

Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 13 October 2016

Present:

Councillor Ollerhead - in the Chair

Councillors Ahmed Ali, Barrett, Connolly, Cookson, Davies, Karney, Lanchbury, Russell (RGSC/16/28-30), Siddiqi, A Simcock, Strong and Lone

Councillor Priest, Deputy Leader

Councillor Andrews, Executive Member for Adult Health and Wellbeing

Councillor Flanagan, Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources

Councillor Stogia, Assistant Executive Member

Claudette Elliott, Chief Operating Officer, South Manchester Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG)

Councillor Watson, Member of Ethical Procurement Task and Finish Group

RGSC/16/28 Minutes

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting held on 8 September 2016.

Decisions:

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 8 September 2016.

RGSC/16/29 Communications

The Committee received a report of the Head of Strategic Communications which outlined the Council's current digital communications activity and its effectiveness and outlined a plan to improve that activity over the coming year. Members were asked to note and comment on the proposed digital strategy for the Council. The Head of Strategic Communications introduced the report across its main themes.

Members welcomed the report. A member welcomed that the Council was embracing social media and how this helped engage residents, particularly a younger audience. A member also welcomed the recognition that some people did not have access to digital communications and so other communication methods were still used. Members raised concerns that twitter was used for making service requests and asked how resilient officers were at responding to comments and criticism; seeking assurance that officers were adequately trained and sensitive to corporate responsibility.

In response to members' queries the Head of Strategic Communications outlined the training and support that were available for those staff involved in updating and monitoring the Councils social media accounts, adding that they were a small team of five. She welcomed members support for the strategy and assured members that the Council also had a considered offline approach. The Deputy Leader noted that residents would engage better with the Council where they had a choice of the

medium and style of engagement and that most engagement was of a positive nature. He added that everyone had a right to an opinion even if the Council did not agree with it and it was better to acknowledge and respond to criticism than to disregard it. A member praised the way Council officers responded to criticism adding that sometimes posts were not necessarily helpful, for example posting a picture of litter with no explanation of how long it had been there. The Head of Strategic Communications agreed and said that staff would always encourage members of the public to make service requests via the Council's website instead as in that way all of the required information would be obtained. In response to members queries the Head of Strategic Communications explained how social media worked, in that where posts were made which other people were not engaging with they would move further down the news feed and have less views.

A member asked why consideration was being given to close place based twitter accounts and why these were not being increased. He added that ward co-ordination should include consideration of this and help the Council engage within residents within their wards. The Head of Communications explained that some local place based twitter accounts were not recognised by local residents. She said it was more important that these accounts reflected those areas people identified with rather than being restricted by geographical boundaries. A member stressed the need for caution when allowing local groups to operate their own accounts in the Council's name as they may be politically motivated, and stressed the need for Communications to engage with members that had been elected. A member suggested that communications should be a standing agenda item at ward co-ordination meetings and statistics for place based twitter accounts be provided.

Members enquired about the possibility of developing an application that residents could download and use to make service requests. The Head of Strategic Communications explained that many residents were not attracted to this idea since applications took up valuable storage on their phones and devices and people were unlikely to download applications that were only for occasional use. Additionally she explained this would be a costly route for the Council to follow and many applications did not integrate with other Council systems. She advised that as technology evolved this may be a consideration in future but was not considered viable at the present time.

A member welcomed the Facebook Live interview with the Leader. Members welcomed this method of communication and suggested its use be developed further. The Strategic Head of Communications confirmed this was currently being explored. Members requested further information on this, including examples of how this was being promoted.

In response to member's queries the Head of Communications explained that a scrum was a stand up team meeting; and welcomed a request to attend. The Chair said he felt it would be useful for members to visit the team to get a sense of how they worked on an operational level.

Decisions:

1. To request that the Committee Support Officer arrange a visit to the Communications Team for members of the Committee.
2. To request that ward co-ordination include communications and statistics from twitter as a standing item on the agenda of their meetings.
3. To request further information on Facebook Live and include examples and how this is promoted.

RGSC/16/30 Update on the Greater Manchester Transformation Fund and Better Care Fund

The Committee received a report on the Greater Manchester Transformation Fund and the Better Care Fund which was split into two parts. Part One was a report of the City Treasurer and Joint Director Health and Social Care Integration providing an overview of the Greater Manchester Transformation Fund and outlining Manchester's approach to bidding for investment funding. Part Two of the report was a report of the City Treasurer, Chief Financial Officer (North, South and Central Clinical Commissioning Groups), Joint Director Health and Social Care Integration and provided the Committee with an overview of the Better Care Fund, planning requirements, resources and spending plans and links to Manchester's recently submitted bid to the Greater Manchester Transformation Fund. The Head of Finance (Children's, Adult Social Care and Public Health) introduced the reports across their main themes. The Committee welcomed Claudette Elliott, Chief Operating Officer, South Manchester Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) who was in attendance to answer members' queries.

Members asked for more detail on the bid that had been made to the Greater Manchester Transformation Fund to deliver the health and social care integration proposals. The Head of Finance advised that he was not able to share the information at this time but could provide it for members once he was able. He offered to share with members also a diagram of the governance arrangements to which members agreed. The Chair asked if this could also be provided to members of Health Scrutiny Committee also to which officers confirmed it would. A member noted that health inequalities were often a result of poverty and deprivation, which were particularly high in Manchester, and questioned whether the bid would be sufficient to respond to the scale of the problem. The Executive Member for Adult Health and Wellbeing advised that the bid would be proportionate to what was felt to be required but the decision was not within his control. He added that the original bid for transformation funding from government had been £500 million but government had only agreed to £450 million being provided.

A member commented on the scale of transformation and welcomed that efficiencies would be made by working collaboratively which would give a better deal for the residents of Manchester. He asked how the new schemes would deal with health inequalities in Manchester such as low life expectancy and low quality of life; in particular discouraging those activities which contributed to this such as smoking, alcohol and poor diet. The member noted the press had commented on the increasing pressures faced by Accident and Emergency (A&E) departments resulting

from the restriction of local authority budgets for adult social care and older people; and wanted to know the scale of the problem in Manchester.

The Joint Director of Health and Social Care Integration responded that prevention of health inequality was a significant part of new health and social care proposals along with a rising risk caused by a growing population. She explained that lots of business analysis had been carried out across the health and social care sector and this information was used by the Integrated Neighbourhood Development Teams to create a targeted approach, in particular with respect of prevention activities. In respect of the scale of the problem the Director advised she would ask the Urgent Care Board to provide further information to members on this, to which members agreed.

In respect of the Better Care Fund a member noted the scale of demand for nursing home care, the costs of providing home care, a rising older population and the issue of bed blocking in hospitals where patients cannot be discharged expediently due to a lack of suitable accommodation for them to be discharged to. The Joint Director of Health and Social Care acknowledged that there were issues with the nursing home and residential care market responding that there was a major piece of work at the Greater Manchester level looking at this market across Greater Manchester and how we built new approaches to providing care. The Executive Member for Adult Health and Wellbeing described the work that he was undertaking with the Deputy Leader who held the remit for housing to support the development of new provision.

A member noted that there would be implications post Brexit for staffing across health and social care; which employed many workers from the European Union (EU) in particular care staff. The Joint Director responded that a local transformation workforce group led by Margot Johnson from Central Manchester Foundation Trust (CMFT) had been established at Greater Manchester level looking at what needed to be done to respond to this.

A member asked how the Better Care Fund schemes were required to share their learning and how efficiently the £8 million budget was being used to date to support intermediate care. Claudette Elliott advised that the Better Care Fund gave the opportunity to test out different ways of providing and delivering care at a local level. She said there were some good examples of schemes in the north of the city which they would like to replicate. She added that the Better Care Fund had facilitated the way for greater collaboration in the context of devolution. The Executive Member for Adult Health and Wellbeing responded that expenditure was on target for this. Members requested a future update in which case studies be provided but the Chair noted that issues specific to Health should be reported to Health Scrutiny Committee instead.

The Executive Member for Adult Health and Social Care advised that these developments were very significant and whilst Health Scrutiny Committee received regular updates, the implications of these developments would likely affect all scrutiny committees. The Chair advised that he would raise this at a meeting of the Chairs of the Council's scrutiny committees to ensure any future implications were monitored.

Decisions:

1. To request that the Head of Finance (Children's, Adult Social Care and Public Health) provide a confidential briefing note to members of both Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee and Health Scrutiny committee on the detail of the bid to the Greater Manchester Transformation Fund in respect of the Better Care Fund; and a diagram of the governance arrangements for the fund.
2. To note that the Joint Director of Health and Social Care would provide further information from the Urgent Care Board to members of the Committee.
3. To note that the Scrutiny Chairs would discuss the implications of the transformation of health and social care in the context of devolution for each Scrutiny Committee; and agree any future appropriate reporting mechanisms.

RGSC/16/31

ICT Update

Members received a report of the Chief Information Officer which provided an update from ICT including the Operating Model; key projects; and the financial position for the service. The Chief Information Officers introduced the report across its main themes.

Members welcomed the improvements to the ICT service. A member suggested a cost savings analysis of the changes may be useful to include within a future update. A member said that he had recently been migrated to Windows 7 and a new smartphone without issue. A member noted the importance of achieving compliance with the Public Service Network (PSN) and asked whether the official security test planned for October 2016 had taken place. She sought assurance that compliance would be achieved shortly. The Chief Information Officer advised that this test would take place at the end of the month and assured the member that no issues were anticipated and he would update members once this was completed.

A member noted the reference to Cloud Technology Services (CTS), a Google partner based in Manchester, enquiring whether they met the Council's requirements and how they accommodated the Council's new 20% social value. The Chief Information Officer told members that Google considered Manchester City Council to be within its top 1% of customers worldwide and had already made significant investments in the city. He noted that the 'Google Garage' service which helped businesses understand how they could best use Google Technology had operated from Manchester Central Library for some time. He confirmed that the partner had to meet social value requirements and described the google proposals including the introduction of video conferencing over the longer term which he would report further on in future updates. He advised that google staff were currently based with the ICT service to facilitate these developments.

Members asked whether the Chief Information Officer was confident that recruitment issues could be fully resolved. The Chief Information Officer responded that a lot of progress had been made to date and described the collaboration with the private sector to encourage new recruits. He explained that the pay structure within the

public sector was a potential barrier for ICT recruitment but he was investigating innovative ways this could be addressed,

In response to members' queries regarding the Solaris Infrastructure the Chief Information Officer advised he would provide more information in a future update. He explained that this project was interdependent on other projects.

The Chief Information Officer commented on the success of the 'Know it all Bar', which was a drop in for Council staff and members to receive technical support. He advised this was now being extended into a 'Know it all Lounge' at no cost to the Council. Members expressed interest in visiting this and meeting the staff from Google to which the Chief Information Officer agreed.

Decisions:

1. To request a future update at an appropriate time.
2. To request that the Committee Support Officer arrange a visit to the ICT team.

RGSC/16/32 Ethical Procurement Task and Finish Group

The Committee received the final report of the Ethical Procurement Task and Finish Group which presented the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the Ethical Procurement Task and Finish Group. The Task and Finish Group carried out an investigation into how the Council can introduce an Ethical Procurement Policy in the Council. The Chair introduced the report across its main themes. He thanked the Head of Procurement and the procurement team, the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources, the invited guests, and Scrutiny Support. He also re-iterated his thanks to Matthew Jackson from the Centre for Local Economic Strategies who had acted as a member of the group and provided valuable advice.

The Chair commented that the investigations of the task and finish group had followed an organic process; and many of the recommendations outlined in the final report had already been completed. The Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources confirmed that this was the case. He described that work had started in respect of Recommendation 6, which referred to the proposed framework and governance arrangements for the Social Fund. In respect of 'in kind benefits' he added that these also needed to be measured and noted that Economy Scrutiny Committee had received a report at its meeting on 12 October 2016 which detailed some of these developments. The Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources advised that a major launch event was scheduled for Tuesday 28 February 2017 to which Small and medium enterprises (SME's) and the voluntary and community sector (VCS) would be invited. The Procurement Manager commented on the benefits of working with different colleagues across the Council including those in Work and Skills and Children and Families. A member noted that it was a very wide ranging informative piece of work and asked what could be done to ensure this work was fed up to the Greater Manchester Combined Authority and whether they could be encouraged to adopt a similar process. The Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources confirmed that this was currently being

pursued. The Chair added that other local authorities outside of the city were also interested in adopting a similar policy.

A member commented that a lot of procurement legislation was based on European Union (EU) law and following Brexit this may need review. The Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources noted that the policy was a living document and would be subject to continued review. A member who was also a member of Economy Scrutiny Committee praised the work of CLES and hoped that we could find some way to reward them for their contribution.

A member commented that it was one of the best task and finish groups she had been involved with, largely due to the wide range of invited guests which had informed the investigations. She added there was a continued need to consider procurement in respect of the transformation of health and social care and evolution going forward. The Chair agreed stressing the benefits of involving a wide range of outside bodies in overview and scrutiny— both to hear what they had to say on the Council's activities and to question them on what they were doing.

Decisions:

1. To endorse the final report of the Ethical Procurement Task and Finish Group
2. To note that future updates would be requested in respect of those recommendations that were not yet completed.

RGSC/16/33 Budget Process 2017-2020: Update and Next Steps

The Committee received a report of the City Treasurer which provided an overview of the budget process to date and the next steps, including details of the Budget Conversation which closed on 16 September. The Committee were asked to note and comment on the activity, engagement and feedback received as part of the Budget Conversation; and note and comment on the next phase of the process, including the second phase of Budget consultation proposals and next steps. The same report had been submitted to all six scrutiny committees to gather their views to inform the Executive when they consider the suite of budget reports at their meeting on Wednesday 19 October 2016. Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee had also received an additional appendix which included the analysis of responses received as part of the budget conversation because corporate communications is included within their remit. The City Treasurer introduced the report across its main themes. The Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources encouraged members to suggest ways in which resident engagement could be improved. He was accompanied by the Head of Strategic Communications who had attended to respond to member's queries in respect of the budget conversation.

A member stressed the importance of lobbying government prior to the autumn statement to ensure that Manchester City Council receives a fair settlement. A member asked whether the budget conversation had made clear to residents what was within the Council's remit; and how we were responding to requests which were not the Council's responsibility. The Head of Strategic Communications responded that the budget conversation was a broad conversation around what mattered to local

people, using the Our Manchester approach. She added that residents were also asked what they could do to help their local communities. Most responses had focussed on what residents could do to improve their own physical environment such as litter picking; rather than how they could help their communities respond to health and social care issues. The Head of Strategic Communications advised that discussions were being held with the NHS Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCG's) to identify ways in which people could help their communities in these areas. Members challenged officers on whether they had done enough to engage with residents who did not use or have access to digital communication. Members offered to help the Council engage and consult with those harder to reach within their wards. The Chair added that it would be useful to include in the demographic breakdown whether respondents were in employment or dependent solely on benefits. He added that those dependent on benefits would be disproportionately affected by any funding cuts being imposed by government; and also less likely to have access to digital media or want to engage with the Council. He noted that those postcodes with a higher response rate were often more affluent.

The Head of Strategic Communications responded that only 6.2% of responses were paper based and despite efforts to improve response rates this was still a small proportion of the overall response. She explained that non digital consultation had been targeted at those groups with historically low response rates including older people, those with disabilities and those living within certain postcodes. Officers had carried out informal consultation at Gorton and Harpurhey markets and Wythenshawe. She added that when informal channels for consultation were used the postcode was not always provided. She stressed that the statutory consultation required the Council to target hard to reach groups and include a range of methods and formats of communication.

A member asked whether that information that was held by postcode could be provided to ward councillors to enable them to respond to any issues within their wards to which officers agreed. The Executive Member requested that members provide any further suggestions as to how resident engagement could be improved to the Head of Strategic Communications directly.

Decision:

To note the report and provide comment to Executive.

RGSC/16/34 Overview Report

This report contained the details of the key decisions due to be taken within the Committee's remit and updates on the recommendations of the Committee. The Committee's work programme was included as an appendix. The report also included details of any key decisions that the Chair would be asked to exempt from call in.

A member requested that the recommendation in respect of the devolution timeline be responded to. Scrutiny Support responded this would be pursued.

The Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources noted that there were a lot of items on the agenda for the next meeting to which the Chair responded an

agenda setting meeting was scheduled and some items would be deferred. The Chair added that invitations would not be extended in respect of the devolution updates, however once the new mayor was elected an invitation to them would be extended at a future date.

The report on Budgets had been received late for the meeting because the Budget reports had been received simultaneously.

The Chair reminded members that the Town Hall tour for members would take place after the meeting.

Decision:

To agree the work programme, subject to the above additions