes for sale and market rent.	Eddie Smith	Paul Beardmore	Public Public	High	Low	New Entry
12	Eastlands Strategic Development Company Ltd	The Eastlands Strategic Development Company, provides an overview and direction for the Eastlands Development Company to carry out the development of Eastlands Regeneration Area. The partnership is a forum for MCC and MCFC to drive growth in the east of the city and best utilise the land surrounding the stadium to encourage economic growth.	Eddie Smith	Eddie Smith	Public Private	High	Low	New Entry
13	Eastlands Development Company Ltd	The company is a vehicle for investment into East Manchester and provides a formal partnership arrangement for MCC and MCFC to leverage funding and investment in the area in line with the East Manchester Regeneration Framework.	Eddie Smith	Eddie Smith	Public Private	High	Low	New Entry

STATUTORY PARTNERSHIPS						2014 Rating Scores		
No	Partnership Name	Short Description of Partnership	SMT Lead	Lead Officer	Class	Significance Rating Score	Partnership Governance Risk Assessment	Risk Assessment Trend
14	Manchester Safeguarding Children's Board	Statutory body responsible for co-ordinating and promote the welfare of children in Manchester. Partners: MCC, GMP, NHS, Manchester Children's Board, Schools and Voluntary & Community Sector.	Gladys Rhodes-White	Russell Pilling	Public Public	High	High	↑
15	Health and Well Being Board (2013)	Thematic partnership providing leadership for health and wellbeing. Partners: NHS and NHS Trusts, Pennine Acute Trust, North, Central and South Clinical Commissioning Groups, CN4M and Local Involvement Network. Reports to Manchester Partnership	Michael Houghton-Evans	David Regan	Public Public	High	Low	↓
16	Children's Improvement Board	A multi-agency board providing the strategic direction for delivering the required improvements for the Council and the Manchester Safeguarding Children's Board following on from the Ofsted report judgement in September 2014. Reports to DFE and Young People and Childrens Scrutiny Committee.	Gladys Rhodes-White	Karen Dolton	Public Public	High	New Entry	New Entry
17	Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs)- Central (2013)	Three CCGs (also known as GP Consortia) cover Manchester Central, North and South areas. The aim of the CCGs is to improve the health of local people through reducing inequalities and commissioning quality services for the best health outcomes. Partners: NHS. Reports to Health and Well Being Board.	Michael Houghton-Evans	Joanne Royle	Public Public	High	Low	↔
18	Clinical Commissioning Group - North (2013)	Three CCGs (also known as GP Consortia) cover Manchester Central, North and South areas. The aim of the CCGs is to improve the health of local people through reducing inequalities and commissioning quality services for the best health outcomes. Partners: NHS. Reports to Health and Well Being Board.	Michael Houghton-Evans	Joanne Royle	Public Public	High	Low	↔
19	Clinical Commissioning Group - South (2013)	Three CCGs (also known as GP Consortia) cover Manchester Central, North and South areas. The aim of the CCGs is to improve the health of local people through reducing inequalities and commissioning quality services for the best health outcomes. Partners: NHS. Reports to Health and Well Being Board.	Michael Houghton-Evans	Joanne Royle	Public Public	High	Low	↔
20	Manchester Community Safety Partnership (formerly Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership)	Statutory thematic partnership providing strategic direction for challenging and resolving crime and antisocial behaviour. Partners: GMP, GM Probation Trust, GM Fire and Rescue Service, Public Health Manchester, GM Probation Authority and Manchester Metropolitan University. Reports to MIB.	Sara Todd	Rebecca Bryant	LSP	High	Low	↔

NON-STATUTORY PARTNERSHIPS						2014 Rating Scores		
No	Partnership Name	Short Description of Partnership	SMT Lead	Lead Officer	Class	Significance Rating Score	Partnership Governance Risk Assessment	Risk Assessment Trend
21	Children's Board	Thematic partnership providing strategic leadership on the design and delivery of services for children, young people and families in Manchester. Partners: Central Manchester Foundation Trust, GMP, NHS, Manchester Safeguarding Children Board, Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS) and Schools. Reports to the MIB.	John Edwards	Hazel Summers	LSP	High	Medium	↑
22	Cityco (Manchester) Ltd	Aims to improve all aspects of the city centre's trading environment. Incorporates Piccadilly Partnership. Partners: Boots, Bruntwood Estates, Marks & Spencer, Prudential Portfolio Managers Ltd and United Utilities. Reports to Cityco Board. MCC Board representation: Sir Howard.	Sara Todd	Fiona Worrall	Public Private	Medium	Low	↔
23	Greater Manchester Multi Agency Public Protection Agency	Enables Police, Probation and Prison services to work together to protect the public against dangerous and sexual offenders. Partners: GM Probation Service, GMP, Her Majesty Prison Service, NHS. Reports to Police Authorities.	Sara Todd	Mel Godfrey	Public Public	Medium	Low	↔
24	Manchester Concert Hall	Manages Bridgewater Hall. Partners: Partners: SMG Theatres (the operator of the Hall) and Manchester Professional Services Ltd. Reports to company Board. Annual Returns are completed to comply with Charity Commission requirements.	Sir Howard Bernstein	Fran Toms	Public Private	High	Low	↔

NON-STATUTORY PARTNERSHIPS						2014 Rating Scores		
No	Partnership Name	Short Description of Partnership	SMT Lead	Lead Officer	Class	Significance Rating Score	Partnership Governance Risk Assessment	Risk Assessment Trend
25	Manchester Credit Union (MCU)	A not-for-profit financial co-operative serving people who live or work in Manchester. Partners: DWP, Northwards Housing and City South Housing (both provide accommodation). Reports to union board.	Carol Culley	Angela Harrington	Public Private	Medium	Low	↔
26	Manchester Cultural Partnership	Delivers Manchester's Cultural Strategy 'Our Creative City' 2002 – 2012. Partners: Sport England, Arts Council England, Heritage Lottery Fund, English Heritage, Marketing Manchester and New Economy. Reports to Neighbourhood and Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Manchester Partnership via Neighbourhoods Board.	Sara Todd	Eamonn O'Rourke	LSP	Medium	Low	↔
27	Manchester Equipment and Adaptations	Operates under a SLA between MCC and NHS Manchester. SLA under review to incorporate changes to Community Health MCR.	Michael Houghton-Evans	Nicky Parker	Public Public	Low	Medium	↔
28	Manchester International Festival	Delivers an International Festival. Partner: Arts Council of England. Reports to the Festival Board. An independent review and evaluation, commissioned at the end of each Festival, is reported to Executive Committee.	Sir Howard Bernstein	Maria Balshaw	Public Private	Medium	Low	↔
29	Manchester Mental Health and Social Care Trust	Delivers Mental Health Services in an integrated and seamless manner, to avoid duplication and provide service users with one point of access. Partner: Manchester Mental Health Social Care Trust. New partnership arrangements as of 1 September 2010 resulted in new governance monitoring arrangements managed by a Section 75 agreement.	Michael Houghton-Evans	Hazel Summers	Public Public	High	High	↔

NON-STATUTORY PARTNERSHIPS						2014 Rating Scores		
No	Partnership Name	Short Description of Partnership	SMT Lead	Lead Officer	Class	Significance Rating Score	Partnership Governance Risk Assessment	Risk Assessment Trend
30	Manchester Museums Consortium	Works to raise the profile of museums and galleries in the city. Partners: University of Manchester, Manchester Museum & Whitworth Art Gallery, People's History Museum and Museum of Science & Industry. Affiliated/subsidiary partners: National Football Museum @ Urbis, The Lowry, Cornerhouse and Imperial War Museum North. Reports to Consortium Board	Sara Todd	Maria Balshaw	Public Public	Medium	Low	↔
31	Manchester Safeguarding Adults Partnership Board	Ensures that the Multi Agency Safeguarding Policy is carried out. Partners include: MMHSC Trust, University Hospital of South Manchester, NHS Pennine Acute Trust, NHS Manchester, Central Manchester Hospital Trust, Crown Prosecution Service, Age Concern Manchester, Manchester Carers Forum, GMP, Care Quality Commission, Probation Trust, Reports to Manchester Safeguarding Adults Board.	Michael Houghton-Evans	Russell Pilling	Public Public	High	Medium	↑
32	Manchester Sports and Leisure Trust	Responsibility for the management and operations of the Manchester Aquatic Centre and community leisure centres across the city. Partners: University of Manchester and Manchester Metropolitan University. Reports to the Trust Board. This Trust is in the process of being wound up.	Sara Todd	Eamonn O'Rourke	Public Private	Medium	Low	↔
33	Millennium Quarter Trust	Manages, operates and maintains amenities and facilities in the Manchester Millennium Quarter project area. Partners: private sector. Reports to Council.	Sean McGonigle	Fran Toms	Public Private	Medium	Low	↔

NON-STATUTORY PARTNERSHIPS						2014 Rating Scores		
No	Partnership Name	Short Description of Partnership	SMT Lead	Lead Officer	Class	Significance Rating Score	Partnership Governance Risk Assessment	Risk Assessment Trend
34	Northwards Housing	ALMO managing and maintaining housing stock totalling 13,000 properties on behalf of the Council. Partners: Northwards Housing. Reports to Strategic Housing and Neighbourhoods DMTs.	Sara Todd	Martin Oldfield	Public Private	Medium	Low	↔
35	Greenwich Leisure Trust	Contractual partnership with Greenwich Leisure Limited to manage and deliver the community leisure contract.	Sara Todd	Eamonn O'Rourke	Public Private	New Entry	New Entry	New Entry
36	St John's (Quay Street)	Manchester Quays Limited (MQL) is a joint venture between the Council and Allied London Properties Ltd set up to re-develop the former ITV site at Quay Street and Water Street.	Sir Howard Bernstein	Pat Bartoli	Public Private	New Entry	New Entry	New Entry
37	North West Consortium for Asylum Seekers and Refugees	Develops and coordinates strategic and contractual activity relating to asylum seekers and refugees across Greater Manchester. Partners: GMCA. Reports to the Exec Board who have delegated decision making powers from AGMA Chief Execs. Reports to AGMA Chief Execs when necessary.	Michael Houghton-Evans	Hazel Summers	Public Public	Medium	Low	↔
38	Regional Strategic Migration Partnership	Supports the development of a regional strategy and co-ordinates support and services for migrants living and/or working in the North West. Partners: 54 organisations representing, public, private and third sector. Reports to UK Border Agency via Partnership's Executive Committee.	Michael Houghton-Evans	Hazel Summers	Public Public	Low	Low	↔



NON-STATUTORY PARTNERSHIPS						2014 Rating Scores		
No	Partnership Name	Short Description of Partnership	SMT Lead	Lead Officer	Class	Significance Rating Score	Partnership Governance Risk Assessment	Risk Assessment Trend
39	The Neighbourhoods Board	Thematic partnership providing a strategic forum around stakeholder accountability for neighbourhood delivery and key strategic / cross-cutting neighbourhood issues to be managed at a city wide level. Partners: GMP, NHS and Registered Social Landlords. Accountable to Manchester Leaders Forum.	Sara Todd	Sara Todd	Public Public	High	Low	↔
40	Eastlands Trust (formerly The Velodrome Trust)	The Trust manages The Velodrome. MCC is the freehold owner. Partners: Sport England and British Cycling. Reports to MCC via lead officer.	Sara Todd	Eamonn O'Rourke	Public Private	Low	Low	↔
41	Wythenshawe Forum Trust	Provides/assists in the provision of facilities for the general public, in particular for recreation or leisure-time. Partners: Parkway Green Housing Trust, Manchester Airport, University Hospital South Manchester and The Manchester College. Reports to the Trust's Board.	Sara Todd	Eamonn O'Rourke	Public Public	Medium	Low	↔
42	Work and Skills Board	Thematic partnership responsible for economic growth, employment and skills. Partners: Job Centre Plus (JCP), Skills Funding Agency (SFA), the New Economy and key delivery partners such as Manchester College, Manchester Solutions and VCS.	Sara Todd	Angela Harrington	LSP	High	Low	↔

NON-STATUTORY PARTNERSHIPS						2014 Rating Scores		
No	Partnership Name	Short Description of Partnership	SMT Lead	Lead Officer	Class	Significance Rating Score	Partnership Governance Risk Assessment	Risk Assessment Trend
43	Manchester Place	Collaborative partnership between MCC and the Homes & Communities Agency to harness the land resources and market intelligence assets of both organisations, to support the delivery of the Residential Growth Prospectus.	Eddie Smith	Ian Slater	Public Public	High	Low	New Entry
44	AVRO Hollows Tenant Management Organisation	Tenant Management Organisations are set up under the Government's Right to Manage legislation. The company manages approx 300+ Council owned homes in Newton Heath, and is a contractual arrangement with a tenant management company.	Eddie Smith	Martin Oldfield	Public Private	Medium	Medium	New Entry
45	SHOUT Tenant Management Organisation	Tenant Management Organisations are set up under the Government's Right to Manage legislation. The company manages approx 100 Council owned homes in Harpurhey, and is a contractual arrangement with a tenant management company.	Eddie Smith	Martin Oldfield	Public Private	Low	High	New Entry
46	South Manchester Credit Union	A not-for-profit financial co-operative serving people who live or work in the following Wards: Ardwick, Burnage, Chorlton, Didsbury, Fallowfield, Hulme Levenshulme, Longsight, Moss Side, Old Moat, Rusholme, Whalley range and Withington. Partners: DWP, Blue Orchid, Southway Housing and City South Housing. Reports to union board.	Carol Culley	Angela Harrington	Public Private	Medium	Low	New Entry

NON-STATUTORY PARTNERSHIPS						2014 Rating Scores		
No	Partnership Name	Short Description of Partnership	SMT Lead	Lead Officer	Class	Significance Rating Score	Partnership Governance Risk Assessment	Risk Assessment Trend
47	Strategic Education Partnership	The partnership brings together the Council, schools and city partners such as MMU and UoM to agree and connect key educational, skills and employment priorities for Manchester.	John Edwards	John Edwards	Public Private	High	Low	New Entry
48	HOME	The partnership between MCC and Greater Manchester Arts Centre (trading name of HOME) is to secure the funding, development and operation of HOME and to ensure it achieves our vision and contributes to the City's economy, cultural ecology and delivering social impact for residents, visitors and workers in Manchester and beyond.	Sara Todd	Fran Toms	Public Private	High	Low	New Entry
49	Manchester Leaders Forum	The partnership provides strategic leadership for the Manchester Partnership on the delivery of the city's priorities of Growth, People and Place as set out in the Community Strategy.	Sara Todd	Jessica Bowles	Public Private	High	Low	New Entry
50	Manchester Investment Board	The Manchester Investment Board drives the delivery of the Community Strategy priorities and also leads the city's work on public service reform.	Sharon Kemp	Sharon Kemp	Public Public	Medium	Low	New Entry
51	Complex Dependency Partnership Board	The role of the Complex Dependency Partnership Board is to manage strategic risks and issues, provide leadership, coordination, communication and decision making across all partner agencies city wide in the delivery of the Complex Dependency Approach. Partners: GMP, NHS and Registered Social Landlords, DWP, Manchester College . The board is accountable to the Manchester Investment Board	Sharon Kemp	James Binks	Public Private	High	Medium	New Entry

SCHOOL LEADERSHIP						2014 Rating Scores		Risk Assessment Trend
No	Partnership Name	Short Description of Partnership	SMT Lead	Lead Officer	Class	Significance Rating Score	Partnership Governance Risk Assessment	
52	Manchester Communication Academy	Part of a wider programme of seven new academies opened in 2010, each one linked to future growth sectors of the city's economy. Lead partner BT. Co-sponsors: Manchester College. Reports to governing body.	Carol Culley	John Edwards	Academy	High	Low	↔
53	The East Manchester Academy	Part of a wider programme of seven new academies opened in 2010, each one linked to future growth sectors of the city's economy. Partners: Laing O'Rourke, Lend Lease, Manchester College, Manchester Airport and Willow Park Housing Trust. Reports to governing body.	Eddie Smith	John Edwards	Academy	High	Low	↔
54	Manchester Enterprise Academy	Part of a wider programme of seven new academies opened in 2010, each one linked to future growth sectors of the city's economy. Partners: Manchester Airport, Willow Park Housing Trust and The Manchester College. Reports to governing body.	Geoff Little	John Edwards	Academy	High	Low	↔
55	Manchester Health Academy	Part of a wider programme of seven new academies opened in 2010, each one linked to future growth sectors of the city's economy. Partners: Central Manchester University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust and The Manchester City College. Reports to governing body.	Sara Todd	Sara Todd	Academy	High	Low	↔
56	One Education	Is commissioned by MCC to respond to the Education Act 2011 in a positive way, both in terms of the interface with schools and in providing challenge as champions of children in the City. One Education has its own Board of Directors which includes officers of the Council. Reports to the Council.	Sharon Kemp	Sharon Kemp	Public Public	High	Medium	↔

PRIVATE FINANCE INITIATIVES (PFI)						2014 Rating Scores		Risk Assessment Trend
No	Partnership Name	Short Description of Partnership	SMT Lead	Lead Officer	Class	Significance Rating Score	Partnership Governance Risk Assessment	
57	Grove Village PFI	Delivers estate regeneration in Ardwick neighbourhood by creating a mixed tenure community, improving the environment, delivering new retail opportunities and offering work, training and other community development activities. Governance managed by the contractual agreement (30 year term). Reports to Strategic Housing DMT and PFI Stock Transfer Board.	Eddie Smith	Paul Beardmore	Public Private	Medium	Low	↔
58	Renaissance (Miles Platting Neighbourhood PFI)	Contractual agreement to manage housing estates in the Miles Platting neighbourhood. Reports to Strategic Housing DMT and PFI Stock Transfer Board.	Eddie Smith	Paul Beardmore	Public Private	Medium	Low	↔
59	Schools PFI - Temple Community Primary	Contractual agreement to design, build and manage facilities at Temple Primary School.	John Edwards	Amanda Corcoran	Public Private	Medium	Low	↔
60	Schools PFI - Wright Robinson	Contractual agreement to design, build and manage facilities at Wright Robinson High School.	John Edwards	Amanda Corcoran	Public Private	Medium	Low	↔
61	Street Lighting PFI	Contractual agreement to replace dilapidated and outdated street lighting columns / licenses street lighting and illuminated traffic signage. Governed by contractual agreement.	Sara Todd	David Lea	Public Private	Medium	Low	↔