

22nd October 2001

WELLAND LEADERS MEETING

30th October 2001, 10.00a.m.
at South Kesteven District Council

BID FOR SSP STATUS: COMPOSITION OF BOARD

Introduction

1. This paper draws on information from other potential strategic sub-regional partnerships, and specifically from feedback from EMDA in relation to green (effectively successful) and amber (good case but more work needed) submissions. It is intended to inform Leaders of the requirements about size and composition of the 'Executive Board' that EMDA will impose as part of the awarding process.

Welland: The Difference

2. Before examining comments for other partnerships we need to reflect that ours is the only applicant body not set up with economic development as its key driver/purpose. In effect we said

- We set ourselves up to work together ...
- That has had some good successes ...
- People are talking about us
- We are genuinely different with a real rural agenda and ignoring traditional pointless boundaries
- Some people at EMDA seem to think we are a breath of fresh air
- So, let's have a go at becoming an SSP

3. Thus EMDA says

"The case for a rural economic agenda was well articulated. However, the partnership is largely of local authorities and, although it has a good track record as an innovative and successful public sector partnership, the case for SSP recognition was not convincing. There is little or no real private sector involvement and the issues of overlap and duplication are not fully thought through."



The Welland Partnership

East Northamptonshire District Council
Harborough District Council
Melton Borough Council
Rutland County Council
South Kesteven District Council

2.

4. The Welland Partnership is, deliberately, not inclusive. Our successes to date are, predominantly, about delivering local government services within the framework of value for money. We must not allow a wish to gain SSP recognition to jeopardise the Partnership's fundamental purpose. This points to a separate body – a Welland SSP Board – created for that single function. What is likely, then, to fit the bill?

The Balance of an SSP Board

5. Lincolnshire Development Partnership's bid has been recommended for approval subject to further consideration of the "size and composition of the Executive team and its relationship to the Board". The Board is all-inclusive and that also is of concern to EMDA because consideration also needs to be given to "the size and flexibility of the Board itself".
6. There has, since EMDA published this 'advice', been considerable political activity within Lincolnshire as all authorities strive to secure representation on the 'Executive'. This will not be allowed to happen and, at the time of writing, it is assumed that the Local Government Association (for Lincolnshire) will eventually agree that the best course of action is to accept EMDA's 'final offer' of an Executive of 15 (5 local government, 5 business and 5 other partners) I think 15 is at, perhaps above, the top end of EMDA's target.
7. It is interesting to observe from anecdotal evidence that EMDA does not want to see partisanship to one's own authority. They consider that any councillor coming onto the body should represent all of the area in much the same way their (EMDA's) own Board are obliged to pursue the Regional good rather than local/personal agendas. (Attached is a sheet showing comments for the 3 current 'green' recommendations).

An Approach for Welland

8. Because the Partnership does other things I can see that the Welland's SSP Board could be established without having any impact upon the current arrangements for management. The '5 Leaders' body can continue, supplemented however the Partnership best decides to involve members in specific services, initiatives and projects.
9. In relation to economic development, South Kesteven has already requested that a members' group should be established. Such a body would be able to co-ordinate the 'local government' component of an SSP. Indeed it could comprise the pool from which the public sector members of the SSP are selected.



The Welland Partnership

East Northamptonshire District Council
Harborough District Council
Melton Borough Council
Rutland County Council
South Kesteven District Council

- 3 -

Proposal

10. I suggest we should strive to establish a 9 strong Welland SSP Board containing
- 3 local government sector
 - 4 business sector, including the chairman
 - 1 education sector
 - 1 voluntary sector

Chris Farmer
21 October 2001



<p>1. Recommendation for Recognition as an SSP</p> <p>The Panel considered that these Partnerships met the criteria for SSPs. Additional work is necessary in order for them to be fully fit for purpose by March 2002, but the Panel deemed that the substance of the Partnerships was sufficiently robust and the additional work achievable in the timescales.</p>	<p>Greater Nottingham Partnership</p> <p>The GNP is a well-established Partnership that demonstrated clear links with the RES and offered a convincing case for recognition. Partnership commitment is clear as is accountability and capacity to deliver. They have been asked to look again at the size and composition of the board and the relationship with their LSPs.</p> <p>Northamptonshire Partnership</p> <p>Although a newly created partnership, largely in response to the SSP agenda, the presentation was clear and convincing. The Partnership showed clear links to RES and a realistic approach to the work that still remains to be done. There is an enthusiastic and committed private sector input and significant distance has clearly been traveled. There needs to be further consideration of the role and engagement of the community/ voluntary sector and of the relationship of the Executive to the wider Partnership. A significant amount of work needs to be done on systems and processes</p> <p>Lincolnshire Development Partnership</p> <p>A clear and convincing presentation, demonstrating evidence that this partnership is genuinely private sector led/ driven. The size and composition of Executive team and its relationship to the Board needs to be considered further as does the size and flexibility of the Board itself. Relationship with the LSP needs clarification.</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------