

**Manchester City Council
Report for Information**

Report to: Audit Committee – 1 December 2016
Subject: Significant Partnerships Register
Report of: Deputy City Treasurer

Summary

This report contains the 2016 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 report focuses on partnerships which have been added to the Register during 2016 and those where the risk rating has changed, or where the risk rating remains “medium” or “high” following last year’s self assessment. The full Register is included as an appendix.

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: Janice Gotts
Position: Deputy City Treasurer
Telephone: 0161 234 3590
E-mail: j.gotts@manchester.gov.uk

Name: Courtney Brightwell
Position: Performance Manager (Place and Core)
Telephone: 0161 234 3770
E-mail: c.brightwell@manchester.gov.uk

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

1. Introduction and Context

- 1.1 This report sets out why the Council produces a Register of Significant Partnerships, the review process and the areas of change during 2016. The latter section of the report sets out the rationale for any additions or deletions to the register and for any changes to the risk ratings. The full Register is included as an appendix.
- 1.2 In recognition of the need to ensure that all of the Council's partnerships continue to perform well, 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 ensure consistent working arrangements.
- 1.3 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 position or reputation of the Council or to its objectives. These arrangements are not uniform; they include joint venture partnerships, statutory groups and Private Finance Initiatives (PFIs). They reflect different governance structures depending on their legal status.
- 1.4 The Register is reviewed annually as part 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 required.
- 1.5 Partnership working is an increasingly important way for the Council to meet its strategic objectives. In light of the financial challenges which continue to be presented by reducing levels of funding, organisations in the city must work together for mutual benefit to make best use of their combined resources. 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 assurance that there are clearly defined and effective governance arrangements in place for all partnership arrangements. 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 CIPFA guidance on delivering good governance in local government was refreshed in April 2016. The guidance emphasises that Councils "*must ensure that when working in partnership, arrangements for accountability are clear and the need for wider public accountability has been recognised and met*". This year, Grant Thornton produced "*Better together: Building a successful joint venture company*". This also highlights that it is critical to have an effective governance framework to provide protection and ensure there is accountability for all parties.

1.7 Each year improvements to the risk assessment process are delivered to make it more rigorous. This year more detailed information about the partnership's purpose has been requested to inform the review of self-assessments.

2. The process of producing the Register of Significant Partnerships

2.1 The annual review process starts with a 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 and performance. This leads to an overall Self-Assessment Rating Score of low, medium or high risk 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 (Human Resources and Organisational Development) 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 sought. Where this assurance can be provided the assessment score is confirmed, where this is not the case it is moderated. The outcome of this is a moderated rating, the Partnership Governance Risk Assessment, which is the rating 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. 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 – Academy status allows freedom to adapt the national curriculum, to vary teachers' pay and conditions, and to vary the length of the school day/week/year.
- 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, political and reputational risk. A high score signifies major significance. It should be noted that even partnerships with a low relative significance are still of significance and weak governance arrangements can affect the achievement of the Council's goals.
- Partnership Governance Risk Assessment – The risk assessment score for the partnership, following moderation.

3. Proposed Changes to Partnership details on the Register

Partnerships added to the Register in 2016

Mayfield (entry 11)

- 3.1 It is proposed that a rating of “Medium” is recorded, which is the first annual self-assessment of the partnership as it was a new entry on the Register last year. The partnership is a Joint Venture agreement between Manchester City Council, Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM), London & Continental Railways (LCR) and a private sector development partner (U&I plc) to deliver the regeneration of the Mayfield site in Manchester city centre, in line with the agreed Strategic Regeneration Framework (SRF).
- 3.2 The partnership has been rated as medium risk, as the legal agreements still need to be finalised and formally entered into (which is due to happen in the next month), and the governance and management processes formally established, in line with the agreements. However, the draft agreements provide arrangements for all of the necessary processes and reporting mechanisms.

Hulme High Street Ltd (entry 48)

- 3.3 Hulme High Street Ltd is a joint venture limited company incorporated in 1996 between Manchester City Council (as landlord) and Amec (as developer) formed to develop the Hulme High Street area brought about following the Hulme City Challenge regeneration project initiated in the early 1990's. The site comprised of the High Street area including the 'Asda' retail park along with the surrounding high street, market and residential development sites. Amec's interest is now held by Muse Developments.
- 3.4 The principle objective for the formation of this partnership arrangement was to develop the Hulme High Street area of the City. All but one of the sites has now been developed. The remaining site, the former Hot Pot pub site remains undeveloped. It is proposed that, once a valuation is agreed for this site between the Council and Amec/Muse, the Development Agreement will be terminated and the Council will become the sole shareholder. The implications of this with regards to assets or liabilities of Hulme High Street Ltd have yet to be fully explored and as such, at this stage it is considered a high risk partnership.

Partnerships where a different risk rating from last year is proposed.

Manchester Safeguarding Children's Board (MSCB) (entry 18).

- 3.5 It is proposed that a Partnership Governance Risk rating of “Medium” is recorded, which is a decrease from the “High” rating, given in 2015. The previous rating reflected the outcome of the July 2014 Ofsted inspection which stated that the functions of the Board were inadequate; and the partnership's

annual report which identified a number of significant governance improvements required.

- 3.6 The rating has been improved as whilst there is still further work to be done, since the appointment of the new Independent Chair in July 2016 significant progress has been made against the MSCB Improvement Plan. Of the 35 original actions in the plan, 31 have been completed with 4 remaining to be actioned. Examples include the embedding of quality assurance processes and an improved self assessment programme including multi-agency dataset analysis with quarterly reports on staff turnover and a case file audit programme.
- 3.7 The learning and improvement framework has been developed and the multi-agency and single agency audits are submitted on time to the board. A new Learning and Development integrated sub-group has been created. The Training Strategy has been presented to the Board and approved. Online feedback rates have improved significantly for all courses and trainers are provided with feedback after all courses to inform and improve course content and delivery. Training Action Plans are included in all course materials and all trainers have standardised slides which highlight the importance of feedback. Impact Evaluation questionnaires are now also included on all on-line courses delivered via the Virtual College and a model to assess and evaluate training was commissioned and adopted.
- 3.8 Further actions and priorities have been identified to drive forward continued improvements over the coming twelve months, and these are summarised below;
- *Leadership and Influence* - through clarification of Board members' responsibilities and commitment, clear business planning, quality assurance and performance improvement framework, drive change and demonstrate the leadership role of the MSCB.
 - *Challenge* - through a multi-agency audit programme of focussed, themed audits, Section 11 audits and quality assurance and Performance Improvement Framework, to identify areas of concern and seek improvement plans.
 - *Learning* - through publication of Serious Case Reviews (SCRs) and dissemination of associated learning, development of the multi agency Training Programme and integration of learning from the audit programme, to learn from, and change, practice.
- 3.9 In addition, the Board agreed to focus on scrutiny and seeking reassurance about the effectiveness of integrated working arrangements, with the emphasis on quality and impact, in the following agreed priority areas;
- *Early Help* - to assess the effectiveness of the preventative services being provided to children and families with an emphasis on Early Help.
 - *Complex Safeguarding* - to ensure the effectiveness of thematic strategies, plans, developments and provide a challenge and support

role within the context of operational delivery in the following work streams:

- Child Sexual Exploitation
 - Missing from home, care and education
 - Gangs and violence
 - Modern Slavery and Trafficking
 - Radicalisation and extremism
 - Female Genital Mutilation and “honour” based violence
 - Understanding/identifying emerging areas of risk e.g. Cyber crime.
- *Domestic Violence & Abuse (DV&A)* - to ensure the focus of the impact of domestic violence and abuse on children and young people is enhanced and is in line with the DV&A Strategy, with an emphasis on understanding and responding to underlying causes.
 - *Neglect* - to develop and assess the impact of the Neglect Strategy and use the learning from SCRs where neglect is a significant factor, identify themes and integrate that learning into the multi-agency training programme.
 - *SCR learning* - to ensure that the learning and recommendations from SCRs, Domestic Homicide Reviews (DHRs) and other local and national reviews are identified and tracked; and that action plans are followed up in order to make sure that learning has changed practice.
 - *Partnership engagement with Children and Young People (CYP) and Communications* - to share examples of good practice and assure the effectiveness of partnership engagement with CYP. In addition, to ensure that the Board itself is informed of and responds to the priorities and concerns of CYP in Manchester.

Manchester Equipment and Adaptations (MEAP) (entry 28).

- 3.10 It is proposed that a Partnership Governance Risk rating of “Low” is recorded, which is a decrease from the “Medium” rating, given in 2014. The risk rating was initially assigned due to the partnership being in a period of transition with a service redesign taking place. New terms of reference, performance indicators and financial reporting procedures were in the process of being developed. The score remained at this level in 2015, which recognised that there were risks around the on-going continuation of the partnership without a signed Service Level Agreement. Due to the substantial amount of progress that has been made in the last 12 months, it has now been possible to lower the risk rating.
- 3.11 During the previous twelve months the partnership has continued to operate successfully, with the MEAP service exceeding its performance targets around equipment delivery times. The service has undergone a transformation programme and been renamed as Manchester’s Service for Independent Living. A joint Improvement Board has been established and an improvement plan commenced in June 2015.
- 3.12 A new delivery model for minor and major adaptations was agreed in principle in November 2015 with Housing providers and this became live in April 2016

and is currently being embedded. There is a new Contract Framework in place.

- 3.13 A workshop was held with colleagues in related health services in March 2016 to discuss new service requirements for the provision of equipment including increased opening hours of the community equipment store, and faster delivery times. These are included in the amended Service Level Agreement, which has now been signed off. Health colleagues have recently produced a comprehensive position statement and financial contributions are also under discussion.
- 3.14 A draft commissioning prospectus has been produced by the new single commissioning function which will be subject to EU procurement processes. This service, as part of the wider Council provider portfolio of services, is part of a partnership with the three hospital Trusts, the new mental health provider, and the GP Federation who will bid to become the new Local Care Organisation (LCO). The LCO will provide services in response to a single out of hospital contract with a pooled budget which will lead to a more rapid, responsive service.

Partnerships where Risk Rating remains “Medium” or “High” for 2016 following last year’s assessment

Biffa Municipal Ltd (entry 5)

- 3.15 It is proposed that a Partnership Governance Risk rating of “Medium” is recorded, which is the same rating as that which was given in 2015. The rating for the new partnership was originally assigned while performance information was awaited which could provide assurance of acceptable contract performance. The Growth and Neighbourhoods Directorate have established a new Waste, Recycling and Street Cleansing Team, to ensure effective contract management structures and processes, including performance management and risk controls. This team was put in place to deliver effective governance through the Strategic Board and the Performance and Contract Management Group. In addition, Biffa have invested in an ICT system to enable more effective gathering and analysis of performance information. These measures have been designed to increase ability to provide transparent oversight of contract performance and risk management. A summary of the developments in the partnership arrangements is included below.

Governance structure

- 3.16 A governance structure has been put in place to ensure performance issues can be analysed and addressed. This structure is designed to have effective two way communication channels for escalation and dissemination. The three main elements of the structure are as follows;
- Partnership Board – responsible for strategy
 - Performance and Contract Management Group (PCMG) – responsible for performance

- Neighbourhood Liaison Meeting (NLM) – responsible for local governance

Reporting and Responsibilities

- 3.17 The Partnership Board is the senior governance meeting, and is attended by the Executive Member, Deputy Chief Executive, Director of Neighbourhoods, Biffa Managing Director and Biffa Regional Manager. The board has responsibility for;
- Strategic decisions and identifying future priorities
 - Escalations from the PCMG
 - Approval of variations to the contract
 - Approval of any new services
 - Approval of proposals for income generation
 - Approval of changes to the service delivery plan
 - Approval of policy changes
 - Escalation of contract performance issues
- 3.18 The PCMG's primary role is to deal with the day to day performance of the Biffa contract. The full range of services are assessed and corrective action applied and monitored using a standard data set drawn from a variety of sources including Customer Relationship Management (CRM) software, Customer Complaints, Cleanliness Inspections and Biffa "Powersuite" software. Responsibilities include;
- Performance management, including Price Performance
 - Management of city wide policy
 - Escalation of local performance issues
 - Contact Centre and CRM improvement
 - Financial Reporting and management
 - Health and Safety verification of processes and systems
 - Maintenance of a Risk Register
- 3.19 The NLM's primary role is to ensure that the Council's Neighbourhood Teams are fully engaged in the governance process and overseeing Biffa's performance. These meetings allow city wide performance, as analysed at PCMG, to be considered on a neighbourhood basis. Neighbourhood specific data (North, Central and South) and issues are discussed and addressed, with any that cannot be resolved escalated to PCMG. The group also has responsibility for management of any local service and compliance issues.

Performance data

- 3.20 The process of producing data that is relevant, clear and can be used to inform operational activity upon is crucial to underpinning governance and performance management of the contract. Intensive work has taken place to develop a consistent data set that can be used to compare performance trends against the contract requirements.
- 3.21 Integration of Biffa and Council ICT systems took place for waste and recycling services in April 2016 and for street cleansing activity in July 2016, with service requests now being passed directly through to Biffa "Powersuite"

software. ICT integration has speeded up operational responsiveness and the ability to now analyse the Biffa performance through a common ICT system will allow officers to interrogate performance more effectively and identify service improvements.

- 3.22 In addition to the electronic data capture of contract performance, an on-site inspection regime is undertaken to ensure that the quality of street cleansing meets the requirements of the contract.
- 3.23 Biffa undertake self-monitoring through random street inspections and report back on the quality, using an industry and government standard (N195) which grades "A-D". In order to quality assure this self-monitoring, the Waste Recycling and Street Cleansing team also undertake a daily check of an area that has been cleansed and report back, and where necessary challenge Biffa as appropriate. The inspections undertaken by the Council have shown an increase in the standards of cleansing in recent weeks following Biffa making changes to how they clean the streets. In addition to overseeing the quality of cleansing taking place, these inspections review cleanliness deterioration rates across the city and enable interim cleans to be more effectively planned. A number of locations have been identified where additional cleansing is required and Biffa have been asked to respond. Over time, a pattern of the cleanliness standards achieved will be identified that will enable a more strategic view of where resources need to be deployed.

Further planned improvements

- 3.24 Further performance management development will take place through the Performance and Contract Management Group – a sub-group of the Strategic Board to ensure that service change is successfully delivered and service standards are met despite financial pressures. This development will include tracking a wider range of data more effectively and quickly, and using this data to identify efficiencies. It will also include capacity to measure tonnage collected from apartment blocks where there are communal collections to inform performance assessment for apartment block collections

Children's Board (entry 22)

- 3.25 It is proposed that a Partnership Governance Risk rating of "Medium" is recorded, which is the same rating as that which was given in 2015. Following the Ofsted Inspection of services for children in need of help and protection, children looked after and care leavers, the Children's Board has maintained a priority focus on 'Early Help' to improve the Early Help offer of the Council and its statutory partner organisations (Health, Police and the Voluntary and Community Sector). The Children's Board is the key strategic partnership to provide overall leadership for the shaping and delivery of the vision for children, young people and their families and is driving the partnership to collectively deliver on the Early Help Strategy. The original rating acknowledged that while progress had been made to improve delivery of the Early Help offer, there was further work required, for example to increase the number of Early Help assessments.

- 3.26 A review of the Early Help Strategy was undertaken in April 2016. The review focussed on the progress and impact from the Early Help Strategy and the delivery arrangements for Early Help. Overall the review confirmed that the approach to Early Help, set out in the Early Help Strategy was the right one, with progress noted in delivering the strategy evidenced by the establishment of Early Help hubs and the development of tools to assist practitioners. The review acknowledged the intended impact from the approach was not yet being felt, and that the new approach would likely take time to embed and therefore impact would not be expected at this stage. A number of recommendations were proposed and an action plan was developed in response to these.
- 3.27 Since the establishment of the Early Help Hubs in September 2015, the volume of enquiries to the hub has been maintained. There were 1,867 enquiries to the hubs in October; the second highest figure in the year to date. A range of agencies are attending the daily triage meetings in the hubs and at the weekly allocation meetings where a lead professional for families requiring more intensive and co-ordinated support is identified, more partners are becoming the lead worker. An Early Help dashboard is in place to support tracking and monitoring of progress to an operational delivery group as well as directly to the Children's Board.
- 3.28 Good progress has been made in developing the new strengths based approach and revising assessment tools. The new Early Help Assessment (EHA) is starting to become embedded and this is reflected in performance data for the last quarter where the target of 300 was exceeded and a peak of 562 children registered, the highest in the year to date. This would achieve a good rating for EHAs and reflects the wide range of agencies holding strength based conversations and registering EHAs. The increase in registrations reflects a significant increase by health agencies especially health visitors. Registrations by health visitors increased from 11 in June to 101 in September and 102 in October.
- 3.29 The quality of the EHAs and Early Help interventions is improving; audits of EHAs show improvements in listening to the child's voice, in the use of scoring and evidence of impact. A programme of audit activity on EHAs has been undertaken in September and October and results are being collated and will report to the Children's Board. Audit of Early Help key worker activity in September demonstrated that 72% of interventions are good or outstanding and 5% were inadequate; all interventions assessed as inadequate received follow up action.
- 3.30 The rating remains medium as this reflects the further work required to embed the offer of Early Help and to impact on demand for statutory services. Whilst the offer of Early Help is starting to embed it has not reduced demand for statutory social work services. Further work is being undertaken to embed the new levels of need framework, to strengthen the offer of Early Help at the front door for social care and to support partners such as GMP and schools to develop and strengthen their contribution to Early Help.

- 3.31 The Early Help Champions network and development of school clusters is working well and will oversee the learning from the audit activity. At this stage it is appropriate to rate the partnership governance as medium; whilst recognising good progress over the last quarter.
Manchester Mental Health and Social Care Trust (MMHSCT) (entry 30)
- 3.32 It is proposed that a Partnership Governance Risk rating of “High” is recorded, which is the same rating as that which was given in 2015. At a strategic level, the Trust Development Authority (TDA) had agreed, following due process and through the Sustainability Steering Group, to lead a procurement process to facilitate the acquisition of the Trust by one of the two other existing Mental Health Trusts in Greater Manchester. The risk rating remains at “High” while the transition to the new provider takes place.
- 3.33 The transaction ‘application’ process began in March 2016 and was partially completed in July 2016 with the announcement of the name of the preferred provider – Greater Manchester West Mental Health NHS Trust. The process of due diligence began immediately with the intention being to transfer services from Manchester Mental Health and Social Care Trust to Greater Manchester West Mental Health NHS Trust be in place from the 1st January 2017.
- 3.34 The Council leads monthly performance meetings relating to the Trust’s social care contract, these meetings include Public Health commissioners, Health commissioners as well as Trust staff. There is a quarterly strategic contract monitoring meeting which is attended by senior Trust staff. This meeting is now also attended by the Director of Public Health. Executive to Executive meetings take place monthly involving the Council, the CCGs and the Trust.
- 3.35 Commissioners from CCGs, and the Council (including Public Health) are closely involved in supporting the transaction process. Additional contract development meetings have been set up between the CCGs and Council (including Public Health) to ensure all of the necessary information, quality and performance requirements and documentation is in place to aid the safe and successful transfer of services. Where appropriate Trust staff from both the existing and new provider are inputting into these meetings. These arrangements will continue as they are whilst the transaction continues to move forward. A Transaction Board, with senior representation from all partners, continues to have oversight and accountability for this area of work.

AVRO Hollows Tenant Management Organisation (entry 42)

- 3.36 It is proposed that a Partnership Governance Risk rating of “Medium” is recorded, which is the same rating as that which was given in 2015. The original rating in 2014 reflected the fact that following an Internal Audit review of the Tenant Management Organisation’s (TMO’s) management and governance, a number of required improvements were identified, relating to financial record keeping and control. Several improvements had been made in the previous 12 months, leading to the development of a programme of works which were in the process of being delivered. In addition to this AVRO Hollows

were looking at developing a suite of performance indicators to enable the Council to monitor performance in the future.

- 3.37 As detailed in the previous report to Committee in September, a number of areas of progress have been made. These include;
- An officer from Strategic Housing is now regularly attending Board meetings
 - The Council has established a TMO Liaison Committee made up of officers from the Council, Northwards Housing and the Housing Managers
 - The Council has also have now developed a reporting mechanism for performance monitoring
- 3.38 A tripartite agreement is currently being negotiated between the Council, AVRO Hollows and Northwards Housing with the aim of achieving clarity around the individual roles and responsibilities each partner has for managing the neighbourhood where they are operating. The Council is now operating a 6 weekly TMO liaison meeting to address operational challenges and to develop the working relationship at different levels with stakeholders.
- 3.39 As part of the agreement the following areas are being addressed;
- The delivery of a governance review.
 - Developing and sustaining the relationship between the Board and key stakeholders.
 - Developing a suite of performance indicators to enable the Council to monitor performance in the future.

SHOUT Tenant Management Organisation (entry 43)

- 3.40 It is proposed that a Partnership Governance Risk rating of “Medium” is recorded, which is the same rating as that which was given in 2015. The original “High” rating in 2014 was due to the fact that there was a potential risk arising from limited availability of Council resources to monitor the performance and governance arrangements of the partnership. Auditing and monitoring of the partnership had 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). The reduction in risk rating was due to significant changes which had taken place in the previous year in the Council’s relationship with SHOUT. An officer from Strategic Housing had started to attend their Board meetings and co-ordinate six weekly progress meetings. This has helped to drive improvements in the governance arrangements of the partnership.
- 3.41 In February 2016, the Council together with SHOUT board members brought in the services of consultants Involve 360, and asked them to work with SHOUT to assess the TMO Board’s development needs and in order to give assurance relating to the organisation’s governance.
- 3.42 The findings of this report were on the whole positive, but have identified training gaps and development needs. The Council is currently considering the

final report from Involve 360 with a view to developing a training plan based on the findings. All of the development items identified will be reviewed during progress meetings with the Council. The SHOUT board will take decisions on how to deliver these items, with support and advice from the Council and other relevant agencies. The main development and training needs were as follows;

- Training for the Board on decision making and working together as a team.
- Strengthening of key functions such as finance and strategy.
- Adoption of a succession plan for the long serving housing manager, and a process for delivering improved guidance and management.
- Adoption of a communication plan for engagement with residents and stakeholders.

Partnerships proposed for removal from the Register

Children's Improvement Board

- 3.43 In summer 2016 the Improvement Board requested a review of the governance structures for Children's Services and its partnership arrangements. The review considered the position of the associated Boards with regard to accountability, delivery, scrutiny and challenge, and the establishment and leadership of strategy. It was agreed that these responsibilities lie with the Manchester Safeguarding Children's Board, the Children's and Health and wellbeing board; with scrutiny invested in the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee to compliment that provided by the respective Executive Member. Therefore it was agreed that whilst the Improvement Board remains an essential part of the children's improvement journey overall; reporting to the Department for Education, it does not constitute a significant partnership for the purposes of the Register and should therefore be removed.

South Manchester Credit Union (SMCU)

- 3.44 The Council continues to work with the South Manchester Credit Union in a voluntary capacity to address the family poverty agenda across south Manchester. The Council has no formal contractual arrangements in place with SMCU, nor any Officers on the SMCU Board of Directors (as individuals). Therefore, it was agreed that the entry would be removed from the Register.

The East Manchester Academy, Manchester Communication Academy, Manchester Enterprise Academy

- 3.45 These Academies are in the process of changing their governance arrangements and are no longer in partnership with the Council.

4. Next Steps

- 4.1 An update on progress made to strengthen governance arrangements in those partnerships where a medium or high Partnership Governance Risk Assessment is recorded will be taken to Audit Committee in June 2017.

- 4.2 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) 2016/17. A draft of the AGS will be taken to Audit Committee in June 2017.
- 4.3 Partnerships will undertake reassessment of their governance arrangements in September 2017; this will include new partnerships that have been formed in 2017 and so will include the Manchester Provider Group who have responsibility for developing the Local Care Organisation due to go live in April 2017. Following this, a Register with revised risk ratings will be submitted to Audit Committee in December 2017.

2016 Register of Significant Partnerships

INCORPORATED BODIES (separate and distinct legal entities)						2016 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 management for commercial businesses. Partners: Enterprise Managed Services Ltd. Reports to company board and shareholders.	Fiona Worrall	Fiona Worrall	Public Private	Low	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.	Carol Culley	Carol Culley	Public Public	Medium	Low	↔
3	Manchester Science Partnerships Ltd	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 Airport Holdings Ltd	Company with shareholding held by the Council, IFM Investors and the other Greater Manchester local authorities.	Eddie Smith	Leon Philip	Public Private	High	Low	↔
5	Biffa Municipal Ltd	Provides provision of domestic waste collection and street cleansing services.	Sara Todd	Fiona Worrall	Public Private	High	Medium	↔
Key to Rating Scores (from Partnership Governance Framework definitions)	Low: Low Risk. There is a sound system of governance designed to achieve the partnership's and the Council's objectives.							
	Medium: 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.							
	High: 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)						2016 Rating Scores		Risk Assessment Trend
No	Partnership Name	Short Description of Partnership	SMT Lead	Lead Officer	Class	Significance Rating Score	Partnership Governance Risk Assessment	
6	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.	Carol Culley	Sean McGonigle	Public Private	Medium	Low	↔
7	National Car Parks	Manages car parking facilities & CCTV under joint venture agreement with MCC. Reports to company board.	Carol Culley	David Lea	Public Private	Medium	Low	↔
8	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	↔
9	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	↔
10	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	↔
11	Mayfield	This is a partnership between the Council, Transport for Greater Manchester and London & Continental Railways, to secure the regeneration of the Mayfield area of Manchester, as a high quality mixed used scheme.	Eddie Smith	Pat Bartoli	Public Private	Medium	Medium	New Entry

INCORPORATED BODIES (separate and distinct legal entities)						2016 Rating Scores		Risk Assessment Trend
No	Partnership Name	Short Description of Partnership	SMT Lead	Lead Officer	Class	Significance Rating Score	Partnership Governance Risk Assessment	
12	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	Low	↔
13	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	↔
14	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	↔
15	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	↔
16	NOMA	Partnership to oversee and guide regeneration and development within the area between Victoria and Shudehill. Partners are the Cooperative Group and Hermes Real Estate.	Eddie Smith	Pat Bartoli	Public Private	High	Low	↔
17	First Street	Partnership to oversee and guide regeneration and development within the First Street area. Partners are Southside Regeneration and HOME / GMAC.	Eddie Smith	Pat Bartoli	Public Private	High	Low	↔

STATUTORY PARTNERSHIPS						2016 Rating Scores		
No	Partnership Name	Short Description of Partnership	SMT Lead	Lead Officer	Class	Significance Rating Score	Partnership Governance Risk Assessment	Risk Assessment Trend
18	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.	Paul Marshall	Linda Evans	Public Public	High	Medium	↓
19	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.	Hazel Summers	Yvonne Nolan	Public Public	High	Low	↔
20	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	Hazel Summers	David Regan	Public Public	High	Low	↔
21	Manchester Community Safety 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	Fiona Sharkey	LSP	High	Low	↔

NON-STATUTORY PARTNERSHIPS						2016 Rating Scores		
No	Partnership Name	Short Description of Partnership	SMT Lead	Lead Officer	Class	Significance Rating Score	Partnership Governance Risk Assessment	Risk Assessment Trend
22	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.	Paul Marshall	Julie Heslop	LSP	High	Medium	↔
23	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.	Sara Todd	Fiona Worrall	Public Private	Medium	Low	↔
24	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	Mark Ellison	Public Public	Medium	Low	↔
25	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						2016 Rating Scores		Risk Assessment Trend
No	Partnership Name	Short Description of Partnership	SMT Lead	Lead Officer	Class	Significance Rating Score	Partnership Governance Risk Assessment	
26	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	↔
27	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	Neil MacInnes	LSP	Medium	Low	↔
28	Manchester Equipment and Adaptations	Operates under a SLA between MCC and NHS Manchester. SLA under review to incorporate changes to Community Health MCR.	Hazel Summers	Nicky Parker	Public Public	Medium	Low	↓
29	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.	Sara Todd	Maria Balshaw	Public Private	Medium	Low	↔

NON-STATUTORY PARTNERSHIPS						2016 Rating Scores		Risk Assessment Trend
No	Partnership Name	Short Description of Partnership	SMT Lead	Lead Officer	Class	Significance Rating Score	Partnership Governance Risk Assessment	
30	Manchester Mental Health and Social Care Trust	The partnership is based on a legal contract with the Manchester Mental Health and Social Care Trust for the delivery of the Council's statutory duties under a Section 75 Agreement (Mental Health Act). This works to deliver care management and assessment and Approved Mental Health Professional (AMHP) functions within an integrated health and social care organisation.	Hazel Summers	Philip Thomas	Public Public	High	High	↔
31	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	↔
32	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						2016 Rating Scores		
No	Partnership Name	Short Description of Partnership	SMT Lead	Lead Officer	Class	Significance Rating Score	Partnership Governance Risk Assessment	Risk Assessment Trend
33	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.	Eddie Smith	Martin Oldfield	Public Private	Medium	Low	↔
34	Greenwich Leisure Trust	Contractual partnership with Greenwich Leisure Limited to manage and deliver the community leisure contract.	Sara Todd	Neil Fairlamb	Public Private	Medium	Low	↔
35	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	High	Low	↔
36	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.	Hazel Summers	Nicola Rea	Public Public	Medium	Low	↔

NON-STATUTORY PARTNERSHIPS						2016 Rating Scores		Risk Assessment Trend
No	Partnership Name	Short Description of Partnership	SMT Lead	Lead Officer	Class	Significance Rating Score	Partnership Governance Risk Assessment	
37	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	Fiona Worrall	Public Public	High	Low	↔
38	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	Neil Fairlamb	Public Private	Medium	Low	↔
39	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	Neil Fairlamb	Public Public	Medium	Low	↔
40	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						2016 Rating Scores		Risk Assessment Trend
No	Partnership Name	Short Description of Partnership	SMT Lead	Lead Officer	Class	Significance Rating Score	Partnership Governance Risk Assessment	
41	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	↔
42	AVRO Hollows Tenant Management Organisation	Tenant Management Organisations are set up under the Government's Right to Manage legislation. The company manages aprox 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	↔
43	SHOUT Tenant Management Organisation	Tenant Management Organisations are set up under the Government's Right to Manage legislation. The company manages aprox 100 Council owned homes in Harpurhey, and is a contractual arrangement with a tenant management company.	Eddie Smith	Martin Oldfield	Public Private	Low	Medium	↔
44	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	↔

NON-STATUTORY PARTNERSHIPS						2016 Rating Scores		
No	Partnership Name	Short Description of Partnership	SMT Lead	Lead Officer	Class	Significance Rating Score	Partnership Governance Risk Assessment	Risk Assessment Trend
45	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	↔
46	Our Manchester Forum	The Our Manchester Forum is a high level group which meets quarterly. It brings together leaders from the public, private and voluntary sector to develop the Our Manchester Strategy and oversee progress towards delivering it.	Sara Todd	Richard Elliott	Public Private	High	Low	↔
47	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.	Geoff Little	Geoff Little	Public Public	Medium	Low	↔
48	Hulme High Street	A joint venture Limited Company incorporated in 1996 between Manchester City Council (Landlord) and Amec (Developer) formed to develop the Hulme High Street area brought about following the Hulme City Challenge project on the early 1990's. The site comprised of the High Street area including the 'Asda' retail park along with the surrounding high street, market and residential development sites. One development site remains. Amecs interest is now held by Muse.	Eddie Smith	Steve Thorncroft	Public Private	Medium	High	New Entry
49	Confident and Achieving Manchester Working Group	The role of the Confident and Achieving Manchester Working Group 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	Geoff Little	James Binks	Public Private	High	Low	↔

SCHOOL LEADERSHIP						2016 Rating Scores		
No	Partnership Name	Short Description of Partnership	SMT Lead	Lead Officer	Class	Significance Rating Score	Partnership Governance Risk Assessment	Risk Assessment Trend
50	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	↔
51	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.	Carol Culley	Angela Harrington	Public Public	High	Low	↔

PRIVATE FINANCE INITIATIVES (PFI)					2016 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	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	↔
53	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	↔
54	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	↔
55	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	↔
56	Street Lighting PFI	Contractual agreement to replace dilapidated and outdated street lighting columns / licenses street lighting and illuminated traffic signage. Governed by contractual agreement.	Kim Dorrington	David Lea	Public Private	Medium	Low	↔