

## Deadline for return – 18 August 2009 (Quarter 1 Performance Report)

### Local Area Agreement 2008-2011

**LAA Priority:** Promote active, empowered and influential communities (LAA16)

**Lead Contact:** Sue Craythorne

**RAG Status:** Green (delete as appropriate)

#### **Delivery Board Recommendations**

To note the progress made towards establishing governance arrangements for this theme.  
 To note the targets to be achieved  
 To endorse work in progress to develop and implement a full delivery plan for this theme

#### **Delivery Board are asked to:**

No decisions or action required this quarter

#### **Summary Statement:**

Since the last report to the DSP the Healthier and Stronger Communities Partnership (HSCP) has been established. It has agreed its membership and terms of reference and is developing a structure for performance management across all the areas for which it is responsible, including the 'Stronger and Inclusive Communities' theme of the LAA. A workshop, which will be focussed on developing an annual work plan, and performance management is to be held on 16<sup>th</sup> October.

It has been confirmed that £734,000 LPSA2 reward funding will be allocated to support the Stronger Communities theme. The funding will be available by March 2010, but spend can start as soon as confirmation is received from CLG.

Theme group members have updated the project proposals and a mechanism has been agreed for assessing and approving the proposals. Third sector members of the Stronger Communities and Health Improvement Group (SCHIG) are preparing a submission as part of the process of developing a service specification. This will then be subject to a streamlined procurement process.

#### **Performance Indicators – National and Local**

Code	Title	+/- (see 1 below)	Year	Annual Target	Status (see 2 below)	Improvement (see 3 below)	Actual to Date	Officer Notes
NI4	% of people who feel they can influence decisions in their locality	+	FY 2008/09	Baseline for LAA	No target	<>	27.9%	(+/- 1.20)
NI7	Environment for a thriving third sector	+	FY 2008/09		Data not due	n/a <>	n/a	

#### **Key to symbols (insert as appropriate):**

1. + equals higher figures are better and – equals lower figures are better

2. No Data/Well Below Target/Below Target/On Target/Above Target/Well Above Target  
 3. Improved Performance ↑ Worse Performance ↓ Unchanged ↔

**Key Milestones (Last Quarter – Quarter 1 09/10, ends 30 June 09)**

	Description	Date	Outputs expected	Achieved/missed

**Key Milestones (This Quarter – Quarter 2 09/10, ends 30 September 09)**

	Description	Date	Outputs expected
1.	Agreement on specification of contracts	Mid August	Written specification of outcomes to be delivered by contracts
2.	Application for LPSA2 reward funding	30th September 2009	Application submitted and written confirmation of monies to be paid from CLG
3.	Agreement on commissioning process	30th September 2009	Written agreement
4.	Sign off by HSC Partnership	30th September 2009	Green light for commissioning
5.			

**Key Risks (\*Please refer to scoring guidelines below)**

Risk	Impact	Likelihood	Score	Mitigation
1. CLG LPSA reward funding not available	High	Low		Would need to work with partners to maximise mainstream activity on community engagement and third sector capacity building
2. Inability to agree on specification and commissioning process	Medium	Low		DCC and statutory sector partners would need to 'go it alone'
3. Commissioned work fails to deliver	High	Low		Ensure robust project monitoring to pick up problems early.
4.				
5.				
6.				

**Spatial Implications**

<b>District</b>	<b>Impact</b> (insert √ or x or unknown)	<b>Disaggregated Data</b> (√ or x)	<b>Examples of Local Delivery Outcomes</b>
Exeter	√	√	My Neighbourhood community engagement project
East Devon	x	√	
Mid Devon	√	√	Community development work targeted on communities most in need. Work about to start on new community strategy
North Devon	√	√	Ilfracombe neighbourhood management pathfinder
Torridge	x	√	
West Devon	√	√	Princetown partners engagement activity
South Hams	x	√	
Teignbridge	√	√	Deprived communities identified for targeted action

**\*Risks – Scoring Guidelines:**

Likelihood of risk:

- 1 – Very low
- 2 – Low
- 3 – Medium
- 4 – High
- 5 – Very high

Impact of risk:

- 1 – Insignificant
- 2 – Minor
- 3 – Moderate
- 4 – Serious
- 5 – Very serious

**Total risk score (likelihood x impact)**

- 1 – 6 Low**
- 8 – 12 Medium**
- 14 – 20 High**
- Over 20 Very high**