

SCRUTINY LEADERSHIP BOARD

Minutes of a meeting of the Scrutiny Leadership Board held on 9 July, 2009 at 4.00 p.m. in the Civic Offices, Telford, Shropshire

PRESENT: Councillors D.R. W. White (Chairman), R. Aveley, A.A. Mackenzie, A.A. Meredith and K.L. Tomlinson

ALSO PRESENT: Victor Brownlees (Interim Chief Executive), Michael Barker (Head of Planning & Environment), Tom Currie (Safer & Stronger Communities Manager), Alison Smith (Scrutiny Manager) and Stephanie Jones (Scrutiny Officer)

SLB-54 MINUTES

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Scrutiny Leadership Board held on 23 June, 2009 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

SLB-55 APOLOGY FOR ABSENCE

Councillor J.A. Francis

SLB-56 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND PARTY WHIP

None.

SLB-57 SCRUTINY SUGGESTIONS FROM 12 MAY 2009 – FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION

Suggestion by Councillor R.K. Austin

Councillor Austin had submitted a Scrutiny Suggestion that the Board should scrutinise the perceived breakdown of communications between Telford & Wrekin Council and Hark Apollo, the owners of Telford Town Centre. This had originally been submitted to the Scrutiny Leadership Board meeting on 12 May but Councillor Austin had subsequently agreed that it be deferred until this meeting.

Victor Brownlees, Interim Chief Executive was invited to inform the Board of the current situation. In doing so he stated that he was only able to speak on the relationship between the Council and Hark Apollo since the date of his appointment, the 7 May 2009.

Since that date he had held four meetings with Rob Cossey of Hark Apollo in addition to speaking to him on the telephone and he considered that their relationship was now harmonious, and although some significant points of issue remained there is now an open and honest dialogue. He spoke of the need for there to be one plan for the Town Centre to which the three partners, Telford & Wrekin Council, Hark Apollo, and the Telford International Centre, could all sign up to. He emphasised that although he could not guarantee that a solution could be formulated which would be agreeable to all parties, they were working hard to achieve a collective vision. He stressed that whilst he was currently

engaged in these discussions, it would be for the Cabinet and full Council to take any decisions.

The Chairman commented on the issues that had arisen in the past between the Council and Hark Apollo and said that whilst it was not possible to change the past, it was possible to ensure that such issues did not arise in the future. The redevelopment of Telford Town Centre was too important an investment project for the partners to be opposing each other and the Council needed to be able to work with the largest landowner in the Centre. It was vital that each of the partners was aware of any changes in policy by the Council before they became public knowledge.

In conclusion, it was agreed that the Suggestion should be left on the table in order to allow for the Chief Executive to continue to develop the relationship and progress discussions and that the Board should be kept informed of progress.

Suggestion by Councillor K.L. Tomlinson

Councillor Tomlinson's Suggestion relating to the adoption of new housing estates had been deferred from the 12 May 2009 to enable the current position to be established and Michael Barker, Head of Planning & Environment, had been invited to discuss this with the Board.

Michael Barker explained that problems arose when a development had not been completed, which could be for a variety of reasons. Whilst many developers fulfilled all their contractual obligations others did not and could be in default of their Section 106 obligations. Most instances of non-adoption arose from economic or non-intentional reasons such as bankruptcy. In considering this issue, the legal and financial implications of adoption by the Council would need to be investigated before any action was taken. The situation was further complicated by the differing procedures of other agencies and partners and the fact that the planning and highways processes of the Council operated independently of each other. He, therefore, suggested that appropriate legal or government advice should first be sought and that ascertaining what course of action other local authorities took could also be useful.

Michael Barker said that he was not currently aware of the full extent of this problem in Telford & Wrekin and recommended that Scrutiny should first try and identify the areas affected and the nature of the actual problems before deciding how best to take forward this Suggestion.

Members put forward a number of suggestions including that of considering Best Practice in other authorities. The Chairman recommended that a Spotlight Review be undertaken, following which a decision could be made on how best to take the work forward, and this was agreed by the Board.

Suggestion by Mrs. J. Clarke

This suggestion regarding the need for improved security in the Town Park had been deferred at the Board's meeting on 12 May 2009 to allow for relevant information on the number and types of offences to be ascertained.

Tom Currie, Safer & Stronger Communities Manager, had been invited to speak to the Board on this issue. As requested he had provided relevant information from the West Mercia incident recording systems on the level of criminal offences and anti-social behaviour incidents committed within the Town Park during the past twelve months. In addition, he had spoken to Dave Ottley, Sport & Recreation Development Officer, on the work of the Town Park Wardens and CSOs. He said that, whilst the problems described by Mrs. Clarke were very serious for the victims, Members needed to be aware that it was not possible to police the Park twenty-four hours a day.

The information provided by West Mercia Police showed that the level of anti-social behaviour in the Park was less than in other areas of the Borough. When incidents did occur they tended to peak at mid-day and were not, therefore, alcohol related. In addition, young people were exposed to assault robbery (relating to mobile phones and ipods) from their own age group.

The following actions were being taken to address issues in the Town Park:

- Active police patrols
- Incidents investigated fairly and fully
- Barriers erected to slow down access from motorbikes, etc. at some entrances
- CSOs were on patrol and Council Park Wardens were equipped with mobile phones
- High visibility patrols helped to increase public confidence

The police, CSOs, and Council staff had a key role in combating anti-social behaviour.

The Board discussed this issue and noted that none of the Park Wardens were currently accredited to issue Fixed Penalty Notices (FPNs) for the offences but, if so authorised by the Chief Constable, their role could be expanded and agreed that accreditation could provide a front line method of dealing with issues. The Board also agreed that this could be further strengthened by erecting notices setting out Codes of Behaviour for users of the Park and the action that would be taken if these were not adhered to.

In response to a question from Councillor Aveley, Tom Currie said that appropriate training could be sourced through the Safer & Stronger Communities Section and the police. Accreditation could also be extended to staff dealing with other problems such as fly tipping and could be extended to other parts of the borough.

The Scrutiny Leadership Board agreed that a recommendation should be made to the Cabinet for the accreditation of appropriate officers to be considered, that

notices setting out Codes of Behaviour for users of the Park and the action that would be taken if these were not adhered to be erected and suggested that the Town Park could be used as a pilot scheme which, if successful, could be extended to other areas of the Council's services such as cleansing and environmental maintenance.

The Scrutiny Manager reminded Members that the Board now had legislative power to scrutinise the Crime & Disorder Partnership. This was a power that needed to be developed for the future and she suggested that this would be an appropriate agenda item for the Board in Autumn 2009 and would enable the context, strategy, patterns of behaviour, and 'hot spots', etc. to be established.

Members further agreed that if accreditation was introduced in respect of the Town Park, a review be carried out once it had been in operation for an appropriate period of 3 or 6 months. In addition, they asked the Scrutiny Manager to inform Mrs. Clarke of the action being proposed by the Board.

RESOLVED – that a report be submitted to the Cabinet seeking approval for Wardens in the Telford Town Park, including Dog Wardens, to become accredited to issue Fixed Penalty Notices and for appropriate notices warning of this action to be erected.

SLB-58 NEW LEGISLATION UPDATE

The report of the Head of Finance & Audit summarised the progress of the three pieces of new legislation that would affect the future remit of Scrutiny.

The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007

The Act enabled Scrutiny Committees to scrutinise the actions of certain public service providers in relation to the delivery of their Local Area Agreement (LAA) targets. It also enabled Scrutiny Committees to require a response from the executive/council and partner authorities would have to have regard to reports and recommendations from Scrutiny.

The Police & Justice Act 2006

The Police & Justice Act 2006 was enacted on 30 April 2009 following which Regulations and guidance had been issued on the scrutiny of local Crime & Disorder Reduction Partnerships (the Safer and Stronger Communities Partnership in Telford & Wrekin). A copy of the guidance was attached as Appendix B of the report.

The main objective of this legislation was to enable Scrutiny to scrutinise its local Safer & Stronger Communities Partnership, as set out in the report. A more detailed report on the ways in which the scrutiny of the Safer & Stronger Communities Partnership could potentially operate would be brought to the Scrutiny Leadership Board in September for consideration.

The Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Bill 2008-09

This Bill sought to create greater opportunities for community and individual involvement in local decision making, as set out in the report. It was currently in Committee Stage but the Department for Communities & Local Government anticipated that it would receive Royal Assent before the summer recess of Parliament on 21 July. They foresaw that, for the statutory scrutiny officer and joint Scrutiny parts of the Bill, the power would come into effect in September with guidance following shortly after. The part of the Bill relating to petitions was not likely to come into force until April 2010.

Review of Health Scrutiny by the Department of Health

The Department of Health (DoH) was undertaking a review of Health Scrutiny, which it had begun by running a number of listening events in the autumn of 2008. The two drivers for the review were:

- a) Lord Darzi's review of the NHS and the reconfiguration of health services had prompted the DoH to look at whether timescales should be introduced for the determination of substantial variations by Health Scrutiny and the process for referral to the Secretary of State by scrutiny of NHS consultations;
- b) The legislation on Health Scrutiny had been introduced six years ago and the structure of the NHS had changed significantly with the introduction of Foundation Trusts and the developing role of PCTs through commissioning.

The DoH's current position was that there was no case for the introduction of timescales in relation to determining substantial variation and these should continue to be worked out locally by Health Scrutiny members and local NHS partners. There were no plans to reduce the remit of Health Scrutiny to determine substantial variation of services. The DoH had also highlighted concerns around the interaction of Health Scrutiny and Foundation Trusts from the listening exercises which it wanted to address. Following two further listening events in 27 July, which would be facilitated by the Centre for Public Scrutiny, the draft guidance would be made available in autumn 2009.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That the progress on the following legislation, that would affect the remit of Scrutiny, be noted:**
 - (i) The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007;**
 - (ii) The Policy & Justice Act 2006;**
 - (iii) The Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Bill 2008-09;**
- (b) That the progress on the Department of Health review of Health Scrutiny be noted.**

**SCRUTINY LEADERSHIP BOARD APPOINTMENTS TO JOINT
HEALTH SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WITH STAFFORDSHIRE,
STOKE-ON-TRENT AND SHROPSHIRE COUNCILS**

The report of the Head of Finance & Audit informed Members of the need for appointments to be made from the Council's Scrutiny Health Monitoring Sub-Group to a Joint Health Scrutiny Committee with Staffordshire, Shropshire and Stoke-on-Trent Councils for the purpose of considering whether the proposal by the Specialist Commissioning Team for the West Midlands to develop Primary Angioplasty (PPCI) was a substantial variation in service that would require public consultation.

Councillor D.R.W. White, as Chairman of the Health Scrutiny Monitoring Sub-Group, had been approached by the Specialist Commissioning Team (SCT) for the West Midlands with regard to a development they wished to make to specialist heart treatment for a small number of patients in Shropshire and Staffordshire. The SCT was unsure whether this development would constitute a substantial variation or development in service which would, if so, require a three month public consultation.

The Joint Committee would be convened under the relevant direction from the Secretary of State, which related to consultations by NHS bodies under the Health and Social Care Act 2001 whereby people from more than one local authority area might be affected by proposed variations or developments to NHS services. In these circumstances all Health Scrutiny Committees consulted must decide whether they considered the proposals to be "substantial" and those that did were required to form a Joint Health Scrutiny Committee to deal with the consultation and to respond on behalf of their communities.

In consultation with the Staffordshire, Shropshire and Stoke-on-Trent Scrutiny functions, Councillor Derek White, as Chairman of the Sub-Group, had agreed to a Joint Committee being convened for this purpose and that, as agreed with the other authorities, the requirement for political proportionality in Joint Committees should be waived in this instance. It had also been agreed that three Health Scrutiny Members would be nominated by each Local Authority taking part and it was proposed that the following members of the Health Scrutiny Monitoring Group be nominated as Telford & Wrekin Council's representatives on the Joint Health Scrutiny Committee.

Councillor Derek White
Councillor Angela McClements
Ms Dilys Davis (Co-optee)

RESOLVED:

- (a) **That the requirement for a Joint Health Scrutiny Committee with Staffordshire, Shropshire and Stoke-on-Trent Councils to consider whether the introduction of Primary Angioplasty (PPCI) was a substantial variation in service and required public consultation be noted;**

- (b) That Councillors Derek White and Angela McClements and Ms. Dilys Davis (co-optee) be nominated to sit on the Joint Health Committee;
- (c) That it be agreed that political proportionality be waived for this Joint Health Scrutiny Committee.

**SLB-60 SIX MONTHLY REVIEW OF NEW SCRUTINY
ARRANGEMENTS**

Attendance/Involvement Update

Details of Member participation in the In-depth and Special Interest Meeting reviews during 2009-10 was tabled for the Board's information. Following a discussion, it was agreed that the Chairman should write to those Members who had not yet put their names forward to attend any of these meetings. Those Members who were currently unable to attend meetings due to ill-health, would be requested to inform the Chairman of this in writing, with an e-mail being acceptable.

Progress with Work Programme

The update on 2008 Programme and the 2009 In-depth Review Programme and Special Interest Meetings, as tabled, was noted by the Board.

Scrutiny Assembly Sessions

Stephanie Jones, the Scrutiny Officer, informed Members that the October Scrutiny Assembly would take the form of a meeting with the Chief Executive and the Leader of the Council and asked what format they would wish this meeting to have. A Question Time format was suggested.

The Chairman said that the format should be that of a dialogue between the Chief Executive and the Leader to inform the Board of the political and policy objectives of the Council but that there should not be a workshop session.

The Scrutiny Manager suggested that, in order for the Chief Executive and the Leader to be sufficiently challenged, questions should be submitted before hand with the Scrutiny Leadership Board acting as a filter but the Chairman said that he would wish there to be a Question Time open to the floor of the meeting. He would also be in favour of the Chief Executive and the Leader seeing the questions before the Assembly Session in order that they could give considered responses rather than their immediate reactions. However, supplementary questions could then be asked in order to probe the original responses given. In conclusion the Chairman suggested that suggested questions should be sought from the Scrutiny Assembly Members and that the Scrutiny Leadership Board would then approve an agreed small number of questions to be put at the Assembly Session and a final decision taken on the format of the Question Time in the light of these.

Councillor K.L. Tomlinson commented on the Assembly Session held on 19 May, 2009 and said that in future she would prefer to have a discussion rather than a Quiz and the Chairman responded that a new mechanism would be drawn up for the next Scrutiny Assembly.

Other Issues

Councillor K.L. Tomlinson asked for details of the Council's current organisational structure to be made available and Councillor A.A. Meredith asked for information on the South Telford Cluster.

SLB-61 CHAIRMAN'S UPDATE

As a result of the recent change in the Council's political balance, following the establishment of the Independent/Liberal Democrat Group, the seat on the Board previously held by TAWPA was now held by the new Group with Councillor K.L. Tomlinson as the current member.

Councillor H.J. Williams, who had been the TAWPA representative on the Board, had subsequently resigned from the Value for Money Scrutiny Group of which she had been the Chairman. As Councillor K.L. Tomlinson did not wish to be appointed to this vacancy, the Chairman agreed that the Leader of the Independent/Liberal Democrat Group should be invited to nominate a representative to join the Value for Money Scrutiny Group and that a new Chairman would be sought from the existing Value for Money group Members.

The Chairman reminded the Board that he and Councillor R.E. Groom had previously proposed, unsuccessfully, that a Staff Suggestion Scheme should be introduced. He and Councillor Groom had now spoken to relevant people, and decided that in the current climate the scheme should be reconsidered. As a result, the original proposals would be reviewed with a view to submitting a report to Cabinet. .

SLB-62 FORWARD PLAN – AGENDA ITEMS 2009-10

The Board noted the Scrutiny Forward Plan items, as set out in Appendix D.

SLB-63 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Members noted that the next scheduled meeting of the Board would take place on Wednesday, 16 September, 2009.

The meeting ended at 6.12 p.m.

Chairman:

Date:

Report for the Scrutiny Leadership Board Scrutiny Assembly Meeting, 12th October 2009

- The Scrutiny Assembly Meeting with the Leader and Chief Executive has been confirmed for 12th October, 6.00-8.00pm in the VIP Suite. Cllr. Andrew Eade and Victor Brownlees have confirmed their attendance.
- The Scrutiny Assembly has been advised of the details and asked to confirm attendance.
- The meeting will take a "Question Time" format, chaired by Cllr. Derek White. There will be no formal presentations.
- The meeting will include asking 4 or 5 pre-agreed questions with an opportunity for members to ask supplementary questions. In addition the session will also allow for additional questions on other issues to be raised by members attending on the night. The Scrutiny Assembly have been invited to put forward their suggested questions for consideration and selection by the Scrutiny Leadership Board.
- The idea behind agreeing questions in advance is to make sure that the questions put are of a sufficiently strategic and challenging nature and to avoid the pitfall of questions being too parochial or relating to individual ward issues. The combination of pre-agreed and open questions should focus the meeting on issues of future strategic importance while allowing scope for members to ask questions about issues of concern to them.
- The suggested layout is theatre style to minimise distracting talk across tables and so that everyone is facing the panel.
- The Scrutiny Leadership Board will need to decide the following:
 1. Whether they are happy with the format as outlined above and whether they have any other suggestions.
 2. Whether the pre-agreed questions should be given in advance to Andrew Eade and Victor Brownlees. The advantage of doing this is to allow them to prepare relevant information in advance to give a more substantive answer to questions.
 3. To select the questions they would like to ask. If there is insufficient response from the Scrutiny Assembly members, then the SLB will need to agree some questions themselves.

Report for the Scrutiny Leadership Board Special Interest Meeting, Surface Water Drainage

- The Surface Water Drainage Special Interest Meeting was held on 30th July 2009. The meeting was to review how the expanding population and climate change impact on the drainage of water, and how system capacity is planned to cope with future demands. (The original scrutiny suggestion also suggested looking at the supply of water, but this was not covered at the meeting.)
- At the end of the meeting the members agreed that they would like to undertake an In-depth review on flooding and surface water drainage matters and that this should be put to the Scrutiny Leadership Board to agree its inclusion in the Scrutiny Work Programme. It was noted that one of the recommendations of the Pitt Review following the 2007 floods was to strengthen overview and scrutiny by local authorities in this area. The Pitt recommendation indicates that the working environment is complex and that flooding issues are not of a 'task and finish' nature. It was suggested that with the range of issues within Telford & Wrekin and the growth expectations that this would be a sensible approach.
- The members agreed a number of areas that an In-depth review would cover, including the strategic planning of surface water drainage across the Council, the cost implications of additional responsibility placed on local authorities by the Flood and Water Management Bill/Act, the relationship with key partners including Severn Trent and the Environment Agency, opportunities for joint working with Shropshire Council, the fee-earning potential of the engineering unit, and the results of the national Integrated Urban Drainage pilot that Telford & Wrekin participated in and how the Council can influence the national agenda.
- The scrutiny suggestion was originally 6th on the priority list for Special Interest Meetings, as shown in the table below. The meeting was brought forward to coincide with early consultation on the Surface Water Drainage Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which will become part of the Local Development Framework. The original suggestion attracted 4 members, although when an e-mail about the meeting was sent out in June, 10 members signed-up. On the day, only four were able to attend, but there was a high level of interest in the topic.

Issue	Score	Number of Votes
Waste Management including Bulk Collection	21	10
Helping Residents Access Benefits	20	12
Cluster Arrangements and Locality Working	19	12
Child Protection & Child Protection Plans	18	9
End of Life Choices	16	7
Developing future skills for business	15	7
Extended Schools and Healthy Communities	19	13
Bringing together Health Related Agencies	19	11
Highways Infrastructure	17	8
Services to Young People Outside School	15	7
Accessibility for people with disabilities/older people/mobility issues	15	6
Keeping elected members informed	15	9
Domestic Violence		
Supporting Local Business	13	5
Customer Contact Centre	13	5
Development Projects	12	4
Transport for Tourism	11	6
Supply and Drainage of Water to T&W	10	4

- The Scrutiny Leadership Board will need to consider whether this should be included in the Work Programme as an In-depth Review, and if so how this should be prioritised against the reviews already agreed.

T&W LOGO

PHOTOS

SCRUTINY ANNUAL REPORT 2008/09

CONTENTS

Introduction	3
Purpose of scrutiny	4
Scrutiny at Telford & Wrekin Council	5
Co-optees	8
The developing role of scrutiny	9
What happened in 2008/09?	
Scrutiny Management Board	10
Scrutiny Commission - Children & Young People	11
Scrutiny Commission - Environment & Regeneration	12
Scrutiny Commission - Health & Care	13
Scrutiny Commission - Community & Resources	14
Corporate Parenting	15
Campus Telford	16
Value for Money	17
Health Monitoring	18
Looking forward to 2009/10	19
Contacts	20
Your Suggestions for Scrutiny	21

INTRODUCTION

Welcome to the 2008/09 annual report on the operation of scrutiny in Telford & Wrekin.

The following pages set out briefly both the local and national context within which scrutiny operates in Telford & Wrekin, summarises the main activities of scrutiny over the last 12 months and looks forward to the planned scrutiny work in 2009/10.

We also focus on how you can make suggestions to scrutiny for future reviews and there is a suggestions form at the back of this report that you can fill in and send to us.

We hope you find the content interesting and informative and welcome your suggestions for topics for future scrutiny reviews.

Cllr. Derek White
Chairman of the Scrutiny Leadership Board

THE PURPOSE OF SCRUTINY

The concept of scrutiny in local authorities was formally introduced by the Local Government Act 2000. There are 54 elected members on Telford & Wrekin Council, but just 8 of these make up a Cabinet which is the main decision making body of the Council. This places a lot of responsibility with a small number of elected members.


Scrutiny is a way for other members of the Council who are not Cabinet Members to monitor, review and, where necessary, challenge the decisions, policies and services of the Cabinet to make sure that people in Telford & Wrekin are getting the best services possible within the resources available to the Council. Scrutiny can look at any Council service, and can also look at services provided by organisations other than the Council where they impact on local people.

The Centre of Public Scrutiny has identified four key principles that underpin effective scrutiny:


- Effective scrutiny should be a “critical friend to Council executives, external authorities and agencies. It should challenge policy development and decision making in a robust, constructive and purposeful way while developing a partnership with external agencies and authorities;
- Effective scrutiny should reflect the voice and concerns of the public and its communities. It should ensure an ongoing dialogue with the public and diverse communities where the public voice is heard and responded to. It should have open and transparent processes with public access to information.
- Effective scrutiny should take the lead and own the scrutiny process on behalf of the public. It should be independent from the executive, legitimised by the Council and should have adequate public representation and political balance that is representative of the current political groups involved.
- Effective scrutiny should make an impact on the delivery of public services. It should promote community well-being and improve the quality of life, providing co-ordinated and strategic reviews of policy and service performance in line with strategic objectives.

SCRUTINY AT TELFORD & WREKIN COUNCIL

The scrutiny function at Telford & Wrekin underwent a re-structure in January 2009 as a result of a review of scrutiny arrangements, undertaken by the then Scrutiny Management Board. The former structure included a Scrutiny Management Board which was made up of 4 Scrutiny Chairman and 4 Vice Chairman. Its role was to scrutinise cross cutting issues, review and improve the way scrutiny operated and to hear call-ins. In addition there were four Scrutiny Commissions reflecting the departmental structure of the Council plus four scrutiny sub groups which focused on particular key issues for the Council.



Following the review, the scrutiny structure was changed to align with the Council Priorities and to emphasise the need for scrutiny members to scrutinise external services as well as those the Council provides. It also allowed members to scrutinise services across all priority areas.



The **Scrutiny Leadership Board** is made up of 6 members and is politically balanced. All 6 members are appointed for a 2 year period. The Chairman is an opposition group member appointed by the opposition group members on the Scrutiny Leadership Board for a 2 year period. Collectively, the Scrutiny Leadership Board is responsible for scrutiny of the Council's overarching objective of Transforming Telford & Wrekin. Each scrutiny lead member takes responsibility for one of the Council's other Community Priorities.

The main tasks of the Scrutiny Leadership Board are to have overall responsibility for ensuring scrutiny is effective, to plan, approve and oversee delivery of the scrutiny work programme and to undertake reviews of strategic issues. The Scrutiny Leadership Board also considers call-ins, councillor calls for action and referrals of issues to consider as part of the work programme.

The **Scrutiny Assembly** consists of all members who are not a member of the Cabinet or a Cabinet Assistant. The Mayor cannot be a member of the Scrutiny Assembly but may attend and participate in any meetings if he or she wishes. All other members and scrutiny co-optees of the Council will be a member of the Scrutiny Assembly.

The Scrutiny Assembly holds three main meetings each municipal year, but the majority of scrutiny work is undertaken outside of the formal Scrutiny Assembly meetings by way of a range of flexible working arrangements which are described later in this report:

- Standing sub-groups
- Spotlight reviews
- In-depth reviews
- Special Interest meetings.

Standing Sub-groups are dedicated to specific service areas or issues and enable members to build up a good knowledge base from which to scrutinise, and enable in-depth scrutiny of these issues. The members of each sub-group decide their own work programme. We have four standing sub-groups of the Scrutiny Leadership Board which look in detail at particular key issues:

- Corporate Parenting
- Campus Telford
- Value for Money
- Health Monitoring

All scrutiny assembly members are invited to take part in a work programme event which will seek to capture and prioritise the issues members wish to investigate over the coming twelve months for the 2009/10 work programme. This took place in January 2009 and is described in detail under section “looking forward to 2009/10” later in this report. Once these issues have been agreed upon, they can be undertaken in one of the three ways set out below.

Special Interest meetings are one-of meetings that give scrutiny members the opportunity to receive information and ask questions on a particular issue or service area. They will be called for work programme items which have not scored in the top 12 and therefore are not subject to in-depth review. A Lead Scrutiny Member may also call a Special Interest meeting for issues that arise during the year that were not on the original scrutiny work programme.

Spotlight Reviews are short reviews with a maximum of 2 meetings in addition to the meeting to agree terms of reference. The second meeting is select committee style with all witnesses that members wish to speak to invited to participate. The third meeting is to discuss conclusions and recommendations. If further details are identified, these will be referred to Scrutiny Leadership Board for possible inclusion in the scrutiny work programme.

In-depth Reviews are detailed reviews that are likely to take a number of months to complete and are used for more complex issues where we might have to talk to a wide range of people and do other research such as finding out what other Councils do, or surveying the public. In-depth reviews take a lot of time to complete so we only undertake a small number in any one year. Generally the Scrutiny Leadership Board members will take the lead on those reviews that fall within their priority remit.

CO-OPTEEES

The Scrutiny Leadership Board has the ability to invite members of the public to participate in scrutiny activities as co-optees. This has the added benefits of providing a lay person's view on services and brings additional expertise in other professional fields /careers to strengthen the effectiveness of the scrutiny process.

From the beginning of scrutiny's inception we have included statutory co-optees in the scrutiny process to consider education matters: two parent governors and two diocesan representatives on the Scrutiny Commission for Children & Young People. In addition we appointed 2 health co-optees following the extension of scrutiny powers to look at health matters to our Scrutiny Commission for Health & Care and we also appointed Head Teacher co-optees representing secondary and primary schools.

However, following a review of the benefits of co-option it was agreed by the Scrutiny Management Board in February 2008 to recruit more co-optees to take part in other parts of scrutiny activity. Following a very successful recruitment campaign in March 2008 we recruited a further 9 co-optees, bringing the total number of co-optees to 14. Some of the co-opted members represent particular groups, for example, older people, parent governors and the Young People's Forum. Other co-opted members do not represent any particular group but bring with them particular experience or knowledge.

Except for the 4 statutory co-opted members on the Scrutiny Commission for Children & Young People, who have voting rights for educational matters only, co-opted members do not have voting rights.

We are fortunate to have some very knowledgeable and dedicated members of the public as co-optees which has further strengthened the scrutiny function at Telford & Wrekin.

THE DEVELOPING ROLE OF SCRUTINY

Scrutiny was introduced as a concept in 2000, and the role has been developing ever since. In 2003, legislation was introduced that widened scrutiny powers to enable elected members to scrutinise and hold to account NHS Trusts that provided services to local residents. The scope and purpose of the scrutiny role continues to evolve and in April 2009 two key pieces of legislation designed to further enhance its effectiveness were implemented.

The provisions of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 and the Police and Justice Act 2006 recognise that the growing emphasis on joint delivery of services between local authorities and other public agencies that will be assessed by the new Comprehensive Area Assessment inspection, need to be matched by effective scrutiny of partnership arrangements. The outward facing role of scrutiny, already well established in the field of healthcare, has therefore been further enhanced by powers to require relevant information from partner agencies responsible for local improvement targets under the Local Area Agreement; these same agencies are now also required to have regard to, and respond to, scrutiny reports and recommendations. Similarly, Crime & Disorder Reduction Partnerships are now required to co-operate with Local Authority scrutiny and to respond and have regard to scrutiny reports and recommendations on relevant issues on community safety. The Scrutiny Leadership Board have considered how to take forward these additional scrutiny activities and will be including them in it's work plan for the coming year.

The legislation also introduces a process called Councillor Call for Action, which allows ward councillors who have a local concern that they have been unable to resolve, to refer it for consideration by the Scrutiny Leadership Board. The Scrutiny Leadership Board has approved a process for managing councillor calls for action which will go to Council Constitution Committee and Full Council for approval in September 2009.

Further legislation is currently being considered by Parliament; The Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Bill specify an enhanced role for scrutiny to receive petitions and to hold officers to account as part of a national petitions scheme. It also requires every unitary authority to ensure that scrutiny is properly resourced and to designate a scrutiny officer, whose role will be to oversee scrutiny support arrangements and champion scrutiny in the organisation.

WHAT HAPPENED IN 2008/09?

Scrutiny Management/Leadership Board

The issues that we looked at in our meetings over the past year were:

- Review of co-optee arrangements
- Chairman and Vice Chairman Appraisals
- City Region
- “Communities in Control – real power, real people” consultation
- Scrutiny Member Survey
- Transforming Telford
- Changes to the scrutiny structure
- Review of the Council’s Constitution
- Introduction of Councillor Call for Action
- The Credit Crunch Advice Centre

The **Scrutiny Assembly** held its first meeting on 6th January to discuss possible areas for scrutiny to investigate during 2009/10. The event attracted a high turnout of both elected members and co-optees and we received very positive feedback.

The second meeting was held on 19th May in workshop format to scrutinise the performance of the Council against each of its community priorities for 2008/09 and to look ahead at the coming year. Again the event was well received with good feedback on how we could improve the process next year.

Call-in is a way for members of the Council to suspend a key decision, made by the Cabinet or by senior officers under delegated powers, until it has been considered by the Scrutiny Leadership Board. Once a decision has been published, members have 3 working days to submit a call-in form. This must be signed by at least 5 members of the Council. The Scrutiny Leadership Board then meets to hear both sides of the debate and decide whether the original decision should stand, or whether to refer the matter back to the decision taker with a recommendation to change the decision.

There have been no call-ins during 2008/09.

Scrutiny Commission for Children & Young People

The issues that we looked at in our meetings during 2008/09 were:

- School OFSTED Inspection Reports
- Southall School – OFSTED Action Plan
- R:Evolution
- The Joint Area Review Inspection
- Raising the profile of Children & Young People
- School Performance Data 2008
- Enhanced Youth Inspection
- Update on Youth Services

INDEPTH REVIEWS

School Travel Review

We have focussed on one in-depth review, looking at 3 main areas:

1. How the Council and schools encourage pupils to travel actively to school, to reduce reliance on cars
2. Whether there is potential to implement a Yellow School Bus scheme in Telford & Wrekin
3. The Education Transport Policy.

As part of the review, we asked for the views of schools and visited a couple of those that replied. We also met with officers in the Council. We also looked at what other Councils do and made a visit to Staffordshire County Council to see their yellow bus service.

The Scrutiny Commission had two sub-groups which looked at key areas of children's services; Corporate Parenting and Campus Telford, further details of the work of these groups are provided in later sections of this report.

Scrutiny Commission for Environment & Regeneration

The issues that we looked at in our formal Commission meetings during 2008/09 were:

- Waste Disposal
- Borough Towns Initiative
- Telford Town Centre Development

IN-DEPTH REVIEWS

Traffic Management in Conservation Areas

This review started with a case study of the Local Safety Scheme that was installed in Newport High Street in 2005. We widened the scope of the review to look at the consultation and design process for putting traffic management schemes into our historic market towns, considering how the design of a traffic scheme can be made to fit with the appearance of the town, and how local residents must be involved in designing traffic systems that will work.

The review included a visit to Newport to examine the local Safety Scheme, and meetings with a number of local organisations like the Chamber of Commerce and the Civic Society. We also met with a number of Council officers and received written views from Newport Town Council and the Newport Regeneration Partnership.

Bus Services

The main objectives of this review were:

- To address immediate and future issues of reliability and quality of provision, and to improve the bus services in Telford & Wrekin
- To review the Quality Bus Partnership between the Council and Arriva
- To identify the needs of Telford & Wrekin with regard to bus services and assess whether the current provision meets these needs
- To change perceptions of the bus services and increase bus patronage.

The review included meetings with Arriva, The Bus User Group, Senior Citizens Transport Group, Young Peoples Forum and the Disability Forum as well as Council officers, transport officers from Shropshire Council and National Express West Midlands.

Scrutiny Commission for Health & Care

As well as scrutinising Council services, we have a specific role in scrutiny of the NHS and they consult us when they are proposing big changes to the services they provide. The issues that we covered in our Commission meetings during 2008/09 were:

- National Institute for Clinical Excellence (NICE)
- Adaptations to the Home for Disabled People
- World Class Commissioning
- Update on Developing a Health and Healthcare Strategy for Shropshire and Telford & Wrekin
- Obesity

IN-DEPTH REVIEWS

Housing and Homelessness

We have focussed our time on a large review of Housing and Homelessness. A number of Councillors have had residents raise issues about the availability of social and affordable housing, and also of homelessness. Coupled with this, the recent credit crunch and ensuing downturn in the economy has highlighted the issues around homelessness. The particular areas that we have looked at are:

- The Choose Your Home choice based lettings scheme;
- Assessing the extent of housing needs and homelessness;
- Investigating the barriers and opportunities in the supply of housing, and considering solutions to this;
- The eligibility criteria for accessing housing support for different groups within the community.

This review has included many meetings with a wide range of organisations including: Citizen's Advice Bureau, all of the major Registered Social Landlords operating in Telford & Wrekin, the local representative of the National Landlords Association, The Homes and Communities Agency. The review group also visited local voluntary organisations offering services to the homeless like STAY, KIP, YMCA, Stars Project and Mark's Pit Stop. The group also undertook shadowing of Housing Needs Officers and met with some of the young residents at the YMCA in Wellington.

Scrutiny Commission for Community & Resources

The issues that we considered during 2008/09 were:

- Update on Procurement
- General Update on Customer Strategy and Business Transformation
- Update on Taxi Action Plan
- Beyond Excellence Through People
- Demonstration of Delta electronic tendering system
- Presentation on West Mercia Supplies
- Use of CCTV
- Update on the Employee Survey 2007

IN-DEPTH REVIEWS

Section 106 agreements

As part of new developments, the Council can negotiate funding from developers under Section 106 agreements. This funding is agreed for specific work that results from the development e.g. a play area for the housing estate, or maintenance of the highway around the development.

Our aim in carrying out this review was to evaluate how effectively the resources secured through Section 106 agreements are secured, managed and utilised.

Procurement

It was agreed by members to undertake an in-depth review of this area because they were concerned that the Council does not have the right model to be able to make the efficiency savings that will be needed as it moves into the future.

Members had three main objectives for the review:

- Evaluate the balance between centralized procurement and devolved procurement;
- evaluate whether the Council's procurement processes provide value for money;
- to make recommendations on the Council's procurement process to improve value for money.

Information for this review came from a number of sources, including: meetings with officers in the Central Procurement Unit and staff responsible for buying in the portfolios, with procurement managers at Staffordshire County Council and Warwickshire County Council and meetings with a Procurement expert witness and a consultant about Sustainable Procurement

Corporate Parenting Scrutiny Monitoring Group

This group looks at issues related to children who are in care. Children come into care for many different reasons, and the Council and Councillors then become their “corporate” parent. This group monitors the services these children received, with one underlying question in mind.....“Would this be good enough for **my** child?”

We have meetings with Council officers to hear about the work they are doing, and we also meet 4 times a year with children and young people in the care system so that we can hear about the services directly from the people that use them.

The issues considered by the group during 2008/09 were:

- Rights and Representations Annual Report
- Statutory Reviews Action Plan
- Regulation 33 visits
- Placements Strategy
- Church Street Residential Children’s Home
- Review of Telford & Wrekin Safeguarding arrangements
- Feedback from working group on Statutory Reviews
- OFSTED report – Looked After Children good practice in schools
- Feedback from outcomes based accountability workshop
- Education Champion Role
- Update on Care Council
- Laming Audit
- Foster Care update
- Children and Young People’s Plan 2008/09
- Leading improvements for Looked After Children (LILAC) report
- Annual Complaints Report
- Annual Performance Report
- Joint Area Review feedback

In the group’s meetings with children & young people in the care system the following issues were discussed:

- How can the Council help me achieve my hopes and dreams?
- Foster Care
- Health issues
- Children In Care Reviews

Campus Telford and Wrekin Scrutiny Monitoring Group

This group monitors the Campus Telford & Wrekin project which will see significant amounts invested into modernising schools across the borough. The group meet as needed to discuss key milestones in the project and to make comments and recommendations back to the project board, based on their observations.

The issues considered by the group during 2008/09 were:

At each meeting the group receive updates on standing items specifically on the project process:

- Project progress
- Position on project costs
- Communication with key stakeholders
- Management of risks

In addition the following items were also discussed and considered:

- Outline business case
- Gateway Report
- Post 16 consultation
- Presentation on role of the 4ps (local government's partnership and project delivery specialist) In Building Schools for the Future
- Developing the vision in the School Strategy for Change into a design that works
- Integration of ICT

Value for Money Scrutiny Monitoring Group

The Value for Money Scrutiny Monitoring Group fulfils two important scrutiny tasks. It is the main mechanism by which the Cabinet formally consults scrutiny on their budget proposals, and allows non-executive members full access to all Council financial data. It also monitors the service and financial performance of Council services through regular review of performance monitoring reports and other necessary information. The group meets monthly with officers from across the Council portfolios to discuss services in detail.

The issues considered by the group during 2008/09 were:

- Value for Money update on “cost outliers”
- New performance management system
- End of year performance 2007/08
- Financial outturn 2007/08
- Telford & Wrekin services contract
- Corporate Value for Money Self Assessment
- Telford Services contract – recycling
- Service & Financial Planning monitoring 2008/09 - quarterly
- Performance monitoring 2008/09 – quarterly
- Value for Money business unit self assessments: on Open spaces, Benefit Administration, Street Cleansing and Special Educational Needs.
- Borough Towns Initiative
- Local Area Agreement
- Performance management – progress against the new performance management framework in 2008/09
- Service & Financial Planning 2009/10 to 2011/12 – draft budget strategy
- Investments and savings in the Adult & Consumer Care portfolio
- A simple guide to Treasury Management
- Roads, footpaths and lighting – investment proposals
- Concessionary travel
- Housing and Council Tax Benefit overspend – B&B provision
- Children & Families Overspend
- Priority Plan: “maintaining a high quality, attractive and sustainable environment”

Health Monitoring Scrutiny Group

This group monitors the performance of adult social care services in the Telford & Wrekin area. The group is also the main mechanism for scrutinising the NHS under the Health & Social Care Act 2001.

The issues considered by the group during 2008/09 were:

- Update on Prevention of Alcohol Misuse and Harm Reduction Strategy
- World Class Commissioning
- Healthcare Commission Annual Health Check 2008/09
- Foundation Trust status for West Midlands Ambulance Service NHS Trust

Scrutiny members from Telford & Wrekin Council and Shropshire County Council sit on the **Joint Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee**. The committee considers health issues or consultations that cut across the boundaries of the two local authorities. The 6 Telford & Wrekin scrutiny members from the Health Scrutiny Monitoring Group also sit on this committee.

The issues considered by the committee during 2008/09 were:

- Developing Health & Health Care – this is a county-wide project considering how acute hospital services can be reconfigured to meet the requirements of the EU Working Time Directive. Work has been ongoing during 2008/09 with the Committee receiving frequent updates on progress. Statutory public consultation on preliminary options for re-configuration is expected in autumn 2009.
- Shelton Hospital redevelopment - the committee is also responsible for scrutinising the ongoing project to reconfigure mental health services in the County to provide a modern facility to replace Shelton Hospital, and provide more community based services. The Committee has received quarterly updates from the project Director on progress and an outline business case is expected in the first quarter of 2010.

LOOKING FORWARD TO 2009/10

The scrutiny work programme for 2009/10 consists of the following:

In depth reviews

- Waste Management including bulk collection
- Helping residents access benefits
- Cluster arrangements and locality working
- Child Protection & Child Protection Plans
- Palliative Care Services for Children & Young People and Adults
- Developing future skills for business
- Extended schools and healthy communities
- Bringing together health-related agencies
- Highways infrastructure
- Services to young people outside school
- Accessibility for people with disabilities / older people / people with mobility issues
- Keeping elected members informed

Special Interest Meetings (provided at least 3 members volunteer)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Security for Victims of Domestic Abuse • Supporting Local Businesses • Customer Contact Centre • Development Projects • Supply and drainage of water to Telford and Wrekin • Young people with mental health problems • Sustainable and balanced developments • Planning applications and the role of Parish/Town Councils • Advertising and road signage. • The transition of disabled children into adult services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equality & Diversity Policy • Music lessons/specialist teaching provision in schools • Co-ordination of CCTV across T&W • Council complaints procedure • Employee travel to work • Inconsistencies in young people paying adult prices • Bringing together people of different age groups and cultural backgrounds • Accommodation for tourism • Providing reassurance through positive media • Car parking enforcement. • Transport for Tourism
---	--

A spotlight review is planned for adoption of roads and green space on un-adopted estates.

CONTACTS

To find out more about scrutiny, take a look at our web pages:

www.telford.gov.uk/scrutiny

You can find meeting dates and agendas for scrutiny meetings on the Council website under Council and Democracy. Or you can call Democratic Services on 01952 383211.

If you would like to contact a member of the Scrutiny team, our contact details and areas of responsibility are below:

Ken Clarke – Head of Finance & Audit

- Value for Money Scrutiny Monitoring Group

Tel: 01952 383100

Email: ken.clarke@telford.gov.uk

Fiona Bottrill – Scrutiny Manager

- Scrutiny Health Monitoring Group

Tel: 01952 383113

Email: fiona.bottrill@telford.gov.uk

Stephanie Jones – Scrutiny Officer

- Corporate Parenting Scrutiny Monitoring Group
- Campus Telford Scrutiny Monitoring Group

Tel: 01952 383114

Email: stephanie.jones2@telford.gov.uk

Beverley Partridge – Assistant Democratic Services Officer (Scrutiny)

Tel: 01952 383118

Email: beverley.patridge@telford.gov.uk

**YOUR
SUGGESTIONS
FOR
SCRUTINY**

If you have any ideas of areas of Council services that we could look at please let us know. Maybe you think a Council service is not providing you and your friends and neighbours with the service you require, or perhaps you have had recurring problems with one of the services. You might think that there is a gap in the services the Council is providing, and want scrutiny to look at what could be done to fill the gap.

You can let us know by filling in the section below, detach it and post to the FREEPOST address below.

Please bear in mind that scrutiny doesn't deal with individual requests for service or complaints. If you have a request for service, e.g. a pot hole on your road or a fault with a street light, these should be reported to the relevant Council department. The main Switchboard number at Telford & Wrekin Council is 01952 380000. If you wish to make a complaint, you should send this first to the people responsible for the service that you are dissatisfied with – this could be by phone, in writing, by email or by filling in the form on the Council's website.

The issue I think scrutiny should look at is:

.....

.....

.....

.....

I think the problems with this service are:

.....

.....

.....

.....

Send to:

Scrutiny Services
FREEPOST RRHJ-TZJL-CTKY
PO Box 215
Telford
TF3 4LF

--- An Efficient, Effective and Customer-Focused Council that Delivers Value for Money for the Community ---



--- An Efficient, Effective and Customer-Focused Council that Delivers Value for Money for the Community ---

Scrutiny Review of Procurement

September 2009



--- An Efficient, Effective and Customer-Focused Council that Delivers Value for Money for the Community ---



--- An Efficient, Effective and Customer-Focused Council that Delivers Value for Money for the Community ---

Scrutiny Review of Procurement at Telford & Wrekin Council

CONTENTS

	PAGE
1. Introduction	3
2. The National Context	4
3. Procurement at Telford & Wrekin	5
4. Sustainable Procurement	10
5. Alternative Models and Case Studies	14
6. Conclusions and Recommendations	18
7. Summary of Recommendations	23

1. INTRODUCTION

Members decided to carry out a review of Telford & Wrekin's procurement arrangements because they were concerned that the Council does not have the right model to be able to make the efficiency savings that will be needed as it moves into the future.

Members had three main objectives for the review:

1. To evaluate whether the Council has the right balance between centralized procurement (corporate) and devolved procurement (within individual business units);
2. To evaluate whether the Council's procurement processes provide value for money;
3. To make recommendations on the Council's procurement process to improve value for money.

Information for this review came from a number of sources, including:

- Meetings with the Procurement and Payments Manager in the Corporate Procurement Unit
- Meetings with staff responsible for buying in the portfolios: Adult & Consumer Wellbeing, Social Care, Children and Young People, Environment and Regeneration, ICT, Design and Property
- Meetings with procurement managers at Staffordshire County Council and Warwickshire County Council
- Meeting with a local authority Procurement expert
- Meeting with a Sustainable Procurement consultancy
- Review of national and Telford & Wrekin procurement strategies

The term "procurement" is generally taken to mean the actual purchasing function i.e. bid evaluation and contract letting, and "commissioning" to mean the wider functions of identifying user need, strategic service development, identifying and developing the market, contract specification and effective contract management. This distinction is clearly made in Children and Young People's Services and Adult and Consumer Wellbeing which have Commissioning teams. Whereas other portfolios do not make this distinction, but Members feel that these wider functions should be undertaken as part of any significant procurement exercise, and in this report the term "procurement" should be taken to include these broader functions.

Sections 3-5 of this report summarise the information gathered as part of our review. We would like to thank all those people who have taken the time to meet with us. We have made a number of recommendations in Section 6 of the report which we believe will generate savings for the Council and deliver greater local economic benefit to the borough. These recommendations will be presented to the Council's Cabinet and for those recommendations that are accepted, we will monitor the progress to implement them.

Members of the Review Group

Cllr Roger Aveley, Scrutiny Lead
Cllr Karen Tomlinson
Scrutiny Co-optee Maurice Viney

2. THE NATIONAL CONTEXT

Local authority procurement has risen up the national agenda in recent years and is now seen as key to delivering the efficiency savings that will be expected of local authorities over the coming years. Procurement impacts on spending in two ways:

- On direct savings to the Council on the cost of contracted services and the cost of the procurement process
- On wider public sector spending by delivering broader economic, social and environmental outcomes through a Sustainable Procurement strategy.

Above all else procurement is about making sure that local authorities are delivering the right services, of the best possible quality and at the right price to local people.

Local authority expenditure in England and Wales is estimated at £40 billion annually. There have been various reviews of local government procurement which advocate procurement as one of the key ways for local authorities to achieve efficiency savings and to deliver improved public services.

The **National Procurement Strategy** (NPS) in 2003-2006 took a leap forward by introducing a strategic approach to procurement. The NPS emphasises the importance of collaborative partnerships between public, private and voluntary sector organisations in delivering savings through better strategic planning and buying. While the NPS focuses on achieving savings for the authority through the whole contract life-cycle, the role of procurement in the delivery of broader economic, social and environmental outcomes is also a central feature. As a result of the NPS, £3.1 billion savings were made nationally by local authorities by the end of 2006-07.

The **Local Government Sustainable Procurement Strategy** in 2007 built on the National Procurement Strategy and set out a flexible framework for delivering sustainable outcomes in 5 key areas: financial savings on capital projects, the creation of training and employment opportunities, improving the number and mix of local businesses in supply chains, better powers to stimulate product and process design and better environmental outcomes (e.g. the reduction of CO2 emissions and residual waste).

The **National Improvement and Efficiency Strategy** in 2008 provides a framework to help local authorities meet their efficiency savings targets through Regional Improvement and Efficiency Partnerships (RIEPs). Telford & Wrekin is supported by Improvement and Efficiency West Midlands (IEWM) which aims to help authorities in the West Midlands achieve the savings target set in the Comprehensive Spending review 2008-11 of £293million.

The **Glover Report** in 2009 includes key recommendations adopted by the government designed to give small and medium enterprises (SMEs), including contractors, opportunities to win much more public sector work through procurement.

The **Roots Review** in 2009 examines Arrangements for Efficiencies from Smarter Procurement in local authorities and emphasises ways in which councils can make even greater efficiency savings through improved procurement processes.

3. PROCURMENT AT TELFORD & WREKIN

3.1 The Telford & Wrekin Procurement Model

Telford & Wrekin currently spends £120 million annually on goods and services, excluding schools.

The Council has a devolved procurement model which means that outside the Corporate Contracts, the actual buying function lies with individual staff in the portfolios and not in the Corporate Procurement Unit (CPU). The Council's Constitution gives delegated procurement authority to Corporate Directors who further delegate authority to their staff to undertake procurement activities. These delegations are aligned to the arrangements for budget delegations. This allows officers in each directorate who are knowledgeable and skilled in the specialist service areas to manage the procurement activities of those services.

The CPU provides a central co-ordination and advice function. It sits under the Corporate Finance Manager in Resources and consists of the Procurement and Payments Manager and two Procurement Officers, all of whom are Chartered Institute of Purchasing and Supply (CIPS) qualified or part-qualified. A third post has been created but this will be part-time and does not come into force until March 2010.

The CPU has several key functions:

- To set procurement strategy and policy for the Council. Telford & Wrekin Council's Procurement Strategy 2009 brings together the key elements of the National Procurement Strategy, and provides a specific focus for sustainability and equality issues.
- To act in an advisory capacity to staff in the portfolios involved in procurement;
- To lead the procurement elements of major corporate projects;
- To tender, manage and promote contracting arrangements;
- To promote the benefits of procurement best practice throughout the organisation;
- To identify potential areas for improving processes and practices that will make efficiency savings.

The CPU sets up and runs the majority of the Corporate Contracts. These are for goods and services purchased across the organisation to rationalise suppliers, reduce processing costs and achieve economies of scale. There are currently 18 Corporate Contracts including stationery, furniture, advertising, printing, hygiene, hotel booking and agency staff. Savings are estimated each year resulting from negotiation of better contract terms or from switching supplier and contracts are awarded on the most economically advantageous criteria. The establishment and re-letting of each new Corporate Contract has brought savings, estimated in total as:

2005-06	£123,802
2006-07	£208,323
2007-08	£367,597
2008-09	£401,949

These are notional figures as they do not take account of off-contract spend i.e. buying from non-contracted suppliers, which will reduce the overall savings potential of the Corporate Contracts.

The actual number of staff involved in procurement across the Council is not known and the total cost to the Council of the actual purchasing process is not known.

3.2 West Mercia Supplies (WMS)

Telford and Wrekin Council is one of four owning local authorities in a purchasing consortium called West Mercier Supplies (WMS). The other owning authorities are Shropshire, Herefordshire and Worcestershire. WMS provides school and office supplies, including photocopiers and utilities (electricity, gas, and oil). Each owning member receives an annual rebate based on the surplus each year. The amount the Joint Committee agree for distribution is then split across the 4 owning authorities based on the amount of business placed during the relevant Financial Year.

3.3 Major Areas of Spend and CPU Involvement in Contract Procurement

The table below lists 40 of the Authority's highest spending contracts by portfolio in 2008-09. This shows where the contract was let, the level of CPU involvement in the process, and where the contract is managed. This illustrates the limited involvement of the CPU with the procurement of the highest value contracts.

Contract	Gross Amount	Contract Responsibility	Comments
THOMAS VALE CONSTRUCTION PLC	£4,540,238.88	Service Area	CPU limited involvement with E&R Contracts
WEST MERCIA SUPPLIES	£3,727,300.03	CPU	
MILLER CONSTRUCTION (UK)LIMITED	£3,379,397.95	Service Area	CPU limited involvement with E&R Contracts
CARILLION REGIONAL CIVIL ENGINEERING	£3,372,515.50	Service Area	CPU limited involvement with E&R Contracts
SITA UK	£3,127,707.01	Service Area	CPU limited involvement with E&R Contracts
INTERCLASS PLC	£2,650,015.88	Service Area	CPU limited involvement with E&R Contracts
JACOBS ENGINEERING UK LTD	£2,470,366.32	Service Area	CPU limited involvement with E&R Contracts
ARRIVA MIDLANDS NORTH LIMITED	£2,235,383.83	Service Area & CPU	CPU increasing involvement with transport contracts
SYNETRIX LTD	£1,838,592.70	Service Area & CPU	Let by Service Areas with dedicated CPU support
DIMENSIONS (UK) LTD	£1,657,070.62	Service Area	CPU limited involvement with E&R Contracts
WYGAR CONSTRUCTION CO. LTD.	£1,602,047.16	Service Area	CPU limited involvement with E&R Contracts
(P) ST GEORGES CARE CENTRE	£1,268,581.32	Service Area	ACW - Procurement handled by dedicated team
COVERAGE CARE SERVICES LTD	£1,254,249.62	Service Area	ACW - Procurement handled by dedicated team
MORRIS CARE CENTRE	£1,201,870.76	Service Area	ACW - Procurement handled by dedicated team
CASTLE HOMES LIMITED	£1,186,933.06	Service Area	ACW - Procurement

			handled by dedicated team
AMEC GROUP LTD	£1,169,239.47	Service Area	CPU limited involvement with E&R Contracts
PAVE AWAYS LTD	£1,169,086.00	Service Area	CPU limited involvement with E&R Contracts
PRYCE (BUILDERS) LTD	£1,022,526.17	Service Area	CPU limited involvement with E&R Contracts
ALLIED HEALTHCARE GROUP LTD	£946,157.76	Service Area	Agency work, but outside remit of Corporate Contract
NEXT STEP CARE MANAGEMENT LTD	£862,710.99	Service Area	CYP
PENNA PLC	£859,697.37	Service Area & CPU	Savings Delivered
EDF ENERGY 1 LIMITED	£820,588.09	Service Area	Opportunity to include in WMS Utilities Contract
FITZGERALD CONTRACTORS LTD	£817,132.37	Service Area	CPU limited involvement with E&R Contracts
D H HOMECARE LTD	£806,520.55	Service Area	Agency work, but outside remit of Corporate Contract
(P)LINCOLN GRANGE COVERAGE CARE	£802,234.90	Service Area	ASC - Procurement handled by dedicated team
MARSH LTD	£791,267.29	Service Area	CPU limited involvement with E&R Contracts
JPCS LTD	£762,078.71	Service Area	ASC - Procurement handled by dedicated team
PRYSMIAN CABLES & SYSTEMS LTD	£732,638.89	Service Area	Street Lighting
(P) COTTAGE CHRISTIAN NURSING HOME	£722,643.19	Service Area	ASC - Procurement handled by dedicated team
HATTON COURT T/A SPRINGCARE (HATTON) LTD	£650,896.28	Service Area	ASC - Procurement handled by dedicated team
DIAMOND CARS (TELFORD) LTD	£629,742.70	Service Area & CPU	CPU to be involved in letting framework contract for taxi's
CAVENDISH HOMECARE SERVICES LTD	£627,926.68	Service Area	ASC - Procurement handled by dedicated team
MENTAL HEALTH CARE (UK) LTD	£621,093.54	Service Area	ASC - Procurement handled by dedicated team
EDUCARE ADOLESCENT SERVICES LTD	£613,454.86	Service Area	CYP
BIKOLD(QUERIES:TRACY HARRIS EXT2719)	£572,737.44	Service Area	Handled by qualified Proc Officer in CYP Team
COMBINED PROPERTY CONTROL	£541,649.93	Service Area	CPU limited involvement with E&R Contracts
THE PRIORY	£533,821.50	Service Area	ASC - Procurement handled by dedicated team
WREKIN CONSTRUCTION LTD	£529,141.14	Service Area	CPU limited involvement with E&R Contracts
WOODCOTE HALL NURSINGHOME/SELECT HEALTH	£526,080.21	Service Area	ASC - Procurement handled by dedicated team
COMPUTACENTER (UK) LIMITED	£523,054.30	Service Area & CPU	Re-letting Nov/Dec 08

Key:							
E&R	ASC	Transport	CYP	ICT	CPU Lead	CPU Support	Other

3.4 Procurement Practices in the Portfolios

Members met individual Business Managers to gather information about a number of key issues and notes of the meetings are attached as below:

Environment and Regeneration
Children & Young People
Adult & Consumer Wellbeing
ICT

Appendix 1
Appendix 2
Appendix 3
Appendix 4

3.5 Issues and Implications of the Telford & Wrekin Devolved Model

We identified a number of issues arising from the devolved (de-centralised) procurement structure which have financial, performance or legal implications.

- Lack of strategic influence
Members consider that the current procurement structure does not have the right level of influence within the organisation. With the budget pressures set to worsen, the Council's priority and budget setting will need to be more stringent than ever. Accountability for the expenditure of council tax payers' money requires that sound economic decisions are taken in relation to the procurement of goods and services and procurement clearly has a key strategic role to play. But although the stated role of the CPU is to "set procurement strategy and policy for the Council" this is not reflected in its position within the Authority.
- Lack of a joined-up approach across the authority
The lack of top level strategic co-ordination means that the Council does not have a joined-up approach to procurement and Members found little or no evidence of cross-portfolio buying. It was not possible within the scope of the review to undertake a detailed analysis of the services which could be jointly procured or where demand could be aggregated. Adult and Consumer Wellbeing and Children and Young People's has one Joint Commissioning team that covers both childrens and adult services and works in partnership with the PCT. This ensures that where services can be jointly commissioned this does happen, although in the meeting with Adult & Consumer Wellbeing it noted that these areas would benefit from closer collaboration.
- Loss of opportunities for cost savings on major contracts
The review identified the fact that the CPU appears to be under-resourced and lacks the capacity to get pro-actively involved in the procurement of major (high-value) contracts where it can have the greatest impact. Each procurement exercise needs to combine the technical expertise, understanding of customer needs and knowledge of markets (which currently lies in the portfolios) with the commercial procurement expertise which lies in the CPU. If the commercial procurement skills (where the CPU can add value) are lost, then the opportunity to maximise value for money savings is lost.

Officers interviewed overwhelmingly thought that the CPU provides a good service, but that its resources are too limited and the extent to which they actively engaged the CPU varied significantly. The CPU had noted that there are officers in business units who set up contracts as an integral part of their role (and although every manager has a duty to secure value for money), they do not necessarily have the professional procurement qualifications that the CPU has and that there can be a tendency to extend or re-let contracts rather than undergo a thorough procurement process which would achieve better value for money.

There can also be a tendency for service area specialists specify "wants", rather than "needs" for services and can over-specify contracts which

results in the Council paying more than necessary. For example, specifying a short response time from a contractor, when a longer response time is adequate. This means the Council is paying for a service that is unnecessary. A distinct function of the CPU is to balance costs with the needs of the service user, whether internal or external.

There is a high volume of work related to operational queries which can constrain the capacity of the CPU to take a more pro-active approach to involvement in the procurement of major contracts were it is felt they can have greater impact.

- Loss of supplier performance and on-going savings
Contracts need to be managed to maintain performance and continue to drive out savings, and good contract management is about building a relationship with suppliers. Each contract has a set of performance indicators for managing and monitoring contracts. As illustrated in the table above, where a contract is let by the portfolio, it is managed by the portfolio. Where a contract is co-let between procurement and the portfolio, a decision is made on a contract by contract basis as to who should manage the contract and responsibility is sometimes split between the technical and the commercial elements. It can happen that officers are letting contracts as part of their overall role, and in these situations contract management can sometimes drift under the pressure of workload so that opportunities to realise the benefits of supplier performance are lost and opportunities to drive out further savings are lost. As discussed in the above section, contracts can be over-specified, and under-management of these means that the Council may not receive a service that it is paying for.
- Risk of non-compliance with EU regulations
There are no mandatory reporting lines between the portfolios and the CPU and contracts are let by staff in business units who lack specific procurement qualifications and expertise. The risk is that contracts can be let which do not comply with EU and Council regulations. Feedback from the three training sessions run by the CPU each year highlighted severe shortfalls in basic understanding of procurement rules and regulations, including EU thresholds, and the fact that Telford & Wrekin Council Terms and Conditions should always be used rather than the supplier's.
- Loss of buying power resulting from devolved budgets
Devolved and inflexible budget structures were highlighted as a barrier to cutting costs. For example, the desktop contract was set up by ICT and the CPU and is managed by ICT. ICT try to forecast buying trends to estimate unit costs to make sure that the price charged is competitive and they can negotiate down for bulk orders. But the PCs are owned by the portfolios and ICT has no control over when new/replacement orders are placed or whether the equipment ordered is the correct specification for the users' business needs or if staff are using old and inefficient equipment. A central budget and central management of buying would mean more accurate forecasting could be done so that money could be saved by consolidating orders and ensuring PCs are correctly specified and kept for the optimum life-cycle. Budgets for stationery are also held by individual business managers and Members felt this could be an area

where a centralised approach could bring savings, although the stationery contract has just been re-let with a saving of £50,000 per year.

- Non-compliance with Corporate Contracts

There are currently 18 corporate contracts, the majority of which are let by the CPU although some are let by specialist service areas such as the ICT hardware contract. These are for goods and services bought across the Council and were set up to rationalise supply, to make efficiency savings and to maximise economies of scale.

Financial regulations state that staff must use corporate contracts where they are in place but non-compliance appears to be a significant issue. Enforcement can be perceived as negative and officers can resist changing supplier when they have an established relationship with a trusted supplier or are expected to use an electronic system that they have no “feel” for. There is an assumption that the cheapest unit price is best value, but individual buyers do not always take overhead costs or protection clauses (such as no-cancellation fees on the hotel booking system) into account.

In 2008-09 savings from the Corporate Contracts were estimated at £401,949 but this is a notional figure as it does not include off-contract spend. Off-contract spend is difficult to monitor and has not been audited. The CPU is neither resourced nor empowered to deal with non-compliance, and no action appears to be taken to address it.

- Rationalisation of skills and the cost of procurement

The actual number of staff involved in procurement, and the total cost of buying to the authority is not known but the review identified a significant number of officers within individual business units involved in buying. This means that skills and costs are not being rationalised. Manchester City Council moved from a devolved to a central procurement model in 2007. An estimated 120 officers, equivalent to 40 full-time staff were involved to varying degrees under the devolved structure, whereas the new central team consists of 30 posts this saving the equivalent of 10 full-time posts. (The report does not make it clear whether the total number of staff was reduced or if it meant that staff-time was freed staff up to do other work.)

- Lack of a consistent approach and to procurement across the authority

The devolved structure means experience is not applied from one procurement project to the next. There are no common standards or criteria for evaluating bids (e.g. the price:quality ratio, evaluation of suppliers). Further, there is no common understanding of procurement best practice, procurement law and consistency in specifying needs, not wants.

4. SUSTAINABLE PROCUREMENT

4.1 What is Sustainable Procurement

“Sustainable Procurement is a process whereby organisations meet their needs for goods, services, works and utilities in a way that achieves value for money on a whole life basis in terms of generating benefits not only to the

organisation, but also to society and the economy, while minimising damage to the environment.” *Procuring the Future* (Sustainable Procurement Task Force, June 2006)

4.2 The National Sustainable Procurement Context

The Local Government Sustainable Procurement Strategy 2007 was drawn up in response to the recommendations of the Sustainable Procurement Taskforce (SPTF) reported in June 2006 in *Procuring the Future* and in the light of the Government response and national action plan published in March 2007. It sets out local government’s strategic intent for Councils to collaborate with local partners to pursue the achievement of social, economic and environmental benefits in procurement. The business case identifies 5 key benefits:

- Financial benefits to the Council by designing/constructing buildings with lower through-life operating costs and better energy efficient processes and materials;
- Economic and social benefits by creating employment and training opportunities for the long-term unemployed and people with disabilities;
- Increased purchasing power, and power to stimulate new products and processes in the market place, by aggregation of demand and resources across public sector partners;
- Better engagement and capacity building with small businesses, Black and Ethnic Minority (BME) businesses and third/voluntary sector organisations to create better supplier diversity in supply chains, to capture innovation from small and medium sized enterprises (SME) and to stimulate and support the local economy.

The distribution of local authority spend nationally shows that construction and facilities management constitute by far the largest category of spend and present the most significant opportunities for the achievement of environmental, social and economic benefits. For this reason, these are accorded top priority in the strategy, followed by social care, waste management, energy, transport and food.

The SPTF proposed that three “building blocks” should be put in place: a Flexible Framework as a route map to deliver the strategy, a Prioritisation Methodology to identify areas of spending where activity should be focussed, and a specialist implementation Toolkit. At the top level the strategy will look to the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) as a way of tackling the shared priorities. Councils were estimated to make some £4 billion in efficiency gains in the three years to March 2008 and there is an expectation that a further £4.9 billion in cashable savings will be made in the spending review period to March 2011 (Comprehensive Spending Review 2007).

The Members consulted a sustainable procurement consultant to find out more about what this means in practice, and to find out what other authorities have achieved by adopting this approach. The interview focussed on economic and community rather than environmental benefits, and on the opportunities around major capital projects.

The main issue in securing economic benefit from capital projects has been

the tension between local authorities wanting to create jobs for local people and EU regulations which restrict the specification of “local” labour and suppliers. In 2004 three EU Directives were consolidated into a single public sector Directive to simplify the framework which allows the requirement to “recruit long-term job-seekers or to implement training measures for the unemployed or young persons”. In reality, this advantages local people. The rules also allow for consideration of social, economic and environmental issues, reflecting the “Well-Being Powers” of the 2000 Local Government Act which give local authorities the power to do anything likely to promote or improve economic, social or environmental well-being. In short, while EU regulations are generally restrictive, there may be some scope to use these exemptions to local advantage.

But there is only so far that legal clauses can go: delivering sustainable outcomes requires more than well specified contracts. To maximise the potential economic impact requires the local authority to be committed at the highest level to a sustainable procurement strategy, and to create the resources to lead the development of the support and delivery infrastructure with a range of public and private sector partners. For example, on big capital development projects, the local authority can play a role in pulling together and co-ordinating the resources of the developer (and sub-contractors), local businesses, funding agencies, training providers, Jobcentre Plus and local people to meet objectives set by the local authority in terms of supplier diversity and the creation of training and employment opportunities for unemployed people. Delivery of these kinds of arrangements would depend on the authority having internal capacity which may not exist currently.

The Olympic Delivery Authority uses the procurement process to create a more diverse supplier base to get more small and third sector enterprises into supply chains and to create employment opportunities and a legacy of training provision for other large capital projects to use up to and post 2012. This has been done through setting up a national construction academy to boost skill levels, and setting targets for the apprenticeships and work placements i.e. at least 2,000 people into trainee, apprenticeships and work placements up to 2012 and for 3% of the workforce to be comprised of apprentices. The training provision has been linked to other planned capital projects so the business case for investment is more robust.

Elevate East Lancashire is a £300 million Housing Market Renewal pathfinder capital project. This project focussed on improving the number of local companies in the supply chain by disaggregating the contract and appointing five local contractors which enhanced local engagement. This was done alongside market development and capacity building with local companies (although support has to be available to all companies not to breach EU regulations). It should be borne in mind however that while there is work that can be done around market development, EU regulations do remain restrictive.

An illustration of this is a local authority in Cornwall which was supplied by a large ice-cream company in the Midlands. The contract was re-specified to increase the nutrient value, change the packaging and unit size. This meant the national Midlands based company could not meet the specifications. Meanwhile, work had been done to identify a local organic supplier to make

sure demand could be met locally. Another way of building capacity in the local market is through networking. As part of the Elevate scheme seminars were held for local companies to build their capacity to submit Pre-Qualification Questionnaires (PQQ) and bids.

4.3 Sustainable Procurement at Telford & Wrekin

The CPU has been looking at Equalities and Diversity in Procurement and Sustainable Procurement over the last few years. The Council spends over £100 million each year undertaking capital projects and buying goods and services so there is a compelling business case for making this procurement more “sustainable”.

Telford & Wrekin’s Sustainable Procurement Policy developed in response to the recommendations of the Sustainable Procurement Taskforce will be adopted by the Council (subject to approval) by the autumn. This outlines the Council’s commitment to make spending decisions in a way that achieves both value for money on a whole life cycle basis, and on the wider economic, social and environmental benefits. The Policy comprises a brief statement of intent and a number of specific aims which focus around the procurement process and on working with suppliers to achieve environmental and community benefits. The remainder of the document is comprised of the National Flexible Framework Action Plan and the milestones from which will be used to aid the Council in achieving the policy aims.

Implementation of the policy will mean:

- Engaging with contractors/suppliers, to pursue the achievement of social, economic and environmental benefits;
- Awarding contracts on the basis of whole life costs and benefits wherever possible;
- Encouraging ownership of our commitment by the political and managerial leadership of the Council;
- Securing appropriate training and development for Members, senior managers, procurement, asset management and other professionals, and service managers.

While adoption of the Policy is recognition of the Council’s commitment to Sustainable Procurement and will ensure compliance with Government recommendations, there are resource implications if it is to be robustly implemented. The initial cost of awareness raising and initial training can be covered from within existing budgets, but the implications of adopting the Flexible Framework will require more investment. It appears that the skills to tackle the economic issues currently lie between the CPU and the Economic Development Unit within E&R. The role of the Strategic Skills Co-ordinator (in Economic Development) is to develop the infrastructure to enable the effective delivery of skills and training programmes in collaboration with partners, and in a way that meets industry needs. This clearly links directly with the delivery of economic outcomes as part of the Sustainable Procurement agenda, and we feel that there needs to be a joined up approach to tackle this. With the BSF programme coming on stream and other major capital projects (the Town Centre development for example), there is an opportunity to work in partnership with developers to maximise economic benefit opportunities, and these should not be lost.

Implementing the Sustainable Procurement Policy may result in higher initial costs such as investment in support and training to help unemployed people access jobs, identifying and building the capacity of local companies to bid for contract opportunities in the supply chain for capital projects, and the additional cost of providing sustainable energy solutions. These need to be weighed against the long-term net savings to the public purse in terms of reduced housing and unemployment benefits and other costs associated with unemployment, stimulation of the local economy and labour market and lower on-going revenue costs of energy savings.

Although there are currently no statutory requirements within the strategy, the Audit Commission has announced its intention to take sustainable procurement and asset management into account within Comprehensive Area Assessment so that they will be scored by the Commission under the use of resources judgement.

5. ALTERNATIVE MODELS AND CASE STUDIES

5.1 Views of a Local Authority Procurement Specialist

Members consulted Mike Philips, Managing Director at WMS, to ascertain his views on local authority procurement models. He outlined some very clear principles:

- First and foremost, the Authority must have a very clear vision for the organisation and a very clearly identified set of strategic priorities and objectives. As budget pressures increase, priorities will be challenged more rigorously than ever, and challenge should come from local people so that the priorities really reflect local need. Accountability for the expenditure of council tax payers' money requires that sound economic decisions are taken in relation to the procurement of goods and services and procurement should be set at the heart of these decisions.
- Procurement must be positioned at a strategic level so that the commissioning and procurement of goods and services is joined up across the authority and is directly aligned with the Council's priorities. The approach has to be "outward looking" to keep sight of customers' changing needs.
- Procurement should be headed up by a "Key Influencer" within the Authority, mandated by the Chief Executive and with influence over individual portfolios. The Key Influencer has two main roles: to understand the needs and priorities of the taxpayer and to champion these internally; to provide shrewd and innovative strategic procurement leadership to aggressively drive out savings. It was acknowledged that this level of skill is difficult to find in the market place.
- Procurement activity (i.e. of the CPU) should be focussed on areas of high-risk, high-value spend where it can have the most impact. Typically these are children and adult services and environment and regeneration.
- Professional procurement skills should be developed in-house so the organisation grows its own for the future to minimise the risk of going to

the market when there is a national shortage of qualified procurement staff.

- Staffordshire County Council was suggested as a good model to look at.

5.2 Staffordshire County Council

Staffordshire County Council (SCC) implemented a rigorous centralised procurement structure 18 months ago. Other less centralised models were considered such as Warwickshire County Council's, but to deliver the tangible savings the Authority wants, the centralised model was considered the only one capable of delivering the required savings in a complex county environment.

Procurement is overseen by a Procurement Board made up of the Council Leader and Cabinet Members, the Directors of Finance, Development Services and Resources, and senior procurement officers. The Board agrees and oversees delivery of the Procurement Strategy and is mandated at Chief Executive level so that decisions cannot be overturned by any staff, even Corporate Directors.

The Central Procurement Team is headed up by the Assistant Director and was set up by moving staff from the Directorates into the Central Team so the new structure was cost neutral to implement. There are 21 staff in a "Category Management" (where interrelated products and services are grouped together under management teams) structure with two teams; strategic and operational. The Strategic team concentrates on the higher-value, high-risk areas of spend such as major capital projects and typically contracts worth in excess of £1 million. For each tender process, the relevant people are brought together in a team to get the right balance of expertise, including staff from the central procurement team, the directorates, legal services and suppliers depending on what is required. If the directorate is deemed to have sufficient competencies, then a light touch approach is adopted and the central procurement team take a lesser role but continue to monitor processes through regular Q&A sessions and cost analyses. The operational team handles operational enquiries and low value/low risk contracts such as cleaning materials, food, and stationery which is outsourced to WMS to free up resources to focus on the larger contracts.

All procurement projects are submitted to the Central Team and assessed against value and risk criteria to evaluate where substantive savings can be made to determine the appropriate approach. The aim is to maximise resources and not tie up procurement in unnecessary work.

The authority has a rigorous enforcement policy and compliance with corporate procurement processes and corporate contracts is mandatory throughout the authority. Breaches can result in disciplinary action.

There is an agreed set of corporate Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) to measure and monitor performance in four key areas: finance, customer, people and process with each area assigned to an accountable internal owner. This enables the constant and effective review of performance against targets. Defaulting on a contract triggers a series of corrective actions which in serious cases could result in the termination of the contract. The authority

aims to use this to change perceptions of local authorities being a “soft touch” for contractors.

The Central Team deals with all types and value of contracts with two exceptions: children’s commissioning is currently done separately although ways of bringing this into the scope of the central team are being looked at; and schools use the Council’s contracts on a voluntary basis although 80-90% of school procurement is done through Council contracts.

- **Savings**

The Authority’s annual spend is £400 million. Savings over the next 4 years are forecast to be £5million per year, largely due to the centralisation and enforcement of procurement and by the new structure focussing on the high spend contracts.

5.3 Warwickshire County Council

Warwickshire County Council implemented a new central procurement structure 18 months ago because it was acknowledged that there was a lack of commercial skills within individual Directorates to achieve real savings and that a more centralised approach was required to drive from the centre if the Council was to maximise savings.

Warwickshire has a much smaller central team than Staffordshire, with 6 staff including a Sustainable Procurement Officer, and a further 3 posts to be agreed at the time of our meeting. The Unit is intended to operate at a strategic level.

A corporate Procurement Plan has been developed to facilitate effective procurement on a consistent basis throughout the authority and to realise savings in common areas of expenditure. For all procurement over £140k, or where there is significant risk to the Authority, a Procurement Plan must be completed by staff in the Directorates and submitted to the CPU prior to the procurement beginning. The Procurement Plan covers a range of corporate standards including risk assessments, how customer needs have been identified, what benefits will be delivered to the community, how competitive the market is and how the market has been developed, performance indicators, cashable efficiencies, equalities impact assessments, environmental impact assessments and benchmarking. The CPU ran a training programme to explain the new processes to staff and to reinforce the message that all future procurement should be compliant with the corporate procedures managed by the CPU. The training session cost in the region of £26k but had realised savings in the region of £224k.

- **Savings**

The Council’s total annual spend is around £300 million. The authority aims to achieve ongoing annual cost savings of approximately £8 million from the centralisation of procurement.

5.4 Manchester City Council

We did not visit Manchester City Council but reviewed a report to members about the savings progress made to-date from the development of the Centralised Corporate Procurement function which was approved in 2007 and is now in its final stages of implementation.

It had been found that over 120 staff to varying degrees, equivalent to 40 full-time, staff were involved in procurement activity across the Council. This meant that opportunities to maximise economic, social and environmental benefits by aggregating demand had been missed. Whereas there were areas of good practice, there was inconsistent application of best practice procurement principles and processes resulting in under use of corporate contracts, lack of contract management and supplier performance and lower than expected benefits realisation.

The procurement function underwent a radical restructuring, and was centralised to ensure the City Council could maximise the opportunities that can be derived from improvements to procurement practices. The central team includes 30 posts (around 10 posts less than the previous devolved structure) and is divided into three teams; a Systems and Strategies Group focused on developing procurement strategies consistent with other Council strategies; the Procurement Operations Team which concentrates on continuing and developing procurement business activities; the Contract Management and Benefits Realisation Team to ensure improvements to supplier management to realise the benefits of improved performance.

- **Savings**

The final outcome for 2007/08 was a saving of £12.95 million and the projected saving for 2008/09 is a further £14.17 million.

The savings have been attributed to five main factors resulting from the new procurement practices and techniques:

- Aggregating spend
- Arranging new contracts/improving existing contracts
- Using electronic reverse auctions
- Introducing gateways
- Improved market management

The Council feels that savings have been made without reducing the quality of services and, in many cases, the quality had improved.

Savings have been made across a much wider base than the traditional procurement areas such as stationery, energy, telephony etc. with significant savings being achieved in Social Care, Housing and Education. The savings distribution for 2008-09 is Housing 24%, Telecoms 12%, Agency 10%, Social Care 8%, Printers and Copiers 8%, Stationery 7%, Furniture 6%, Education 4%, Maintenance 3%, Miscellaneous 13%.

These are direct savings to the Council and do not include long-term indirect savings made from wider economic, social and environmental benefits. The generic procurement model requires that consideration is given to all sustainability issues throughout the procurement process and a more focussed approach to sustainability issues has been adopted to join up the various strands and develop a corporate sustainability policy.

5.5 Equivalent Savings at Telford and Wrekin Council

The savings from the centralised structure forecast by Staffordshire County

Council equate to 1¼% of total spend. This would be equivalent to a £1.5 million saving per year for Telford & Wrekin. For Warwickshire, projected savings equate to 2.67% of spend, which would be equivalent to a saving of £3.2 million per year for Telford & Wrekin.

It is difficult to accurately project figures onto Telford & Wrekin as the other authorities may have made savings in areas that Telford & Wrekin has already looked at, and their experience may not be directly comparable, but the overall message is one of more efficient spending.

It is very difficult to make accurate projections about what savings would be made by having a more central structure, and to some extent a leap of faith is required by the authority. Others have taken this leap of faith and are now seeing the benefits.

6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As public sector budgets come under increasing pressure, and local authorities face budget cuts, local government spending and procurement are under increased scrutiny. For the Council to meet the financial challenges head-on, procurement will be a key engine to drive out efficiency savings, stop unnecessary spending and maximise return on investment for the taxpayer. There are three key elements to this:

- Direct savings to the authority by ensuring that every action maximises value for money and stops any unnecessary spending: alignment of spending to corporate objectives, aggregating demand and supply, developing markets, managing supplier relationships, rigorous contract specification and negotiation, contract management, rationalisation of internal procurement activity.
- Indirect, long-term savings to the public purse and stimulation of the local economy through sustainable procurement strategies.
- Increased purchasing power and cost-sharing by maximising joint-procurement opportunities with local authority neighbours, regional collaboration through the West Midlands Regional Improvement and Efficiency Partnership and public sector partners in the borough.

Members agreed that although there is much good procurement practice within individual portfolios, and within the CPU itself, the current devolved model is not consistent with maximising the full savings potential to be brought from a more centralised and better resourced structure. The review identified significant scope for service improvement, particularly in the areas outlined in section 3.5 (*The Issues and Implications of the Telford & Wrekin Devolved Model*) in this report. Members felt that these all fundamentally derive from a lack of overall central control and co-ordination, and most importantly, a lack of procurement influence at a strategic level; this needs to be embedded across the Authority.

Members have suggested a number of recommendations to address these issues. As a building block, the Scrutiny Members felt that the organisation as a whole – both elected Members and officers – need to understand and recognise the key role that procurement has to play in supporting the

organisation into the future and that a change of approach is required.

Recommendation 1

To undertake a full cost-benefit analysis of the current procurement arrangements, and a cost-benefit analysis of models for an alternative centralised structure to determine the remit of the CPU and the resources required.

The evidence gathered points to the savings and efficiencies to be gained from having a more strategic and centralised procurement facility as part of reshaping the organisation. An initial detailed cost-benefit analysis should be undertaken to determine:

- The current cost of procurement across the authority
- Models for a restructured procurement function and a cost benefit for each model. This will include a cost benefit of implementing each of the recommendations in this report, noting the areas of responsibility set out under Recommendation 3 in this report.

Recommendation 2

To create a new post to champion, influence and co-ordinate Procurement policies and strategy at a corporate level across the Council.

Members felt that there should be a post created to draw together and oversee the delivery of the procurement strategy and activity at a high level so that the full savings potential and net benefits of a consolidated approach can be realised. The post should be mandated at Chief Executive Level and positioned above and across the portfolios to provide a joined-up strategic approach, so that policies and decisions can be implemented at a corporate level and embedded across the organisation. A key function will be to explore the opportunities for collaborative arrangements with partners across the borough and at regional level and to develop joint commissioning and procurement strategies. Moreover, the post will play a key role in the community engagement strategy so that at a time when the authority is facing difficult budget decisions, he/she has an understanding of the public's needs and priorities and can support the Chief Executive in championing Council tax payers' views when it comes to making spending decisions. The overall purpose is to make sure that the Council is getting value for money in the goods and services it requires and ensuring the right products are provided at the right time for the right place, whilst operating in a way which is consistent with promoting wider Council policies, aims and objectives.

Members are aware that current financial pressures may deter consideration of investment in an additional post, but feel strongly that a fresh approach and the commensurate investment is necessary if the Council is to make the savings that are already being demonstrated by other authorities which have made similar changes.

Recommendation 3

To appropriately increase the staffing levels and resources of the Corporate Procurement Unit to support the delivery of key spending and service objectives, including the Sustainable Procurement and Equalities and Diversity strategy.

Members recognised the good work that the CPU does within existing resources, but were concerned that its current capacity constrains effective procurement activity and reduces cost-saving opportunities.

Members feel that the capacity of the CPU needs to be increased and, dependent on the work carried out under Recommendation 1 of this report, should be strengthened to carry out the following functions, some of which are recommendations contained in the report:

- To support the work of the Procurement strategic champion described in Recommendation 2
- To develop and implement procurement policies, practice and procedures across the Council and in-line with Council spending priorities
- To provide central co-ordination and oversight of the authority's procurement activity, to maximise opportunities to join-up demand and joint procurement projects with other partners
- To implement and ensure compliance with mandatory lines of reporting between the CPU and the portfolios so that procurement plans are submitted to the CPU for contract worth over £75
- To review all procurement plans submitted to the CPU to determine the correct balance of skills for the procurement project between the CPU and the portfolios are used and maximised. This should include:
 - Ensuring compliance with EU regulations, Council terms and conditions and Council standards and procedures
 - Ensuring CPU input onto the specification of contracts to drive out savings and deliver best value for money
 - Ensuring the functions associated with "commissioning" i.e. understanding user needs, strategic development of services and market development are carried out
 - Ensuring that contracts are effectively and continuously managed to maximise benefits realisation and to determine who will be responsible for contract management (i.e. the CPU or the portfolio)
 - Ensuring internal compliance with Corporate Contracts and with the authority to take action against non-compliance
 - To deliver the Sustainable Procurement Strategy, including the development and delivery of economic benefit outcomes such as local training and employment and a mixed economy of suppliers
 - To deliver the Equalities and Diversity Strategy within the procurement process
 - To deal with day-to-day enquiries and operational tasks

Recommendation 4

That the level of influence and authority of the CPU is increased so that it has the authority to impose procurement practices and procedures across the authority and is mandated with power to take action appropriate against non-compliance with corporate procurement practices and procedures.

Members were concerned that although the CPU provides a good service, it is not positioned high enough up the authority to have the necessary influence or power to mandate compliance with procurement best value and best practice practices. Neither does it have the power to take action against non-

compliance with corporate contracts. This can result in unnecessary spending and loss of savings.

Recommendation 5

To introduce mandatory lines of reporting and a procurement Gateway, between the portfolios and the CPU so that a Procurement Plan is submitted to the CPU for contracts worth £75,000 or more prior to the procurement beginning. This would enable the CPU to co-ordinate overall activity, to determine the appropriate approach for the procurement process, that value for money considerations are robust and that contracts are compliant with legislation and Council policies.

Members were concerned that the CPU is not involved in some of the Council's major procurement projects and that there is no central co-ordination across the authority. Procurement practices are not consistent throughout the organisation and there is a risk that contracts are being let which are not compliant with EU and Council procurement regulations. Mandatory reporting lines would allow the CPU to co-ordinate activity, to identify and join-up demand (and supply) across the Council, to determine the approach for dealing with each contract and ensure the correct resources are engaged, to apply exacting commercial skills, to challenge attitudes and approaches and to ensure that all contracts are compliant with regulations.

As mentioned in Recommendation 3 above, it is important that the links between the CPU and the portfolios are strong so that Managers in the portfolios are engaged and skills are maximised and not diluted.

Recommendation 6

That compliance with Corporate Contracts is mandatory, and audited, and that the CPU has the authority to deal with instances of non-compliance or to approve off-contract spend in exceptional circumstances where it can be justified on the grounds of value for money.

The Members recognised the savings that had been accrued from the Corporate Contracts but were concerned that the full savings potential is not realised because of the level of off-contract spending. Off contract spend has not to date been audited so the exact extent of the problem is not known but the CPU highlighted this as a particular issue. The CPU should be empowered to take appropriate action against non-compliance.

Recommendation 7

That the Economic Development Unit is involved in the procurement of major capital projects from the contract specification stage to ensure opportunities for local economic and employment benefit are maximised.

The capacity of the Economic Development Unit has been increased to take a strategic approach to co-ordinating local supplier and labour initiatives with partners so that the local community benefits from public investment in capital projects. It appears that the skills to maximise local economic benefit lie between the Economic Development Unit (predominantly the Strategic Skills

Co-ordinator) and that these skills should be joined-up from the contract specification stage of major projects to make sure that opportunities are not lost.

Recommendation 8

That budget structures for office equipment and supplies are reviewed and centralised where it can be evidenced that this will bring savings.

The authority has a devolved budget structure so that individual business managers have their own budgets for office supplies and equipment and these are ordered by each unit. In the case of IT hardware, it was thought that there could be further economies of scale to be made by central control of the budget and central management of user demand/supply by ITC, or from centralising the supply of stationery. It should be noted that currently from an accountancy perspective costs would have to be apportioned back to services to show the full costs of that particular service and that additional control mechanisms would be needed to manage and control spend.

Recommendation 9

To invest in additional specialist contract management resource within Environment and Regeneration to reduce the level of work contracted out to Jacobs and to drive out further savings by more effective contract management.

E&R currently contract specialist engineering consultancy from Jacobs Engineering. A balance has to be drawn between using in-house staff or consultants to cope with specialist work and varying workloads. A level of marginal increase in staffing would mean that expertise is brought in-house and consultants would only be required as a “top up” for technical expertise where it would not be cost effective to retain it permanently within the Council or where the overall workload is in excess of what can be sustained by the Council's engineering teams. This could be an Invest to Save bid.

Recommendation 10

To develop the central register of other local authority contracts and when they are due for re-negotiation to identify opportunities for joint working on both existing and new contracts.

This already exists to a degree through involvement with the other WMS owning authorities, engagement with the West Midlands Regional Improvement and Efficiency Partnership and the OGC buying solutions frameworks. This recommendation would be particularly welcomed by Environment and Regeneration.

Recommendation 11

To develop strategies to build capacity in the local SME market to enable them to access contracts directly, or in supply chains, and to set up a register of quality assured local suppliers including those used by the authority those used by local developers to create a database of potential suppliers with local market knowledge and expertise who can be invited to tender for contracts.

Members suggest this would be a joint activity between the CPU and the

Recommendation 12

To set up a Procurement Board to include the Leader, Cabinet Members, the Chief Executive, Corporate Directors and senior Procurement officers, to meet bi-annually to oversee the development and implementation of the Procurement Strategy and to mandate decisions.

This would that decisions are agreed and enforced at a strategic level.

7. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations are summarised in the table below. We have assigned a priority level to each of the recommendations, and given an indication of the cost.

It is not possible to provide detailed costings for the recommendations within this report without a considerable amount of additional work being undertaken by both scrutiny members and finance officers. However, the recommendations have been placed into one of three categories as follows:-

- Spend to Save indicates a recommendation that would generate more savings than the cost of implementation
- Low cost indicates that the recommendation could be funded from within existing resources, although not necessarily in the current year.
- Medium cost indicates that the recommendation is anticipated to cost up to £10,000 which is not currently budgeted.
- High cost indicates that the recommendation is expected to cost more than £10,000 which is not currently budgeted.

Recommendation	Indication of cost	Priority level
<u>Recommendation 1</u> To undertake a full cost-benefit analysis of the current procurement arrangements and a cost-benefit analysis of models for an alternative centralised structure to determine the remit of the CPU and the resources required.	LOW	1
<u>Recommendation 2</u> To create a new post to champion, influence and co-ordinate Procurement policies and strategy at a corporate level across the Council.	Spend to Save Initiative	3
<u>Recommendation 3</u> To appropriately increase staffing levels and resources in the Corporate Procurement and Purchasing Unit to support the delivery of key spending and	Spend to Save Initiative	2

service objectives, including the Sustainable Procurement and Equalities and Diversity strategy.		
<u>Recommendation 4</u> That the level of influence and authority of the CPU is increased so that it has the authority to impose procurement practices and procedures across the authority and is mandated with power to take action appropriate against non-compliance with corporate procurement practices and procedures.	LOW	4
<u>Recommendation 5</u> To introduce mandatory lines of reporting and a procurement Gateway, between the portfolios and the CPU so that a Procurement Plan is submitted to the CPU for contracts worth £75,000 or more prior to the procurement beginning. This would enable the CPU to co-ordinate overall activity, to determine the appropriate approach for the procurement process, that value for money considerations are robust and that contracts are compliant with legislation and Council policies.	LOW (dependent on recommendation 2 being accepted)	5
<u>Recommendation 6</u> That compliance with Corporate Contracts is mandatory, and audited, and that the CPU has the authority to deal with instances of non-compliance or to approve off-contract spend in exceptional circumstances where it can be justified on the grounds of value for money.	LOW	6
<u>Recommendation 7</u> That the Economic Development Unit is involved in the procurement of major capital projects from the contract specification stage to ensure opportunities for local economic and employment benefit are maximised.	LOW	10
<u>Recommendation 8</u> That budget structures for office equipment and supplies are reviewed and centralised where it can be evidenced that this will bring savings.	LOW	11
<u>Recommendation 9</u> To invest in additional specialist contract	Spend to Save	8

management resource within Environment and Regeneration to reduce the level of work contracted out to Jacobs and to drive out further savings by more effective contract management.	Initiative	
<u>Recommendation 10</u> To develop the central register of all local authority contracts and when they are due for re-negotiation to identify opportunities for joint working on both existing and new contracts.	LOW (dependent on recommendation 2 being accepted)	12
<u>Recommendation 11</u> To develop strategies to build capacity in the local SME market to enable them to access contracts directly, or in supply chains, and to set up a register of quality assured local suppliers including those used by the authority those used by local developers to create a database of potential suppliers with local market knowledge and expertise who can be invited to tender for contracts.	LOW (dependent on recommendation 2 being accepted)	9
<u>Recommendation 12</u> To set up a Procurement Board to include the Leader, Cabinet Members, the Chief Executive, Corporate Directors and senior Procurement officers, to meet bi-annually to oversee the development and implementation of the Procurement Strategy and to mandate decisions.	LOW	7

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank all those listed below who have contributed their time to participate in this review, and have shared information and views with us.

Victor Brownlees	Chief Executive (Corporate Director for Resources at the time of the review meeting)
Adrian Griffith	Procurement and Payments Manager
Keith Smith	Business Manager, Highways & Transport Maintenance
Stuart Freeman	Business Manager, Network Management & Policy
Martyn Withnall	Team Leader, Transport
Mike Weston	Head of Service, ICT
Tom Greateorex	Business Manager, ICT
Kirsty King	Business Manager, ICT
Tina Wood	Head of Commissioning, Performance and Partnerships, CYP
Angela Yapp	Business Unit Manager, CYP
Paul Taylor	Head of Service, ACW
Christine Harrison	Lead Joint Commissioner, Commissioning & Contracting (Older People, Physical & Sensory Disability and Carers)
Richard Peach	Business Manager, ACW
High Rodger	Business Manager, Property & Design Management
Chris Butler	Business Unit Manager, Engineering Services
Corin Crane	Strategic Skills Co-ordinator
Mike Philips	Managing Director, WMS
Ian Simpson	Assistant Director (Staffordshire Procurement), Staffordshire County Council
Paul White	Corporate Procurement Manager, Warwickshire County Council
Jane McRobbie	FSquared (Sustainable Procurement Consultancy)
John Wilcox	FSquared (Sustainable Procurement Consultancy)

Appendix 1

Procurement Scrutiny Review Meeting with E&R – 10th February 2009

Present:

Councillor Roger Aveley (Chairman)
Keith Smith – Business Manager, Highways and Transport Maintenance
Stuart Freeman – Business Manager, Network Management and Policy
Martyn Withnall – Team Leader, Transport
Ken Clarke - Scrutiny
Stephanie Jones – Scrutiny

Apologies:

Councillor Karen Tomlinson, Maurice Viney Co-opted Member

Summary of major contracts in Keith Smith, Stuart Freeman and Martyn Withnall's business areas:

1. Hosting

This is managed by Keith Smith. The current contract is with TWS. We are in the 9th year of an 18 year contract for environmental maintenance including highways maintenance. This was a negotiated contract to externalise services previously done in-house involving TUPE transfers. A 9 year review is being lead by Dave Hanley. The highways maintenance revenue contract value is £1.8-2m p.a. A Schedule of Rates is being added to cover minor works < £10k.

2. Street lighting

This is managed by Keith Smith. The current contract is with Prismian. This is a 3 year contract with a 2 year renewal option, let in June 2008 under OJEU regulations. Business Transformation was involved in the tender process and added significant value by building technical/IT obligations and stringent monitoring into the core contract. Business Transformation was sent the documentation and came forward with support.

3. Capital projects

These are managed by Keith Smith, although Stuart Freeman has overall responsibility for the Jacobs contract. These are let as 3 separate contracts for resurfacing, footways and structural repairs each worth £400-500k p.a.. Jacobs was appointed in 2004 on a 4 year contract, now being extended to 2010, to put contract documentation together, manage contract processes and provide technical consultancy and contract management. Jacobs' fees are 12-15% of the value of the works. Rates are negotiated downwards for similar types of work done on contracts. The re-tender process is starting now for the new contract from 2010. Reports relating to both the contract extension and the re-tendering of the contract are going to Cabinet on 23rd February.

4. Small Works Contract

Keith Smith gave an overview of this, but the contract is lead by Chris Butler. This is for small value work (such as drainage) that is not included in the hosting contract and worth about £200k p.a. in total. There are a number of local suppliers used under the contract, last tendered 12 months ago. This is being reviewed as the value of the work has increased over the last 2-3 years with flooding, and may be re-

tendered as a one drainage contract. Enforcement of car parking penalty notices in Council car parks is also being considered.

5. Jacobs

Stuart Freeman is responsible for managing this contract. This is an engineering partnership contract covering a range of services. There are 13 areas of scope including architectural services and transport planning. The contract provides a range of professional and technical services for traffic and transportation, civil and structural engineering, planning and architectural design. As part of the work Jacobs can manage procurement of works or services for the Council which can include putting together contract documentation and procurement.

6. Traffic signals

Stuart Freeman is responsible for this contract. This is a 4 year framework contract with a 1 + 1 year extension option for maintenance of 70 sets of traffic lights worth £38k p.a. Adrian's team is involved with the re-tendering of this contract, particularly filling gaps in the specification as the Council's contract is currently for basic provision compared to other local authorities.

7. School /CYP transport

Martyn Withnall and his team manage all the non-educational transport contracts. The school service has a mix of big buses supplied by local suppliers under 17 contracts let under the OJEU process with the central procurement team. CYP spend is £2.3m p.a., plus £800k p.a. on the in-house fleet. An OJEU tender for minibus services for children with special needs has been delayed due to the Transport Services Review. Taxi spend for children with special educational needs is c. £800k p.a.. The new electronic procurement system (Delta) has brought spend down as all the approved companies quote enabling the cheapest price to be procured. A new framework contract developed with the central procurement team for electronic auctions has also been put on hold because of the Transport Service review.

8. ACC transport

Public transport subsidised routes: spend is c. £700k and the 5 year contract with Arriva is due for renewal in the next 12 months. This follows OJEU regulations. There has been an issue as traditionally the only bidder is Arriva. Travel West Midlands and Choice have shown no interest.

Taxis: this service is for vulnerable and disabled people. Maximum 12 month contracts are awarded linked to care packages, and CSV is used whenever possible. Approximately 300 ACC passengers are moved each day and around 400-500 children with mobility problems. Spend is around £300k p.a.

9. Bus Shelters

There is no budget for bus shelters so the team work with Town and Parish Councils to share costs 50:50 using steel stockholders and local glaziers. This works on a "grace and favour" basis, so there are no formal procurement processes.

What KPIs are used in contracts?

1. TWS

There is a range of monitoring procedures in place linked to indicators that are reported to the public (e.g. the pot-hole promise) for response times, all of which are measured monthly. Monitoring meetings are held weekly with TWS and monthly with the TWS Director. Penalties are imposed for non-performance.

2. Prismian

KPIs are linked to BV215A for the % of lights out at any one time. There is a contractual maximum 5 day response time for problems within the contractor's remit, although often problems are due to cabling which are outside this. In these cases, no

penalty can be imposed. Monthly monitoring meetings are held with Prismian, and the last six months have shown a significant decrease in the number of lights out due to the stringent enforcement of contract obligations.

3. Jacobs

There are clear contract management arrangements in place with a recently revised project commissioning process to ensure that there is a clear agreement on fees and that progress in delivering services (such as project designs, site supervision of schemes) is monitored monthly. There are agreed processes to agree any variation in the commissions that Jacobs work on. The contract is based on an industry standard, the New Engineering Contract (NEC) for Professional Services.

Civil engineering contracts have many conditions relating to the specifications and all have to meet industry standards. The same applies to the Small Works Contract.

How do you ensure you are securing value for money?

Some contracts are let between price and quality, others purely on price. Value for money does not always equate to the cheapest bid.

1. Jacobs

There are 13 areas of scope which give good value for money. Market testing has been done on quality and price with local consultants and the OGC framework. Typically you would expect Jacobs fees to be are of 12-15% of the value of the works, although this can vary depending on the nature of the project, and these are negotiated down for similar types of work. During the contract extension to 2010, the cost of fees for work on capital projects will be benchmarked against the value of additional savings accrued on capital works. The Partnership Board for the Jacobs contract are looking at how other local authority professional service frameworks are identifying National Indicator 179 efficiency gains, which can then be used to benchmark against.

Stuart's view is that engineering is very lean internally. A balance has to be drawn between using in-house staff or consultants to cope with specialist work and varying workloads. A level of marginal increase in staffing would mean that expertise is brought in-house and consultants would only be required as a "top up" for technical expertise where it would not be cost effective to retain it permanently within the Council or where the overall workload is in excess of what can be sustained by the Council's engineering teams.

Adrian Griffiths' team has been involved in the procurement of the next contract and scoping discussions are being held with other authorities including Shropshire to explore the opportunities for joint working. The possibility of batching up the 13 areas of scope into separate contracts, or appointing one supplier for each area are also being explored. This will be reviewed with Shropshire over the next few months.

The Midlands Highways Alliance (MHA) is a shared contractor framework for civil engineering projects of up to £8m. The cost of joining the framework is £2.5k, and the potential benefits and savings to be made are being explored, balanced against the potential loss of local economic if a national contractor is appointed. The MHA is a partnership between the Highways Agency and some of the East Midlands authorities, but it is open for other authorities to join. The MHA has been supported by the East Midlands Regional Efficiency and Improvement Partnership. There is also a West Midlands Highways Alliance which has worked with the MHA on procurement of commodities such as salt. In future it is hoped that there may be opportunities for closer working between the West Midlands Highways Alliance and the MHA. There are opportunities to save on individual procurement costs for contractors or other services/supplies such as lamp columns and traffic signals.

Advice is being taken from the legal and procurement departments to clarify any potential TUPE liability the council may have for Jacobs' staff working on the Telford & Wrekin contract in the event of Jacobs not being re-appointed.

There have been occasions when it is necessary to go outside the Jacobs contract. The Greyhound Link scheme needed very specialist advice so went to an existing OGC framework contractor.

For some of the projects that were put out to open market competition as part of the contract benchmarking exercise Adrian's team were involved in the procurement process to draw up the standard contract documentation, receive and assess tenders. Stuart thought this had worked well although it had required some learning in getting procurement and legal staff familiar with the engineering contracts being used.

2. Traffic Signals

Work is being done with the procurement team to identify other authorities doing a similar procurement and to find gaps in our specification. Industry benchmarking has been done.

What criteria are used to evaluate tenders?

Tenders are evaluated on a balance of quality and price, depending on the nature of the contract. The Jacobs contract is evaluated on a 70% quality:30% price ratio. The Wellington Bus Station contract was let on price only, as the contract had a defined specification so if contractors priced the specification they automatically met the quality requirements.

Other factors are taken into consideration:

- **Local suppliers and local labour**
There are no specific clauses in contracts about using local suppliers and labour, although this is discussed as part of the contract negotiation and contractors are encouraged to use local supply chains. On the Wellington Bus Station contract, only local/regional contractors were shortlisted, and they try to use local sub-contractors. A post-code survey of Jacobs' staff showed 41% had a Telford postcode and a further 43% had Shropshire postcodes. Stuart Freeman thinks this brings added value in terms of local knowledge, rather than metropolitan consultants who may have less understanding of the local environment.
- **Equalities**
Equalities issues are considered as part of the evaluation process, for example, whether contractors have equalities statements. There is also an equalities statement to be included in the Memorandum of Understanding between the Council and Jacobs for the life of the contract extension, which will outline how both organisations will work together to promote equality and diversity.
- **Sustainability**
This is an emerging issue nationally and thought needs to be given to how this can be integrated into procurement processes. WMS declared an interest in the electricity/street lighting contract, but were not able to provide information about green energy. There are on-going discussions with Jacobs about tracking landfill / CO2 emissions, although there are no fixed assessments in place yet.

What role do staff in the department play in procurement and what is their level of knowledge about the markets they are procuring in?

In Keith Smith's area the role of staff is to identify and prioritise the works that need to be done, and to work with Jacobs to agree the contract documents and analyse tenders to make sure the let meets identified requirements. Business Transformation have input into this process.

Most procurement is based on scheduled prices, so negotiation happens at the

contract letting stage. The cheapest contract is identified and there are then detailed negotiations around specific areas to squeeze out value for money and savings. There is no further negotiation once the contract has been let.

Stuart Freeman's view is that staff have good knowledge of the consultancy and contractor market, and know what rates to expect. The current economic climate means that bids are more competitive with construction rates coming down. For example, the estimated costs for the Wellington contract 12 months ago was £650k+, but tenders now are for £590k - £650k. Experience has shown that there has been approximately a 10% drop in costs over the last 12 months, but this can vary between projects.

In Martyn Withnall's team, staff procure and manage all contracts. The central procurement team is used and Martyn noted that Vicky Fisher has given them tremendous support and they are happy with this arrangement. The new on-line procurement system has made procurement easier and more efficient as the team are able to select the cheapest supplier.

Do you think the procurement structure should be more centralised?

In Keith Smith's view E&R let very specialised contracts and need expertise in these fields to produce the best documents. Keith is not supportive of a corporate procurement structure for the works contracts because of their specialist nature, although street-lighting energy could be an area to look at corporately.

Stuart Freeman's view is that procurement should not be centralised but there is an argument for having a specialist resource within E&R to work on all contracts as they come up. This would save costs by taking more of the work contracted out to Jacobs. At present the management of the work placed through the Jacobs contract forms a small part of people's substantive roles, there would be greater opportunity to squeeze more value from if a dedicated contract management resource were in place – the contract management could be across more than one contract in the portfolio/ council. This could be an invest to save bid.

Who deals with electricity / street lighting?

The energy contract is with EDF procured through OGC Solutions, the government procurement agency securing energy for local authorities and public services. Keith Smith is aware of other potential suppliers – WMS declared an interest and were invited last year to supply costs, but they could not provide green energy or supply to the required timescale. A report is going to cabinet within the next month stating that 6 months statutory notice is being served to OGC Solutions to review energy charges. This will open the field to other suppliers such as WMS or the West Midlands Highways Alliance.

If you could make one change to improve procurement, what would it be?

Keith Smith will e-mail suggestions to Stephanie Jones.

Stuart Freeman:

- To invest in additional specialist resource within E&R. This would allow for consolidation of workload, more work to be handled in-house and more savings to be squeezed from Jacobs through better contract management.
- Set up a register of all local authority contracts and when they are due for re-negotiation to identify opportunities for joint working on both existing and new contracts. This may include understanding what existing collaborative groups such as the West Midlands Highways Alliance and the MHA are planning to procure.
- To develop a register of quality assured local suppliers including those used by the authority and those used by local developers. This will create a database of

potential suppliers with local market knowledge and expertise who can be invited to tender for contracts.

Martyn Withnall:

- To give staff a better understanding of procurement processes.
- To have an in-house procurement officer within the team that is fully trained.

Appendix 2

Procurement Scrutiny Review Meeting with CYP – 20th March 2009

Present:

Cllr. Roger Aveley
Maurice Viney – scrutiny co-optee
Tina Wood – Head of Commissioning, CYP
Angela Yapp – Business Manager
Stephanie Jones – Scrutiny

Apologies:

Councillor Karen Tomlinson

Tina Wood

Tina explained that children's services are procured through a commissioning process which she defined as broader than procurement.

There are different stages of the commissioning process:

- Evaluation of service users needs
- Mapping of current services delivered by Telford & Wrekin, PCT and other partners
- Design or re-design of services to fit needs – this could involve re-shaping current provision or purchasing new services
- Evaluation and monitoring of new services

Commissioning in CYP is led at a strategic level by the Children's Trust which is a joint planning and commissioning body responsible at borough or cross-boundary level. The Council and the PCT are the most significant players on the Trust, but it also includes the LSC, the police and other partners. There is a children's Joint Commissioning Team made up of 5 commissioning posts jointly funded by T&W and the PCT. Resources are reviewed collectively.

The Children's Trust links into Change for Children Boards at cluster level. The CfCs commission services at locality level.

The CfCs link to locality working where individual care packages are commissioned.

Does the Children's Trust tie into the LEA, schools and governing bodies?

This is an important part of the Trust and has strong links with education. The CfC Boards in the clusters are led by head teachers.

Do you use the Central Procurement Team (CPT)?

The CPT is used for advice and guidance around tendering but the business managers and joint commissioning team do the procurement. This is a very specialised area of work around service development and designing individual care packages so the portfolio needs to do this

Are any of the commissioning staff qualified in procurement?

Tina thinks that there are at least 2 qualified (Gail Stephens, Brian Kitson) and one has done a certificated course (Kate Smeetley).

How do you ensure value for money?

Value of money is considered on a balance of quality and price. Joint commissioning pushes forward integrated services so services are better, more savings are made

and work is not duplicated. Joint commissioning goes across the council as well as partners.

Do you do any joint commissioning with other local authorities?

Some services are regionally procured. Children and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAHMS) are procured with Shropshire and Staffordshire.

Angela Yapp

Angela is the Business Manager for placements of Children in Care (CiC) in the safeguarding / corporate parenting team. There are around 234 children residential or foster care. They receive a range of support some of which is delivered by in-house staff and some is bought in.

The main contracts are:

Castel Care – a block contract for residential care within Jigsaw.

National Foster Care Associates – for initial placements

Transport contract for children in care

Spot purchase assessments

There are also a number of other contracts

A central unit has been set up and all requests for resources are made through the unit.

How are the contract managed and how do you secure value for money?

This is done through regular meetings with providers. The placements officer meets them once a month and assesses value for money. A report on each child is made – school attendance, leisure and fun etc.

The cost of keeping a child in an internal foster care placement is £400 per week, for an external foster placement the costs is £773 per week, the costs for external residential is £3,069 per week. Angela has been looking at ways of stimulating the market for foster carers. Consultation has been done with foster carers to ascertain their capacity and to identify ways of encouraging new foster carers to come forward. Support carers are used to support foster carers (providing back-up if they need it) and this saves money by keeping children out of residential care. There is a shortage of foster carers but T&W compares well with other local authorities. The numbers in residential care are reducing. Costs were saved by the closure of one of the children's homes. 12 months ago there were about 35 in residential care, there are now 18 and this is expected to drop to 14 by the summer.

When children are placed out of county, a needs assessment is undertaken with the child and social worker to find the best solution for the child. Quality of care has to be taken into account as well as cost when placing. All provider invoices are evaluated to eliminate waste. Meetings are held with the management teams of providers so that they understand T&W's requirements as a local authority and what is expected of them.

£10k of savings have been made on the travel budget for 08/09 so far this year. Some costs are statutory and cannot be avoided such as transport for children placed out of county and children under care protection orders attending needs assessment meetings. The other main transport spend is on taxis for school and leisure. The policy is that when a child goes into care, the education department is liable for travel costs to and from school for journeys over 3 miles for one school term. Angela picked up the fact that this was not happening and that these costs were being paid by Children's Social care. This has now been rectified and the education Business Unit now pay these costs for all new children in care for a period of 4 months. Other options for increasing transport by foster carers are being

explored such as the viability of paying for driving lessons for carers and increasing the mileage allowance to make carers more flexible about giving lifts. The possibility of using CVS to provide transport instead of taxis is also being looked at. Flexcards are used for local buses. Angela was not sure if the red buses and twister service is being used but will check, and if not consider if they are a better or cheaper option than ones used currently.

Do you use Integrated Transport?

The Integrated Transport is used but Angela did a mystery shopping exercise on the contracted taxi firm and found that they were overcharging the council – the firm quoted a lower price to the mystery shopper as a private client. This has been brought to the attention of Integrated Transport and has been included in the Transport Review just undertaken.

Schools funding is ring-fenced. In Staffordshire, the schools use the County Council's contracts. Do you know if this happens in T&W?

Angela thinks this happens in the clusters through the Partnership Boards.

If you could change one thing about procurement to improve it what would you do?

Tina - Difficult to influence, but change the national rules to make the tender process less bureaucratic and faster.

Appendix 3

Procurement Scrutiny Review Meeting with ACC – 5th May 2009

Present:

Paul Taylor – Head of Service
Christine Harrison – Head of Commissioning for Adult Social Care
Richard Peach – Business Manager
Councillor Roger Aveley (Chairman)
Maurice Viney – scrutiny Co-optee
Stephanie Jones – Scrutiny

Apologies:

Councillor Karen Tomlinson

Paul Taylor gave an overview of commissioning in ASC.

Before the 1993 Community Care Act, social services was responsible for assessing needs and were also the main providers of residential care for older people and people with special needs including day care centres and home help. The social security system for residential care led to the growth of the private care sector. The 1993 Community Care Act transferred funding from social security to local authorities and also increased funding for residential and nursing homes plus care to support people at home. By this time, most local authorities had transferred residential care out to the private sector. By the time Telford & Wrekin became a unitary authority, 85% of provision was contracted out to private providers through block contracts.

The Choice Directive then gave individuals the right to choose which provider to use. This meant that procurement of care could no longer be done on a block contract basis but had to move to spot contracts to procure for individual care. This means that the council may have a block contract with a provider as well as many spot contracts.

There are still block contracts in place to ensure services are available locally i.e. block contracts are used to develop the market. For example:

- Day centres for adults with learning disabilities (ALD): there was historically no market for this, so the council block contracts day centre services in Halesfield, Lakeside and Stirchley. This is in addition to the 2 council owned homes in Wellington and Stirchley.
- Day centres for older people: there are block contracts with Accord and Coverage Care for specialist day centres and in Millbrook for specialist centre for people with dementia.

Questions

Are people means tested for funding?

People's needs are assessed first to determine the level of care required. There is then a financial assessment to see how services will be funded and if they are eligible for public funding. The threshold for eligibility is less than £23K in savings, and there is also a high salary threshold. If the person is living at home and will remain living at home, the value of the property is not counted as savings. If the person has to move to residential care and the house is left empty, then the value of the property is taken into consideration. If the person moves into residential care but a spouse or dependant remains in the property, then it is not classified as savings.

How do you ensure value for money and how do you benchmark?

Richard Peach has a member of staff working on benchmarking and does a significant amount of work with CIPFA on unit costs. Other local authorities have been consulted and there was a meeting at the end of March to report back on the results of this consultation and to identify areas for improvement and potential savings. This could include different financial modelling, the IT infrastructure and provision for Adults with Learning Disabilities (ALD). There are regional centres of excellence for ALD and there is a training day in June to look at models to see how value for money should be built in.

The Department of Health produces an annual report on spend across all local authorities and the information can be broken down to disaggregate overheads from care costs so that actual costs can be compared.

In addition to national and regional benchmarking, market testing is done by going out to tender and inviting bids to look for value for money, unit costs are profiled in conjunction with Shropshire Partners in Care, a national benchmarking model by the UK Home Care Association is used for domiciliary care and work is done with private providers to understand their costs including profit and overheads as well as cost of care so these can be benchmarked.

The Purchasing Plan is used as a strategic planning tool. This explains what services are contracted, from whom, blocks and spots, priorities for the future (e.g. shifting to home care away from residential) and there is a hyperlink to tender documents so that suppliers can shape provision to future needs.

The team is dynamic and intervenes in contracts to challenge prices for example in ALD residential care, but quality of care also has to be taken into consideration.

Direct payments will be a national driver for the future. Money will be given to users directly to procure the services they want and need and this will have an impact on the Purchasing Plan. It is not clear how this will fit in with block contracting (currently ¼ of provision is block contracted) but users may choose to buy from elsewhere and this could de-stabilise the market. What people spend money on will also need to be monitored.

How much profit do private providers make on average?

An average of 10-12%. In 2000 T&W specified that providers should be not-for-profit companies, but even not-for-profit companies have to make a surplus. This is taken into consideration at the evaluation stage.

Do you do any joint commissioning?

The total annual budget for care is £34m. This buys care for older people and adults with learning disabilities, mental health issues and sight disabilities.

£26m is spent on spot purchasing.

£8m is spent on block contracts.

People's needs can be for health as well as social care so some funding comes from the PCT. Of the total spend, the council funds around £19m and the PCT funds around £14m.

Several block and spot contracts are wholly funded or partly by the PCT and the council contracts on behalf of the PCT. There is a joint budget for some services such as intermediate care and these are jointly procured with the PCT.

T&W also joins procurement up with Shropshire where the 2 authorities need similar services to strip out costs, although contracts are awarded separately. For example this was done for mental health provision and the Community Meals on Wheels.

Which internal staff are involved in procurement?

Christine Harris manages the joint commissioning team. There are 2 lead joint commissioners. The commissioning and contract team take the lead in identifying need and the market.

The commissioners work with a number of stakeholders including carers, providers, advocates to represent users and social services to identify needs and specify the service. For example, looking at domestic care for old people, there was a workshop involving Senior Citizens, Age Concern and the voluntary services. Once the service is procured there are a series of discussions to identify what care is needed, when and how it should be provided. Social workers review the quality of care.

What competencies and qualifications do staff have in procurement?

Commissioning and contracting officers are in the West Midlands Group for quality monitoring. Other national organisations are used to support staff such as the Care Services Improvement Partnership and Care Services Efficiency. There is currently no mandatory competency framework for commissioners, but this is being looked at nationally and it could be that a professional qualification will be developed. Staff undergo course in contracting and commissioning and all have done certificated courses through CIPS. Chris thinks there are 2 CIPS qualified staff.

How do you work with the Central Procurement Team (CPT)?

They are used for expert advice on standards terms and conditions so standard clauses are used where possible, but many are non-standard as care is very individual so the commissioning team specify these parts of the contracts. Fran Jones is on the Central Procurement Group. The CPT provides support and advice on EU tenders.

The commissioning teams write the specifications for tenders and then check these with the legal and procurement teams. KPIs are specified and monitored.

How are complaints from users dealt with?

All domiciliary and residential providers have to be registered with what used to be the Commission for Social Inspectors which is now called the Care Quality Commission (CQC). Complaints can be made directly to the provider, or to the CQC. Users can also complain to the council even if they are in private residential care.

Do people complain or do they tolerate poor quality services?

Some users have no capacity to complain and there are therefore contracts with advocacy organisations such as Age Concern and Taking Part to provide this kind of feedback. The contracts are funded out of the central budget.

All provision has to be funded from within the set budgets and there is always more need than money so tough decisions have to be taken. People have to meet minimum thresholds of need to qualify for funding.

How are social workers trained and qualified?

All social workers are fully qualified to degree level and are registered with the General Care Social Council.

Who is responsible for checking the quality of care?

The local authority employs social workers who work with individual service users. There is a small team of contracts monitoring staff. A risk and proportionate based monitoring system has been developed and a range of intelligence is gathered about when a provider is not working. The council then works with the provider to help them take steps to address any issues and improve the quality of care. This is done through a developmental action plan and the approach is to work together and not an adversarial process. If this does not work, the council can suspend purchasing with the provider which is a powerful tool. It can be difficult when standards in a certain

home are not good, but an individual user chooses to remain there and a decision has to be made as to whether to fund an alternative provider. The CQC also acts as a regulator, but the process takes much longer and the council's power to cease funding a contract is a much more effective tool in achieving a quick response.

The logistics of home care are difficult. The council runs 2 domiciliary care centres, one for short-term rehabilitation of older people and the other is a specialist centre for adults with learning disabilities. It can be logistically complex when people become ill and need to stay longer than expected.

The council works with Shropshire Partners in Care, the LINKS and Senior Citizens to look at provision on the "softer" side – talking to people about what it is like to live in a residential home so people can make individual judgements about quality. Users, relatives and social workers are all involved in these discussions.

Overall, Telford & Wrekin provides a reasonable level of service to users according to national and regional indicators. The CQC has rated Telford as excellent on a number of indicators produced annually and overall is rated as providing a high level of service.

How do you ensure consistency of cover i.e. users have the same carer?

Consistency is specified and a KPI in contracts. If carers change very regularly this could indicate there is a problem and this would be investigated and monitored. This is reported to the CQC and improvement plans are put in place as soon as possible.

A big issue is there is not enough money so carers are poorly paid, earning about £6 per hour so there is little value placed on care work. T&W works with Shropshire Partners in Care and grant funding for care is put into training for providers.

How do you know which providers offer good quality care?

The CQC monitor and rate providers on a 0-3 star rating system. It is difficult when a low rated provider can actually have very good individual staff working for it, so the rating system does not give the whole picture. Quality is a very individual matter.

Are there any changes that could be made to save money?

Historically services for adults with severe learning disabilities contracted out of area because local service and hospitals could not provide the service. This is very expensive. If there was a service in place to stabilise and tackle the problems of challenging behaviour, this could bring significant savings. People could be brought back into the county, although there could be an issue with people who have been living out of county for more than 10 years and who choose not to move back.

The work that Richard Peach has been doing on benchmarking and value of money has made savings.

There is an issue when people make the transition from children to adult services as there is more funding available for children's services. ACC should work very closely with CYP because if the services for 16-17 year olds are not right, this sets ACC up for very high costs.

Conversely, providers would argue that they should be funded at a higher level. Tendering provides an opportunity to be more focussed on costs and where they can be stripped out. The monitoring team is not very big for dealing with all the issues, but money spent on this diverts money from actual care.

A fees incentive scheme has introduced to offer higher rewards for meeting minimum quality standards. This means that poor/low quality services are not rewarded and this sends an important signal to providers. Fees are negotiated on the quality of

provision. Information about dignity, meals etc are provided on the website.

There is a balance between value for money and length of contract. Care contracts have historically been let for 3 years as the council has been quite risk averse, but the tender process can take up to 12 months which means that work loads are very high and the cost of procurement is high. Contracts are now let on a longer term basis so reduce the workload and costs. The average contract is now 5 years with a 5 year extension option. Contracts are monitored so if there is a drop in standards, action is taken and the contract can ultimately be stopped. Contracts are subject to annual inflationary negotiation, which is within the budget envelope for this year. 2/3 of contracts are now spot contracts which are not subject to a tender process so immediate needs and changing volumes can be responded to quickly.

Is there an issue with care homes buying up houses for people?

If the business meets the planning requirements, then they can do it. This has not caused a great problem for ACC yet, although if the county becomes a net importer of older people whose capital runs out, then they become the responsibility of the council. The same applies to children placed in Telford & Wrekin who become “ordinarily resident” in the borough, the council can become liable for their care, but this is an issue for CYP.

Appendix 4

Procurement Scrutiny Review Meeting with ICT – 24th February 2009

Present:

Cllrs. Roger Aveley (Chairman), Karen Tomlinson
Mike Weston – Head of Service ICT
Tom Greatorex – Business Manager
Kirsty King – Business Manager
Alison Smith – Scrutiny Manager
Stephanie Jones – Scrutiny Officer

Apologies:

Maurice Viney Co-opted Member

What are the main contracts that you procure?

There are a number of main contracts:

- Network management – this is a standard contract across all council properties and schools except for Civic Offices. ICT are looking at including Civic Offices within the scope of the SLA at no extra cost.
- Geographical Information Systems (GIS) – this is a managed contract with MacDonald Dettweiler which has been taken over from E&R. ICT have worked with MDA to develop an SLA in order to manage the contract better.
- New main infrastructure project – this is with Dell and the central procurement team are involved in the contract procurement
- Desktop equipment (PCs, Laptops) – the contract has been with Computacentre since 2004 but is currently being re-tendered using the central procurement team and the legal department
- Maintenance of aging hardware and printers – these come under a smaller contract
- Pool vehicle contract – this is a 3 year contract, managed in conjunction with fleet services, currently under review as part of the Transport Services Review. ICT has already achieved savings by moving away from a daily hire contract.
- Mobile phones are procured from Orange via the OGC framework agreement.

Which other staff are involved in procurement e.g. writing tender documents, evaluating tenders, actual procurement?

The technical nature of the services procured means that the technical specs are written by ICT staff, but the central procurement team is used throughout the process. External experts such as the Society of IT Managers are sometimes used to specify contracts.

ICT also help develop technical specifications in-house for other departments needing software applications such as revenues & benefits. The OLAS system which requires upgrading is being market tested to ensure value for money. When considering procuring software or hardware the process involves market testing and benchmarking with other local authorities.

How much do you involve the central procurement team and could you use them to more effect?

The central procurement team is used to set up and evaluate all contracts.

ICT has a good relationship with central procurement, and they work jointly on contracts let by other portfolios that require technical specification, as the central

team lack the required degree of technical expertise. This is a mutually supportive relationship, and ICT is aware that the procurement team struggle for resources. ICT provides as much notice as possible to large procurement projects and involves central procurement in the early stages.

Contract management is done by ICT as the central team have limited resources for this. Contract management is not just about monitoring performance against KPIs and calling suppliers to book; it is important to build a relationship with suppliers. Mike manages the Dell and Synetrix contracts, Tom the desktop and mobile contracts. All three are involved. There is a contracts register which makes sure that reviews are done when they should be.

How are staff qualified and trained in procurement? Do they all understand regulations relating to procurement?

The ICT staff do not have procurement qualifications but have done the corporate procurement training and some have also done the SOCTIM negotiation course and a course on PPP outsourcing processes. ICT rely on the central procurement team and legal to guide them through the process. There is no refresher training.

What criteria are used to evaluate tenders i.e. how is price balanced with quality and what other factors are considered (e.g. local suppliers, equality, sustainability)?

Quality, price and local suppliers are all considered. ICT follow the CIPFA evaluation model for price and quality, see reference sites and take up references.

How is the equipment contract managed?

Equipment is called off from the OGC framework agreement which is in place for three years. The central procurement team helped to set the contract up and ICT manage it.

ICT try to forecast needs and trends to estimate unit costs to make sure that the price charged is competitive and negotiate down for bulk orders. PCs are owned by the portfolios so ICT have no control over when new orders are placed. ICT want to change this so that they own the PCs and have a new model to get best value from the PC lifecycle. A desktop pc has a lifespan of 4 years, but staff in portfolios sometimes replace equipment earlier when manufacturers bring out upgrades. Better management and forecasting will bring more savings. Equally 25% of PCs are over 4 years old so staff are not getting the best quality service.

The desktop contract is just going out to tender. 16 suppliers have been invited to tender and have 2 weeks to respond. The whole process from evaluation to award should be 4-6 weeks. The pre-tender documents were written by the central procurement team who designed the framework and ICT put in the technical specifications. The tender templates on the procurement website are good, and the Delta on-line procurement system has reduced paperwork.

ICT support 10,000 PCs in schools and 3,000 corporate PCs. Current spend on support is just under £1m per year and ICT are looking at ways this can be reduced.

The schools do not have to procure equipment through ICT, but 50% do especially if the school has no IT staff on site. With the move to the BSF model, all secondary schools will have to buy through ICT. Schools will be able to use the on-line catalogue when this is set up to get the best prices.

How are the mobile and telephone network contracts managed?

Telewest have the best network call tariffs with an almost zero charge for local calls

from aggregating calls on the VOIP network. One school saves around £10k a year. The council and schools annual bill is around £120k. Calls from the Orange mobiles are now being routed over the VOIP network so this is reducing costs. ICT is aiming for no-cost calls to the Orange corporate mobile phones

The Orange mobile contract is worth £250k per year. This is being renegotiated via the OGC framework to get unlimited talk/text/e-mails on phones. Comparisons with other providers have been made but there are costs associated with switching provider. Performance testing for black spots has also been done and Orange has better coverage in the borough. The broadband network could be extended to parish councils.

Currently it is down to individual preferences as to whether staff buy a Blackberry or SPV. ICT think a needs assessment should be done so users get whichever kit is best for their circumstances and job.

Do you link procurement of equipment to training so that staff getting new equipment are trained in how to use it?

The ICT courses are on the public schedule, but individual managers have to budget and arrange these for staff.

An induction training toolkit is being developed, starting with telephone use. The new equipment catalogue on the website will have information about recommended training courses for the equipment being bought. Staff volunteers will be used to deliver this to save on buying in trainers.

It was noted that training for members could be better. The new training toolkit should help this but there could be extra sessions for members.

Do you use local suppliers?

It is difficult to buy locally with IT because suppliers are national or international companies, but ICT specify wherever possible that suppliers should have a local presence. PC World will be tendering for the desktop contract within the next 2 weeks. Synetrix opened an office in Telford on the back of a 5 year contract with the council.

Do staff have a good knowledge of the markets they are procuring in?

Mike thinks they do. Mike has previous experience from 4 other authorities.

How do you ensure that you are securing value for money?

- **Do you use key performance indicators as what are they?**
- **Do you benchmark with other local authorities or market competitors?**

Benchmarking is done with other local authorities. SOCTIM indices are used to benchmark performance and price. KPIs are specified in every contract with penalty clauses. There are regular service reviews. Turn-around times are specified in the equipment contract. Prices are scrutinised to check that the supplier has not built the cost of potential penalties into the price.

A benchmarking exercise with other local authorities into the cost of laptops and network connections found we were paying more, so this contract is being re-tendered.

How is old equipment disposed of?

WEE regulations are followed for council owned equipment. Leased equipment goes back to the lease company. Centralised ownership of all PCs would make compliance with disposal regulations tighter.

Are you aware of people buying off-contract? What can be done to stop this?

Mike is not aware of any off-contract spend within ICT.

The corporate credit p-card is used for emergency fixes if the supplier can't provide parts. This happens 2-3 times a month and is avoided if at all possible as PC World is more expensive than contracted suppliers.

Do you procure with partners?

ICT considered a joint procurement with Staffordshire for the desktop contract, but the requirements and timescales could not be tied together.

Mike is approaching the LSP to consider public sector broadband aggregation and joint procurement with partners.

How do you evaluate customer's (council staff) ICT needs and link this to procurement?

There are ICT commissioning groups within the portfolios which set the priorities which are then taken to the Technology & Transformation Board. This works at a strategic level to join up the needs of the portfolios and link them into the central procurement team so that procurement is strategically planned and not reactive. Each portfolio has a nominated ICT contact to help develop and support the commissioning group.

Mike – what is your experience of other procurement models in other local authorities and how does Telford & Wrekin compare?

Mike started working in procurement Liverpool in 1985 where there was a massive procurement department.

Powys has a similar model to Telford & Wrekin. East Riding had a very small department which did not have enough capacity so the department was extended and all procurement was put on-line, using industry standard codes. No other ordering could be done outside the central contracts.

If you could change one thing about procurement to improve it what would it be?

The availability of procurement support from the central team. The quality is very good, but they are under resourced. This slows down processes and means that departments tend to go ahead on their own.

All on-line procurement.

Appendix 5

Procurement Scrutiny Review Meeting with Asset & Property Management, 2nd March 2009

Present:

Councillor Roger Aveley (Chairman)
Hugh Rodger – Business Manager
Chris Butler – Business Manager
Stephanie Jones – Scrutiny

Apologies:

Councillor Karen Tomlinson, Maurice Viney Co-opted Member

Summary of major contracts in Hugh Rodger and Chris Butler's business areas:

Hugh Rodger

The Architecture Landscape & Building (ALB) Business unit along with the other business units in Asset & Property Management provide a comprehensive service for land and property development and management.

The Architecture Landscape & Building Business Unit design and manage contracts for a range of new buildings and also arrange and supervise the repair and maintenance of the Council's existing buildings including schools libraries, leisure buildings civic buildings and also the Property Investment Portfolio (PIP), which includes industrial and commercial units.

Contracts procured relate to both new buildings (such as schools) and also the refurbishment and adaptation of existing Council buildings, including extensions. Capital and maintenance projects have a client representative from Asset & Property Management who works closely with the client (e.g.CYP) the end user (e.g. school) and the design and contractor teams in the delivery of projects, School have their own devolved budgets for maintenance and the majority of schools buy back into the R&M service provided by ALB.

The procurement route depends on the nature (e.g. size and complexity) and value of the project. Contracts are procured in line with the Council's standing orders and financial regulations and this generally means the following:

- For small contracts (up to a maximum value of £50,000), quotes are obtained from the required number of suppliers.
- For responsive maintenance, a term contract is in place with Seddons for some of the Councils buildings, (including PIP properties and Leisure buildings),and a range of local contractors are appointed for response maintenance on other buildings including schools..
- For contracts estimated over £50,000 a full tender process is adopted with either 4 or 6 tenderers invited, depending on the value.
- The type of contract used depends on the project but can include full design, design & build, or partnering. Each of these options have differing needs with regard to the level of information provided.
- For contract over the OJEU threshold, OJEU processes are followed.

Chris Butler

Chris' team is an in-house business unit providing consultancy to a range of engineering schemes with both internal and external clients. Chris manages a number of contracts.

There are a number of small, longer term contracts for works to the value of £75k which operate on a schedule of rates so there is no need to retender these. The rates are constantly monitored. A reactive contract for response times of under an hour for small works such as repairs to manhole covers is being introduced. There is a small contract for £15k in place for sewerage maintenance and a small contract team manages the contract for the flood defences in Ironbridge.

There are major contracts in place funded through various external funding bodies including ERDF and DEFRA. OJEU processes are applied to contract worth in excess of £3.6m. Procurement has to follow very stringent processes which are all subject to European Audit, so robust evidence of compliance has to be kept. These include a new £7m landing stability contract project in the Gorge with Birse which follows an older £4.6m contract. Further funding is being sought from Europe for this.

Jacobs are used to provide engineering consultancy on large projects to support on-site internal staff. Jacobs are used only for peak workloads or for areas where specialist knowledge is required. The Jacobs contract has just been renewed for 2 years and the procurement process for the re-tender of the contract after that has started. The contract is let on quality and price.

Do you use local suppliers?

Local suppliers are used for the smaller and responsive maintenance contracts for example for the shops in Leegomery and Malinslee. The use of local labour and materials is encouraged wherever possible, although it cannot be specified in contracts. In practice, contractors (including national ones) buy materials locally because it is more economical than paying haulage costs. The council does not buy materials itself as the cost of storage and insurance is prohibitive.

Do you use the Central Procurement Team (CPT)?

The CPT is involved early on in the process to advise on the letting of the larger contracts such as OJEU to ensure compliance. They are less involved in letting small contracts which are not subject to OJEU procurement regulations, although they are used for all queries about procurement. For example, a contractor had submitted an invoice for additional work on contaminated material. The CPT got involved with this and the contract was re-tendered. An e-procurement process (Delta) is being introduced whereby contract drawings, specifications and other information are stored in a vault and can be accessed by bidders to price up bids. This has been developed in conjunction with the CPT and can lead to savings on paper and administration.

The team also has a representative on the Corporate Procurement Steering Group (CPSG) which shares best practice across the authority. The CPSG met before Christmas to agree Terms of Reference and there is a meeting scheduled in the week following this meeting to take this forward.

What other staff are involved in procurement?

The engineers are involved in writing and evaluating tender documents. The CPT check the process for compliance and are used for advice, but the engineers specify documents and tenders as they understand what needs to be bought. Within ALB because of the multi disciplinary nature of building projects a range of staff are involved in preparing tender documents (usually drawings and technical specifications).

Are there any staff in the department with a procurement qualification?

There are no staff in the department with a procurement qualification but they are construction experts experienced in letting contracts. Some have PRINCE2 project management qualifications.

What criteria are used to evaluate tenders?

A Pre-Qualification Questionnaire (PQQ) is issued as part of the OJEU regulations so that bidders are matched against the tender criteria so that contractors not complying with the required minimum standards are eliminated. Chris Butler's team does the evaluation and the pitching process is also used to question and assess value for money.

Compliance or registration with industry standards and bodies are used as part of the pre-qualification and evaluation process such as:

- Construction Line – to meet financial criteria
- Contractors Health & Safety Assessment Scheme (CHAS)
- Safer Working standards
- Considerate Contractor policies

For new contractors who have not worked for T&W before, references are sought from previous clients

How do you assess value for money, and do you have KPIs in contracts?

National indicators and other local authorities are used to benchmark value for money. KPIs are built into contracts to measure performance against timescales, budgets and client satisfaction. A point system is used on major contracts to score performance.

On smaller term contracts, response times are monitored daily to pick up non-compliance. There are no penalty clauses for non-compliance, but liquidated damages can be charged, or the contractor can charge the council for delays to projects. Caution has to be exercised with very low quotes as it can mean that the contractor has no profit margin and cuts corners on delivery, so price has to be balanced with quality in evaluating bids.

Who manages contracts and how are they managed?

Engineering manage the engineering contracts for value for money. Contracts are structured so that contractors are incentivised by sharing profits from cost savings. On partnership contracts the approach has been to move away from adversarial contracts.

What partners do you procure with?

Jacobs are used as procurement partners.

The Council partnered with the PCT and procured on their behalf a new building at Malinslee. AFC Telford is another example of a partnership which delivered a new building. Salt was jointly procured with Shropshire for the recent freeze. Joint procurement of consultancy services is being explored with the new unitary council in Shropshire. Asset & Property have been working jointly with Shropshire Fire and rescue in relation to the maintenance Fire Stations and development of new and refurbished premises and the main site in Shrewsbury.

OGC frameworks have been looked at but have not been used as Jacobs supply the required services.

Are you aware of any off contract spend?

Chris Butler signs off all contracts and is not aware of any off-contract spend. Hugh Rodger is also not aware of any off contract spend.

What suggestions would you make to improve procurement at Telford & Wrekin?

- If it were possible, to reduce the amount of bureaucracy around OJEU contracts. The audit trail is very onerous and 3 dedicated staff were required to administrate the last contract.
- To reduce the amount of tender paperwork by moving to e-procurement systems, especially for smaller contracts under £50k. The only issue with this is that small contractors may be precluded from bidding if they do not have compatible AUTOCAD software.
- Development of IT systems. For example Asset & Property are looking at the procurement of a web based system to manage property assets and contracts on buildings. The facility will have the potential for orders and payments to be processed electronically, cutting down on time.


Scrutiny Leadership Board – Forward Plan 2009-10

Date of meeting	Agenda items
12th May 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scrutiny Assembly 19th May • Chairman's update: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Away day ○ Chairing arrangements for subgroups
Additional meeting 23rd June 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change to review order for Children & Young people • Feedback from the Scrutiny Assembly on 19th May • Proposal for Introduction of Councillor Call for Action • Amendments to terms of reference for standing sub groups • To consider the options for co-opting from West Mercia police Authority onto SLB for scrutiny of crime & disorder items • Chairman's update: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scrutiny and the media Report on urgent decisions by the Chairman
9th July 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration of further information on scrutiny suggestions from 12 May 2009 meeting • New legislation update • Appointment of members to the Joint health Scrutiny Committee with Shropshire, Staffordshire and Stoke • 6 Monthly review of new scrutiny arrangements
16th Sep 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on TSLEC • Preparation for Scrutiny Assembly meeting on 12th October 2009 • Surface Water Drainage – to consider inclusion in the programme as an in-depth review • Draft Scrutiny Annual Report for Full Council on 30th September 2009 • Scrutiny Review Reports for approval – Procurement
24th September 2009 – additional meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To receive presentation on employee survey results • CDRP scrutiny • Update on First Point recommendations • Scrutiny and the media • Report on the Council's Forward Plan • Preparation for Scrutiny Assembly on 12th October 2009 • Update on implementation of past recommendations • Scrutiny Review Reports for approval – Section 106
19th Nov 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan for Work Programme session in January • Update on implementation of past recommendations • Scrutiny Lead member appraisals • Scrutiny Review reports – Bus Services and Housing & Homelessness
14 Jan 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work Programme decisions following Scrutiny Assembly • To receive update on actions to address issues from employee survey
25th Mar 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparation for Scrutiny Assembly performance meeting • CDRP scrutiny

13th May 2010	

Standing Items

- Chairman's Update
- Scrutiny Suggestions
- SLB Forward Plan
- Council Forward Plan
- Progress on reviews
- Recommendations from scrutiny reviews/sub-groups etc.



Telford & Wrekin

C O U N C I L

FORWARD PLAN

96th Edition

Published on 14th August 2009

Effective from 1st September 2009

Covering the period

September 2009 to December 2009



**DEMOCRATIC
SERVICES**

TELFORD & WREKIN COUNCIL
96th EDITION FORWARD PLAN
September 2009 to December 2009

EFFECTIVE FROM 1st September 2009

- ❑ This Plan is a list of the Key Decisions likely to be taken over the coming 4 months. The list is not exhaustive as not all decisions are known that far in advance. The Plan is re-published monthly and the next Plan will be published on 16th September 2009 and effective from 1st October 2009.
- ❑ The contents of the Plan are subject to change each month. When the Plan is re-published the items identified in each month will be reviewed and depending on circumstances the timescale for some decisions may change. Attached to this Plan is the list of Key Decisions due to be taken in August 2009. Any Key Decisions not taken by the end of August 2009 will automatically be rolled forward into September 2009.
- ❑ Each key decision in the Plan will be the subject of a written report and that report will be published and available for public inspection 5 working days prior to the decision being taken.

Contact Officer:	Phil Smith Democratic Services Officer
Address	Civic Offices PO Box 215 Telford, TF3 4LF
Telephone	01952 383211
Email	phil.smith@telford.gov.uk

If you would like free help to understand this document in your own language, please phone the Borough of Telford & Wrekin on 01952 382121.

This information can also be made available in alternative formats including large print, Braille and audio tape.

INDEX

STANDARD ITEMS	4
Budget Strategy / Service & Financial Planning Process	4
Capital Strategy and Capital Programme Decisions within the agreed Capital Programme	4
Community Safety / Community Development / Social Inclusion Issues	4
Community Strategy / Local Area Agreement (LAA)/Priority Plans	5
Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) and External Inspection	5
Consultation Strategy and Activities	5
Corporate Property Amendments	6
Customer Strategy & E-Government	6
Regeneration Strategy for Telford & Wrekin	6
Financial Monitoring and Financial Updates	7
Improved Customer Service – Transforming the Business to Deliver the Vision	7
Local Development Framework	7
Overview of Service and Financial Outturns	8
Performance Management, Value-for-Money and Best Value	8
Property Investment Portfolio	8
School Organisation/Capital Financing	9
Scrutiny Leadership Board Reports	9
Sutton Hill Regeneration	9
Telford & Wrekin Partnership / Partnership Bid Applications and Projects	9
Telford Railfreight Terminal	10
Telford Town Centre	10
Woodside Regeneration	10
SEPTEMBER 2009	11
Draft Telford and Wrekin Economic Strategy (2010-2026)	11
Environmental Service Review	11
Facilities Management Review	12
Housing & Regeneration Local Investment Plan	12
Improving the Kerbside Recycling Service	13
Re-provision of Services for Looked after Children	13
OCTOBER 2009	14
Affordable Housing Small Sites Programme	14
Benefits Fraud Sanction Policy	14
Community Strategy for Telford & Wrekin	15
Future Delivery Of Economic Development and Regeneration Services	15
Planning of School Places – Co-location of Three Oaks and Stirchley Primary Schools to form a new Primary School at Stirchley District Centre	16
Regional Spatial Strategy Phase 3 Consultation	16
Waste Strategy Review 2009	17
AUGUST 2009	18
No Specific Reports	18

STANDARD ITEMS

The following are Standard Items for decisions relating to each Portfolio/Service which may be taken as and when necessary.

Title	Budget Strategy / Service & Financial Planning Process	
Exempt		If yes please state Paragraph Number(s) under which item is exempt:
Lead Cabinet Member and Portfolio Area	Cllr Andrew Eade / Cllr Adrian Lawrence Resources	
Decision Maker	Cabinet	
Target Cabinet/Date of Decision	As appropriate	
Contact	Name	Designation
	Ken Clarke	Head of Finance & Audit
	Telephone No 01952 383003	Email ken.clarke@telford.gov.uk

Title	Capital Strategy and Capital Programme Decisions within the agreed Capital Programme	
Exempt	Refer to Specific Reports	If yes please state Paragraph Number(s) under which item is exempt:
Lead Cabinet Member and Portfolio Area	All Cabinet Members All Portfolios	
Decision Maker	Cabinet	
Target Cabinet/Date of Decision	As appropriate	
Contact	Name	Designation
	Ken Clarke	Head of Finance & Audit
	Telephone No 01952 383703	Email ken.clarke@telford.gov.uk

Title	Community Safety / Community Development / Social Inclusion Issues	
Exempt		If yes please state Paragraph Number(s) under which item is exempt:
Lead Cabinet Member and Portfolio Area	Cllr Adrian Lawrence Community Services	
Decision Maker	Cabinet	
Target Cabinet/Date of Decision	As required	
Contact	Name	Designation
	Angie Astley	Head of Customer Services & Business Transformation
	Telephone No 01952 382400	Email angie.astley@telford.gov.uk

[Return to Index](#)

Title	Community Strategy / Local Area Agreement (LAA)/Priority Plans	
Exempt	Refer to specific reports	If yes please state Paragraph Number(s) under which item is exempt:
Lead Cabinet Member and Portfolio Area	Cllr Andrew Eade Leader	
Decision Maker	Cabinet	
Target Cabinet/Date of Decision	As appropriate	
Contact	Name Richard Partington	Designation Head of Policy, Performance & Partnership
	Telephone No 01952 380131	Email richard.partington@telford.gov.uk

Title	Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) and External Inspection	
Exempt		If yes please state Paragraph Number(s) under which item is exempt:
Lead Cabinet Member and Portfolio Area	Cllr Andrew Eade Leader	
Decision Maker	Cabinet	
Target Cabinet/Date of Decision	As appropriate	
Contact	Name Richard Partington	Designation Head of Policy, Performance and Partnership
	Telephone No 01952 380131	Email richard.partington@telford.gov.uk

Title	Consultation Strategy and Activities	
Exempt		If yes please state Paragraph Number(s) under which item is exempt:
Lead Cabinet Member and Portfolio Area	Cllr Andrew Eade Leader	
Decision Maker	Cabinet	
Target Cabinet/Date of Decision	As appropriate	
Contact	Name Richard Partington	Designation Head of Policy, Performance and Partnership
	Telephone No 01952 380131	Email richard.partington@telford.gov.uk

[Return to Index](#)

Title	Corporate Property Amendments	
Exempt	Refer to Specific Reports	If yes please state Paragraph Number(s) under which item is exempt:
Lead Cabinet Member and Portfolio Area	Cllr Eric Carter Environment & Regeneration	
Decision Maker	Cabinet and/or Head of Asset & Property Management	
Target Cabinet/Date of Decision	As appropriate	
Contact	Name	Designation
	David Sidaway	Head of Asset & Property Management
	Telephone No 01952 384300	Email david.sidaway@telford.gov.uk

Title	Customer Strategy & E-Government	
Exempt	Refer to Specific Reports	If yes please state Paragraph Number(s) under which item is exempt:
Lead Cabinet Member and Portfolio Area	Cllr Adrian Lawrence Resources	
Decision Maker	Cabinet / Corporate Director: Community Services	
Target Cabinet/Date of Decision	As appropriate	
Contact	Name	Designation
	Angie Astley	Head of Customer Strategy & Business Transformation
	Telephone No 01952 382400	Email angie.astley@telford.gov.uk

Title	Regeneration Strategy for Telford & Wrekin	
Exempt		If yes please state Paragraph Number(s) under which item is exempt:
Lead Cabinet Member and Portfolio Area	Cllr Eric Carter Environment & Regeneration	
Decision Maker	Cabinet	
Target Cabinet/Date of Decision	As appropriate	
Contact	Name	Designation
	Sophie Griffiths	Project Lead Officer
	Telephone No 01952 384700	Email mark.donovan@telford.gov.uk

[Return to Index](#)

Title	Financial Monitoring and Financial Updates	
Exempt	No	If yes please state Paragraph Number(s) under which item is exempt:
Lead Cabinet Member and Portfolio Area	Cllr Adrian Lawrence Resources/All Portfolios	
Decision Maker	Cabinet	
Target Cabinet/Date of Decision	As appropriate	
Contact	Name Pauline Harris	Designation Corporate Finance Manager
	Telephone No 01952 383701	Email pauline.harris@telford.gov.uk

Title	Improved Customer Service – Transforming the Business to Deliver the Vision	
Exempt		If yes please state Paragraph Number(s) under which item is exempt:
Lead Cabinet Member and Portfolio Area	Cllr Adrian Lawrence Resources	
Decision Maker	Cabinet	
Target Cabinet/Date of Decision	As appropriate	
Contact	Name Angie Astley	Designation Head of Customer Strategy & Business Transformation
	Telephone No 01952 382900	Email angie.astley@telford.gov.uk

Title	Local Development Framework	
Exempt	Refer to specific reports	If yes please state Paragraph Number(s) under which item is exempt:
Lead Cabinet Member and Portfolio Area	Cllr Steve Bentley Environment & Regeneration	
Decision Maker	Cabinet	
Target Cabinet/Date of Decision	As appropriate	
Contact	Name Matthew Wedderburn	Designation Principal Planning Officer (Policy Information)
	Telephone No 01952 384246	Email matthew.wedderburn@telford.gov.uk

[Return to Index](#)

Title	Overview of Service and Financial Outturns	
Exempt	No	If yes please state Paragraph Number(s) under which item is exempt:
Lead Cabinet Member and Portfolio Area	Cllr Adrian Lawrence Resources/All Portfolios	
Decision Maker	Cabinet	
Target Cabinet/Date of Decision	As appropriate	
Contact	Name Pauline Harris John Power Telephone No 01952 383701 01952 380134	Designation Corporate Finance Manager Corporate Performance Manager Email pauline.harris@telford.gov.uk hilary.knight@telford.gov.uk

Title	Performance Management, Value-for-Money and Best Value	
Exempt		If yes please state Paragraph Number(s) under which item is exempt:
Lead Cabinet Member and Portfolio Area	Cllr Andrew Eade Leader	
Decision Maker	Cabinet	
Target Cabinet/Date of Decision	As appropriate	
Contact	Name Richard Partington Telephone No 01952 380131	Designation Head of Policy, Performance and Partnership Email richard.partington@telford.gov.uk

Title	Property Investment Portfolio	
Exempt	Yes	If yes please state Paragraph Number(s) under which item is exempt: 3
Lead Cabinet Member and Portfolio Area	Cllr Eric Carter Environment & Regeneration	
Decision Maker	Cabinet/Head of Asset & Property Management	
Target Cabinet/Date of Decision	As appropriate	
Contact	Name David Sidaway Telephone No 01952 384300	Designation Head of Asset & Property Management Email david.sidaway@telford.gov.uk

[Return to Index](#)

Title	School Organisation/Capital Financing	
Exempt		If yes please state Paragraph Number(s) under which item is exempt:
Lead Cabinet Member and Portfolio Area	Cllr Stephen Burrell Children & Young People	
Decision Maker	Cabinet	
Target Cabinet/Date of Decision	As appropriate	
Contact	Name Clive Jones	Designation Head of Policy, Resources & Social Regeneration
	Telephone No 01952 380900	Email clive.jones@telford.gov.uk

Title	Scrutiny Leadership Board Reports	
Exempt	Please refer to individual reports	If yes please state Paragraph Number(s) under which item is exempt:
Lead Cabinet Member and Portfolio Area	Please refer to individual reports	
Decision Maker	Cabinet	
Target Cabinet/Date of Decision	As appropriate	
Contact	Name Ken Clarke	Designation Head of Finance & Audit.
	Telephone No 01952 383100	Email ken.clarke@telford.gov.uk

Title	Sutton Hill Regeneration	
Exempt	Please refer to individual reports	If yes please state Paragraph Number(s) under which item is exempt:
Lead Cabinet Member and Portfolio Area	Cllr E.J.Carter Environment & Regeneration	
Decision Maker	Cabinet	
Target Cabinet/Date of Decision	As appropriate	
Contact	Name Katherine Kynaston	Designation Head of I.H.P.
	Telephone No 01952 384021	Email katherine.kynaston@telford.gov.uk

Title	Telford & Wrekin Partnership / Partnership Bid Applications and Projects	
Exempt	Refer to Specific Reports	If yes please state Paragraph Number(s) under which item is exempt:
Lead Cabinet Member and Portfolio Area	All Cabinet Members All Portfolios	
Decision Maker	Cabinet	
Target Cabinet/Date of Decision	As appropriate	
Contact	Name Please refer to individual reports	Designation Not applicable
	Telephone No Not applicable	Email Not applicable

Title	Telford Railfreight Terminal	
Exempt		If yes please state Paragraph Number(s) under which item is exempt:
Lead Cabinet Member and Portfolio Area	Cllr Steve Bentley Environment & Regeneration	
Decision Maker	Cabinet	
Target Cabinet/Date of Decision	As appropriate	
Contact	Name	Designation
	Graham Fairhurst	Special Projects Manager
	Telephone No 01952 384590	Email graham.fairhurst@telford.gov.uk

Title	Telford Town Centre	
Exempt		If yes please state Paragraph Number(s) under which item is exempt:
Lead Cabinet Member and Portfolio Area	Cllr Eric Carter Environment & Regeneration	
Decision Maker	Cabinet	
Target Cabinet/Date of Decision	As appropriate	
Contact	Name	Designation
	David Sidaway	Head of Asset & Property Management
	Telephone No 01952 384300	Email david.sidaway@telford.gov.uk

Title	Woodside Regeneration	
Exempt		If yes please state Paragraph Number(s) under which item is exempt:
Lead Cabinet Member and Portfolio Area	Cllr Eric Carter Environment & Regeneration	
Decision Maker	Cabinet	
Target Cabinet/Date of Decision	As appropriate	
Contact	Name	Designation
	Will Schofield	Strategic Regeneration Officer
	Telephone No 01952 384700	Email mark.donovan@telford.gov.uk

[Return to Index](#)

SEPTEMBER 2009

Title	Draft Telford and Wrekin Economic Strategy (2010-2026)	
Exempt (ie Not for Publication)	NO	Paragraph Number(s) (Section 12A LGA 1972)
Lead Cabinet Member and Portfolio Area	Councillor Eric Carter Environment & Regeneration	
Why this is a Key Decision	The Borough Economic Strategy sets key priorities for the economic development and regeneration of the Borough up to 2026. The report seeks Council endorsement to these priorities prior to seeking wider partner endorsement	
Purpose	To seek Cabinet endorsement of a draft Borough Economic Strategy, prior to the launch of the Strategy at the State of the Borough Conference in October 2009.	
Recommendation	Cabinet is recommended to endorse the draft Telford and Wrekin Economic Strategy (2010-2026)	
Decision Maker	Cabinet	
Target Cabinet/Date of Decision	15 th September 2009	
Proposed Consultation	Telford and Wrekin Partnership (June 2009); Telford Economic Development partnership (May 2009); other agencies and business networks	
Contact	Name Peter Smith	Designation Head of Economic Devt and Housing
	Telephone No 01952 384700	Email peter.smith@telford.gov.uk

Title	Environmental Service Review	
Exempt (ie Not for Publication)	NO	Paragraph Number(s) (Section 12A LGA 1972)
Lead Cabinet Member and Portfolio Area	Councillor Stephen Bentley Environment & Regeneration	
Why this is a Key Decision	Borough wide implications and of significant public interest	
Purpose	To share the recommendations made as part of the Environmental Service Review, which is one of a number of fundamental service reviews that will be carried out across the Authority and are intended to identify the potential for significant cost savings, whilst maintaining or improving upon current customer service levels	
Recommendation	That the recommendations are approved and the Authority moves towards implementation	
Decision Maker	Cabinet	
Target Cabinet/Date of Decision	29th September 2009	
Proposed Consultation		
Contact	Name Angie Astley	Designation Head of Customer Strategy & Business Transformation
	Telephone No 01952 382007	Email Angie.astley@telford.gov.uk

Title	Facilities Management Review	
Exempt (ie Not for Publication)	NO	Paragraph Number(s) (Section 12A LGA 1972)
Lead Cabinet Member and Portfolio Area	Cllr Stephen Burrell Children & Young People	
Why this is a Key Decision	There is an opportunity as a longer term solution to share services with another authority and support the government's "Shared Services" agenda. Operating in a different way to that which is provided currently.	
Purpose	To share the recommendations made as part of the Facilities Management Review. This one of a number of Fundamental Service Reviews that will be carried out across the Authority and are intended to identify the potential for significant cost savings, whilst maintaining or improving upon current customer service levels	
Recommendation	That the recommendations are approved and the Authority moves towards implementation	
Decision Maker	Cabinet	
Target Cabinet/Date of Decision	29 th September 2009	
Proposed Consultation		
Contact	Name	Designation
	Angie Astley	Head of Customer Strategy & Business Transformation
	Telephone No	Email
	01952 382007	angie.astley@telford.gov.uk

Title	Housing & Regeneration Local Investment Plan	
Exempt (ie Not for Publication)	NO	Paragraph Number(s) (Section 12A LGA 1972)
Lead Cabinet Member and Portfolio Area	Cllr Eric Carter Environment & Regeneration	
Why this is a Key Decision	The Investment Plan will set out priorities for investment in housing and housing led regeneration for the next 3 years, across the whole Borough.	
Purpose	To seek approval for the Housing & Regeneration Local Investment Plan being prepared by the Housing & Regeneration Partnership with the Homes & Communities Agency. The Plan will set out investment and proposed use of assets by both partners to support housing delivery and address issues of homelessness and housing led regeneration, over the next 3 years.	
Recommendation	Adoption of the Local Investment Plan	
Decision Maker	Cabinet.	
Target Cabinet/Date of Decision	29 th September 2009	
Proposed Consultation	Investment Plan priorities are drawn from the Housing Priority Plan which has been subject to consultation. Discussions are ongoing with development and investment partners.	
Contact	Name	Designation
	Katherine Kynaston	Head of IHP
	Telephone No	Email
	01952 384021	Katherine.kynaston@telford.gov.uk

Title	Improving the Kerbside Recycling Service	
Exempt (ie Not for Publication)	YES	Paragraph Number 3, Section 12A LGA 1972
Lead Cabinet Member and Portfolio Area	Cllr Stephen Bentley Environment & Regeneration	
Why this is a Key Decision	A key change in the delivery of a service that affects all wards	
Purpose	To seek approval to amend the recycling services in line with the proposals contained within this report.	
Recommendation	That the changes to the kerbside recycling services be approved	
Decision Maker	Cabinet	
Target Cabinet/Date of Decision	15 th September 2009	
Proposed Consultation	None proposed	
Contact	Name Sally Hall	Designation Interim Business Manager DP&S
	Telephone No 01952 384202	Email sally.hall@telford.gov.uk

Title	Re-provision of Services for Looked after Children	
Exempt (ie Not for Publication)	YES	Paragraph Number 3, Section 12A LGA 1972
Lead Cabinet Member and Portfolio Area	Cllr Stephen Burrell Children & Young People	
Why this is a Key Decision	Significant financial impact	
Purpose	To present the updated placement strategy, as part of re-provision plans for services for children in care	
Recommendation	That agreement is given to the recommendations contained within the updated placement strategy	
Decision Maker	Cabinet	
Target Cabinet/Date of Decision	15 th September 2009	
Proposed Consultation	Staff and trade unions	
Contact	Name Laura Johnston	Designation Head of Locality Services
	Telephone No 01952 385001	Email Laura.johnston@telford.gov.uk

OCTOBER 2009

Title	Affordable Housing Small Sites Programme	
Exempt (ie Not for Publication)	No	Paragraph Number(s) (Section 12A LGA 1972)
Lead Cabinet Member and Portfolio Area	Cllr Eric Carter Environment & Regeneration	
Why this is a Key Decision	Involves investment of land and resources and provision of sites for affordable housing across the whole Borough	
Purpose	To seek approval to progress the delivery of a programme of small sites for affordable housing in partnership with the Homes & Communities Agency.	
Recommendation	Various – likely to include approval to appoint a delivery partner, inclusion of sites or process for approving inclusion, phasing and investment	
Decision Maker	Cabinet.	
Target Cabinet/Date of Decision	13 th October 2009	
Proposed Consultation	TWC sites will require planning permission and consultation will be undertake as part of the statutory process. Parish and Ward members will be involved in the development of the programme.	
Contact	Name	Designation
	Katherine Kynaston	Head of IHP
	Telephone No	Email
	01952 384021	Katherine.kynaston@telford.gov.uk

Title	Benefits Fraud Sanction Policy	
Exempt (ie Not for Publication)	No	Paragraph Number(s) (Section 12A LGA 1972)
Lead Cabinet Member and Portfolio Area	Cllr Adrian Lawrence Resources	
Why this is a Key Decision	To ensure that this Authority takes appropriate action in cases of suspected benefit fraud to punish offenders in line with Audit Commission guidelines and Key Lines of Enquiry (KLOE), including the appropriateness of taking prosecution action against the most serious cases.	
Purpose	To set out the Authority's criteria for the authorising of sanctions against benefit fraudsters, and to demonstrate to the residents of Telford & Wrekin that this Authority takes benefit fraud seriously, and will not tolerate such behaviour.	
Recommendation	That the revised guidelines for determining the most appropriate sanction to apply in the case of proven benefit fraud are approved; That the revised delegated authority to authorise sanction action is approved	
Decision Maker	Cabinet	
Target Cabinet/Date of Decision	27 th October 2009	
Proposed Consultation	Department for Work and Pensions - Fraud Investigation Service; BTW Legal Services; BTW Internal Audit; Citizens Advice Bureau; Telford Magistrates; Benefit Investigation Team; Benefit Control Team	
Contact	Name	Designation
	Lee Higgins	Benefit Manager
	Telephone No	Email
	01952 383835	Lee.higgins@telford.gov.uk

Title	Community Strategy for Telford & Wrekin	
Exempt (ie Not for Publication)	NO	Paragraph Number(s) (Section 12A LGA 1972)
Lead Cabinet Member and Portfolio Area	Cllr Andrew Eade Policy Performance & Partnerships	
Why this is a Key Decision	The Community Strategy is an overarching strategy that covers all wards of the Borough	
Purpose	The Community Strategy has been refreshed to reflect revised Community Priorities (as per Priority Plans), new Local Area Agreement (2008-11) and refreshed Vision 2026	
Recommendation	To endorse the refreshed Community Strategy for Telford & Wrekin	
Decision Maker	Cabinet	
Target Cabinet/Date of Decision	13 th October 2009	
Proposed Consultation	Significant public and partner consultation has taken place in the development of the Priority Plans, Vision 2026 and Local Area Agreement round 2. Communication and consultation will be ongoing with LSP partners and the community.	
Contact	Name Tim Moore	Designation Partnership & Performance Officer
	Telephone No 01952 380140	Email Tim.moore@telford.gov.uk

Title	Future Delivery Of Economic Development and Regeneration Services	
Exempt (i.e not for publication)	YES	Paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972
Lead Cabinet Member and Portfolio Area	Councillor Eric Carter Environment & Regeneration	
Purpose	To consider a detailed legal and financial analysis of the implications of revised delivery arrangements for economic development and regeneration services following a Cabinet approval in principle of those proposals on 21 st July 2009, and to agree the implementation of those proposals	
Recommendation	To approve revised arrangements for the delivery of economic development and regeneration services in the Borough	
Why this is a Key Decision	Significant financial impact	
Decision Maker (if officer specify whom)	Cabinet/ Full Council	
Target Cabinet / Date of Decision	13 th October 2009	
Proposed Consultation	Legal Services, Resources, HR, external legal advice	
Contact	Name Peter Smith	Designation Head of Economic Development
	Telephone No: 01952 384700	Email: Peter.smith@telford.gov.uk

Title	Planning of School Places – Co-location of Three Oaks and Stirchley Primary Schools to form a new Primary School at Stirchley District Centre	
Exempt (ie Not for Publication)	NO	Paragraph Number(s) (Section 12A LGA 1972)
Lead Cabinet Member and Portfolio Area	Cllr Stephen Burrell Children & Young People	
Why this is a Key Decision	Decisions are likely to incur expenditure greater than £500k and will impact on people in more than one ward within the Borough	
Purpose	To report on the consultation process regarding proposals to co-locate Three Oaks Primary and Stirchley Primary to form a new primary school at Lord Silkin Learning Community, as part of wider proposals for Campus Telford & Wrekin	
Recommendation	To approve a request for permission to consult on these proposals	
Decision Maker	Cabinet	
Target Cabinet/Date of Decision	27th October 2009	
Proposed Consultation	Wider community, Members and any other interested parties	
Contact	Name Mal Yale	Designation Capital & Facilities Manager
	Telephone No 01952 380931	Email Mal.yale@telford.gov.uk

Title	Regional Spatial Strategy Phase 3 Consultation	
Exempt (ie Not for Publication)	NO	Paragraph Number(s) (Section 12A LGA 1972)
Lead Cabinet Member and Portfolio Area	Cllr Stephen Bentley Environment & Regeneration	
Why this is a Key Decision	Significant public interest	
Purpose	To agree officer comments already submitted, due to the consultation timescale over the summer months, on the consultation for the RSS Phase 3; in particular to gain agreement to the approach to the topic areas of Critical Rural Services, Gypsies and Travellers, Culture, Sport & Tourism, Quality of Environment and Minerals	
Recommendation	To agree officer comments previously submitted to West Midlands Regional Assembly	
Decision Maker	Cabinet	
Target Cabinet/Date of Decision	27th October 2009	
Proposed Consultation	Portfolios and Members were contacted and invited to the RSS consultation event; Development Plan Steering Group	
Contact	Name Mark Edwards	Designation Business Manager DPS
	Telephone No 01952 384260	Email Mark.edwards@telford.gov.uk

Title	Waste Strategy Review 2009	
Exempt (ie Not for Publication)	NO	Paragraph Number(s) (Section 12A LGA 1972)
Lead Cabinet Member and Portfolio Area	Cllr Stephen Bentley Environment & Regeneration	
Why this is a Key Decision	This is a Council Strategy and covers the whole Borough. It therefore has an impact on all wards. It provides the platform from which future investment in waste services will be made.	
Purpose	The current Waste Management Strategy 2005 – 2021, adopted by members in 2005/06 is scheduled for its first review in 2008/09. Work is currently being undertaken in this respect and the purpose of this report is to provide an update on delivery of the strategy to date, consider new regional/national policy in the context of service delivery, consider ongoing targets and propose new actions. Overall the report will seek approval for the adoption of a refreshed Strategy document.	
Recommendation	Adoption of the revised Strategy	
Decision Maker	Cabinet	
Target Cabinet/Date of Decision	13 th October 2009	
Proposed Consultation	Full public consultation	
Contact	Name	Designation
	Sally Sheward	Waste Management Team Leader
	Telephone No	Email
	01952 384211	sally.sheward@telford.gov.uk

[Return to Index](#)

AUGUST 2009
No Specific Reports