

London Borough of Hackney
Governance and Resources Scrutiny Commission
Municipal Year 2016/17
Date of Meeting Monday, 14th November, 2016

Minutes of the proceedings of
the Governance & Resources
Scrutiny Commission held at
Hackney Town Hall, Mare
Street, London E8 1EA

Chair	Councillor Anna-Joy Rickard
Councillors in Attendance	Cllr Deniz Oguzkanli, Cllr Nick Sharman, Cllr Susan Fajana-Thomas (Vice-Chair) and Cllr Ned Hercock
Apologies:	Cllr James Peters
Co-optees	
Officers In Attendance	Tim Shields (Chief Executive) and Bruce Devile (Head of Governance & Business Intelligence)
Other People in Attendance	Councillor Jonathan McShane (Cabinet Member for Health, Social Care and Culture)
Members of the Public	
Officer Contact:	Tracey Anderson ☎ 020 8356 3312 ✉ tracey.anderson@hackney.gov.uk

Councillor Anna-Joy Rickard in the Chair

1 Apologies for Absence

- 1.1 Apologies for absence from Cllr Peters and Cllr Taylor, Cabinet Member Finance and Customer Services.

2 Urgent Items / Order of Business

- 2.1 The first order of business was the election of a new Chair for the Commission.
- 2.2 Following formal nominations for the position of Chair, Councillor Anna-Joy Rickard was elected by the Members as Chair of the Governance and Resource Scrutiny Commission.
- 2.3 Following formal nominations for the position of Vice Chair, Councillor Susan Fajana-Thomas was elected by the Members as Vice Chair of the Governance and Resource Scrutiny Commission.

2.4 The remaining order of business was as per the agenda.

3 Declarations of Interest

3.1 None.

4 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

4.1 Minutes of the meeting held on 19th October 2016 were agreed.

RESOLVED	Minutes were approved.
-----------------	------------------------

5 Complaints and Enquires Annual Report

- 5.1 The Chair welcomed Bruce Deville, Head of Governance and Business Intelligence to the meeting, also in attendance was the Chief Executive from London Borough of Hackney (LBH).
- 5.2 The Governance & Resources Scrutiny Commission receive the annual report for Complaints and Members Enquiries for LBH.
- 5.3 The report in the agenda provides an overview of the complaints and enquiries for the Council during 2015/16 and appendix 2 provides an update on the first 6 months of 2016/17.
- 5.4 The report was as laid out in the agenda. The main points highlighted from the report were:
 - 5.4.1 The volume of complaints for 2015/16 were similar to previous years.
 - 5.4.2 For the first half of 2016/17 there has been an increase in the number of complaints. The increase is predominately related to benefits and temporary accommodation. Residents appear to be using the complaints process to challenge decisions made. The complaints have not been about the service received but are challenging decisions to improve their points or scoring.
 - 5.4.3 Housing related complaints remains the highest volume of complaints received. In the housing complaints category approximately 50% relate to housing management and 50% relate to housing repairs. There has been some progress in getting complaints to a swifter resolution. In the housing repair cases the main issue seems to be related to contractors.
 - 5.4.4 Children Social Care complaints are slightly down and Adults Social Care complaints have increased.
 - 5.4.5 The main challenge in relation to complaints is the turnaround time. This is due to the focus being on resolution and not just on getting a response to the complaint.
 - 5.4.6 The quality of complaints remains an issue for some service areas. The Governance and Business Intelligence team have an increase in demand from services areas for the performance and quality information of their complaints. The team is talking to management teams about areas of improvement.

5.5 Discussion, Questions and Answers

- (i) **Members referred to page 21 in the agenda and asked for confirmation of the areas under the category ‘other’ and enquired if the Governance and Business Intelligence team were satisfied with the progress service areas were making in relation to complaints.**

The Head of Governance and Business Intelligence advised he did not have that information at the meeting but would provide the breakdown to the category ‘other’ after the meeting. It was pointed out the percentage of complaints for service areas in the other category would be less than 5%.

The Head of Governance and Business Intelligence informed Members he was satisfied with the progress being made considering the reduction in resources faced by the Council to date. However, there was always still room for improvement.

ACTION	The Head of Governance and Business Intelligence to update Commission on service areas under the complaints category ‘other’ in the report.
---------------	--

- (ii) **Member commented that good managers would use the complaints information as a source of data to support service improvement, therefore viewing complaints in a positive way. Members were of the view that complaints were not improving and the response times were not at acceptable levels.**

The Head of Governance and Business Intelligence explained the Council could have quicker response times if the council imposed hard target for response. It was pointed out that some complaints were more complex and to reach the resolution stage required a longer period of time. Housing repair cases were not closed until the repair was completed. Previously the complaints case would be closed once the repair ticket was raised. However the council has found that repairs were not being followed through and came back into the complaints system.

- (iii) **Members expressed concern about having a standard / target that the Council could not meet.**

The Head of Governance and Business Intelligence highlighted the focus on resolution meant the council calculated the average response time with the caveat of case complexity. The council publicises its aim to resolve a complaint within 15 working days. This is not a hard target due to the complexity of cases, particularly housing repair cases. The key is the complaint will not get closed until the job is completed.

- (iv) **Members asked for the officer’s comment on the service area feedback taken to management teams.**

The Head of Governance and Business Intelligence explained the score for record keeping was a requirement from his team and related to the system they

Monday, 14th November, 2016

use to capture the information about complaints. The team want service areas to fill in all the fields on the system not just the required fields. This in their view will help the service area to learn more from the complaint. This requirement is an internal process not a standard to be met.

The feedback to service areas does not necessarily mean the complaint was not being managed appropriately. The feedback could be related to record keeping of fields that allow the service are to learn more from the complaint. Feedback on this area is being requested by the service.

- (v) Members enquired if the volume of housing complaints had changed since the service moved back in-house?**
- (vi) Members referred to the Adult Social Care complaints and enquired about the type of complaints coming in, in relation to the categories of complaint especially the quality of care.**

The Head of Governance and Business Intelligence informed Members the figures for the first 2 quarters showed a slight decrease in the number of complaint for housing since the service moved back in-house. There has been a difference in approach with more direct action since housing services moved back in; especially for complaints related to contractors. This is alongside a more robust approach to management.

The Head of Governance and Business Intelligence advised he could not provide the information about the breakdown of complaints in the categories for Adult Social Care. The officer confirmed he would provide the information after the meeting.

ACTION	The Head of Governance and Business Intelligence to update the Commission with the breakdown of complaints in the category 'quality of care'.
---------------	--

- (vii) Members enquired how much of the increase in complaints for 2016/17 related to answering complaints to a resolution and what percentage related to resources. Members were of the view there were less resources to deal with complaints.**

The Head of Governance and Business Intelligence advised it was a mixture of both. There are some areas that have struggled in terms of turning around information. This is areas like benefits and housing needs. This is associated to the volume of case work and dealing with response to complaints.

It was highlighted that for housing repairs unresolved cases that were closed, but not completed, re-entered the complaints system. There were over 100 cases like this, it is now down to 8/9 outstanding cases. It was pointed out when cases like this get closed, it leads to a higher volume of complaint cases.

- (viii) Members referred to Member Enquiry process and asked about the distinction between a normal case and an urgent case. Members**

Monday, 14th November, 2016

enquired if there was the ability to flag up different needs of particular cases. If not is the distinction of cases being considered?

The Head of Governance and Business Intelligence explained the team has 3 officers that managed over 3000 cases last year. If Members have an urgent case which needs an answer within 24/48 hours. The officer advised Members to bring cases like this to his attention or to a member of his team and to state why the case was urgent and this would be followed it up. The officer expressed this action needed to be used appropriately and should not be used for all casework. The officer encouraged Councillors to raise any concerns with him if they were experiencing issues with casework resolution.

The Chief Executive added this involved trust. He hoped that Councillors would trust officers to respond to urgent cases appropriately.

- (ix) Members enquired if the key issue was poor response and the standard of response.**
- (x) Members for information to be distributed to Councillors about the process for different case work.**

In response the Chief Executive explained there is a step change in relation to complaints. The officer referred to live data and highlighted the current improvement in complaints: for housing repairs the council currently has 3 outstanding responses and for housing management the council currently has 1 outstanding response.

- (xi) Members enquired if Hackney Council had received any recommendations from the Local Government Ombudsman in relation to its handling of complaints? If yes, what were the recommendations and have they been implemented?**

The Head of Governance and Business Intelligence informed the Commission LBH had received 1 report from the LGO and this was 2 months ago for a long standing case for many years. This related to a planning case. Prior to this the last report was 9 years ago.

- (xii) Members were still concern about the increase in response times.**

The Head of Governance and Business Intelligence advised this is largely due to historic housing cases. At the start of the year the council had over 100 outstanding housing cases. This has been reduced to less than 10.

6 Council Restructure Update

- 6.1 The Chair welcomed Tim Shields the Chief Executive from London Borough of Hackney.
- 6.2 The Commission invited the Chief Executive to provide an update on the progress of the Council's restructure and implementation of joint working across services.

- 6.3 The Commission received a verbal update. The main points from the update were:
- 6.3.1 The Chief Executive issued the restructure on 27th November 2015. The restructure moved to implementation in December 2015. This is the first restructure since 2010.
 - 6.3.2 The restructure deleted 5 director posts and reduced the top tier of senior management to 3.
 - 6.3.3 The restructure also recommended a reduction to the 2nd tier of management from 15 posts down to 8 posts.
 - 6.3.4 The organisation now has a corporate management team of four 1st tier management including the Chief Executive and 21 2nd tier management.
 - 6.3.5 The new directorates have been completed and the new structure is in place. All group director appointment made except for the post of Children, Adults & Community Health. There is currently an interim Group Director in place and the recruitment is expected to be completed by December 2016.
 - 6.3.6 In the 2nd tier the last director post for adult social care was appointed and the officer joined the organisation this week.
 - 6.3.7 The remaining part of the restructure to conclude is the posts earmarked for deletion. The Director of Procurement post is scheduled to be deleted in April 2017.
 - 6.3.8 There are 2 posts within the Chief Executive Directorate that are earmarked for deletion in March 2017. The Assistant Director of Human Resources and Assistant Chief Executive. These posts are being reviewed and will be completed by March 2017.
 - 6.3.9 The restructure has been completed except for the post mentioned in the above points.
 - 6.3.10 In response to the success of the restructure. The Chief Executive pointed out the organisation has attracted new people bring new energy, created joint working across directorates and incorporated Hackney Homes back into the organisation under the Neighbourhoods and Housing directorate.
 - 6.3.11 The Council is now moving forward with big pieces of cross cutting work like the enforcement review and this has progressed to the stage of issuing a delegated powers report. There will also be changes in relation to regeneration and public health within the organisation.
 - 6.3.12 In terms of administration support to senior management, this was restricted too. This has been reduced from 33 posts to 14 posts. The team is bedding in with 1/2 posts pending recruitment.

6.4 Discussion, Questions and Answers

(i) In response to Members enquiry about how the smaller senior management structure fits with an expanded Cabinet structure.

The Chief Executive explained the political structure for the Council changed over the summer (expansion of Cabinet Members and Advisors). This has added complexity and a challenge to how they work – some Group Directors are supporting 3 Cabinet Members and in some instances a Cabinet Advisor too. In response to this the officers are using a mix of 221 or 321 meetings and in some cases setting up Boards. The meetings / Boards are used to cover

Monday, 14th November, 2016

cross cutting issues like sustainability/ health/public realm. An example of this is a new Economic and Community Development Board has been set up. This Board has 2 Cabinet Members and the Mayor. The move has been towards looking at cross cutting issues rather than individual pieces of work.

- (ii) Members queried how officers were responding to the new Mayor's priorities. Members assumed the changes had resulted in a cost to the organisation. Members enquired if the Council has ceased some activities previously carried out? In addition Members asked for tangible examples that demonstrated the new co-ordinated way of working for the organisation.**

The Chief Executive explained the challenge for all parties has been working at a different level. All management teams need to be more strategic and less operational. The new roles bring more accountability and responsibility and are slowly bedding in.

For the organisation this means officers are working harder, having to work longer hours and much smarter. The changes to the support structure have provided staff with the right skills to enable managers to use technology more to aid a manager's daily work. Managers are doing more self-maintenance which requires them to stay on top of emails, respond quicker and use performance management information more. There will be a number of processes that require change and the organisation will be reviewing processes to remove those that are not efficient or effective.

The negatives have been having to respond to an unforeseen change (that happened over the summer) with a reduced workforce which put pressure on the organisation.

Tangible examples of the new joint working arrangements are the enforcement review and the creation of a growth team. The Growth team has the planning and regeneration team working together on the Employment and Opportunities cross cutting work programme. The new support structure for the senior management team is a demonstration of the new working arrangements. The whole support team can view all diaries and can pick up work across the team, so if an officer is off sick the work can be picked up.

The positives from the restructure have been new energy, new ways of working – joined up working, stopping unproductive processes and a new structure e.g. the enforcement structure which has removed inefficiencies. The organisation is using information differently and does not produce multi levels of information. Instead a smaller number of briefings are produced that can be used in different forums by officers.

It was pointed out the organisation has experienced changes in staffing levels through voluntary redundancies and management. Therefore the organisation is much smaller and leaner.

- (iii) Members enquired if the financial savings from the Council restructure have been achieved.**

Monday, 14th November, 2016

The Chief Executive informed the Commission the new structure proposed savings of £1.3million through the restructure of the top 2 tiers of management and their support staff. It was confirmed by March 2017 all the proposed savings from the restructured would have been delivered.

- (iv) Members enquired about the organisation's limit in relation to the reduction of staff and the expectations from officers with reduced resources.**

The Chief Executive advised the limit for an organisation is reached when it starts to see a rise in sickness, poor performance and response rates from officers. Currently this organisation is still seeing a largely responsive workforce and the organisation is not showing these signs at the moment. The most challenging area for the organisation is housing services. Officers are running day to day operations and carrying out a service transformation simultaneously. In this instance a transformation team has been created to support the service with the transformation changes.

- (v) Members commented the new structure appeared to have a heavy reliance on good joint projects. Members requested for an update on these in 6 months to review their progress. Members suggested seeing a report about the areas the Chief Executive uses to monitor the health of the organisation.**

The Chief Executive informed the Commission he monitors and regularly reviews the organisations: sickness rates, staff turnover, stress related illnesses and would look for signs of poor performance and slower response times from officers.

The biggest pieces of work over the next 6 months for the organisation will be the enforcement review, public realm review and the bedding in of the new support staff arrangements.

One of the key comments from residents in the 'Hackney a Place for Everyone' consultation was scepticism about the economic growth benefiting local people. In relation to the economic regeneration work for town centres and linking the jobs to local economic growth. The Council has refocused the team's priorities on ensuring the local growth benefits local people.

Members asked for an update on the cross cutting projects and information about how jobs for local people are being measured.

ACTION	Overview and Scrutiny Officer to schedule in the work programme an update on the cross cutting projects and information about how jobs for local people are being measured in the G&R work programme.
---------------	--

7 Devolution - The Prospect for Hackney

- 7.1 The Chair welcomed Councillor Jonathan McShane the Cabinet Member for Health, Social Care and Devolution and Tim Shields the Chief Executive for London Borough of Hackney to the meeting.
- 7.2 Following previous evidence sessions for the Devolution review, the Commission asked the Council's lead Cabinet Member for Devolution and lead officer to inform them about the Council's approach to devolution, its plans, ideal scenario and the principles being used to drive forward the Council's engagement in devolution at different levels.
- 7.3 In the opening statement the Commission asked for information about the real opportunities for Hackney to influence the devolution discussions; if there is a plan that brings all the elements of devolution together or if the different elements will be led separately.
- 7.4 The Commission received a verbal update. The main points from the verbal update were:
- There is still no clarity on what the Treasury Department and Government will give up as part of devolution for London.
 - Discussion are being held with Leaders and Mayors from London boroughs.
 - Health devolution is the only devolution area for London that has made tangible progress.
 - In relation to the different devolution areas councils may end up working on different geographies; for example a council could be working with a different group of councils for housing than it would do for skills. However there is an understandable desire in the process for everything to fit neatly.
 - In relation to devolution more broadly the current situation is there is no plan. This reason for this is fluidity and continuing discussion.
 - If the devolution asks are devolved they are unlikely to be devolved to a borough level.
 - Councils are involved in discussion about what will be devolved at either a pan-London level or regional level.
- 7.4.1 In relation to the health pilots, this is unusually asking for powers to be devolved to a borough level. Hackney unusually has co-terminosity for its local health economy.
- 7.4.2 The key areas for devolution requests for London are:
- Business rates
 - Employment and skills
 - Housing
 - Criminal justice
 - Health and social care
 - Transport.
- 7.4.3 Since the devolution requests were submitted there have been a number of changes to the current political landscape. There is a new Mayor for London, new Prime Minister and new Chancellor of the Exchequer.
- 7.4.4 Progress of the devolution discussion for the areas of request listed above are:

Monday, 14th November, 2016

- For business rates, the request is for 100% retention of London's business rates within London. A request for a fair funding principle. The requests are linked to the work of the Financial Committee led by Professor Tony Travers using the recommendations previously reported. The request in this area is asking for the detachment of London's business rates from the rest of the country. The response from Treasury to this request is it is unlikely to happen.
- 7.4.5 In response to a query about Hackney's involvement in discussions; it was explained for London, there is a lead Chief Executive from Boroughs and for London Councils a lead Cabinet Member; each covering particular areas.
 - 7.4.6 London's devolution requests are for permissive powers to raise smaller taxes and radical powers such as to setting VAT rates.
 - 7.4.7 There is a representative from London Councils in discussion with Government and the Mayor of London on behalf of London boroughs.
 - 7.4.8 Currently councils are waiting to see what will be provided in the Government's Autumn statement. London is seeking the ability to retain all rights to the funds raised in London and to be able to use them flexibly.
 - 7.4.9 The main request in relation to housing is the retention of all right to buy receipts within London, so London would be able to use those receipts more flexibly. The other requests in this area for London were nullified by the Housing and Planning Bill.
 - 7.4.10 In the area of Work and Pensions the request from London was for co-location of job centres and co-commissioning for the work programme contracted services. The thought is London may get agreement to co-commission contracted services for approximately £55 million.
 - 7.4.11 In the area of criminal justice system the London ask is for devolution of the management of rehabilitation contracts. To date the offer from Government in this area is to manage the Courts system. The last time local authorities inherited a quasi-judicial service (licensing) it resulted in a cost burden to councils.
 - 7.4.12 In the area of transport the request is for further devolution of transport routes to TfL and concessions e.g. freedom pass legislation. The more devolved to TfL means less cost burdens to councils.
 - 7.4.13 It was noted in the requests were quite limited and generally for pan London level.
 - 7.4.14 One of the devolution areas showing real opportunity is employment and skills. There is currently a pan London review of all further education providers with the aim of consolidating service providers. An example of this locally is Hackney Community College merging with Tower Hamlets Community College. The aim of this exercise is to get a more sustainable sector because many provider are in deficit. The work in this area is separate to the devolution requests.
 - 7.4.15 Following completions of the sectors review the request is for the funding for London to be devolved to 4 sub-regional partnerships by-passing the GLA. The aim is to join up business demand to the skills. The regions would decide on the provision. If this request is granted it would be in shadow form in 2018/19 and then fully implemented in 2019/20. Early signs are the funding request is unlikely to go ahead in the form requested. The funding is likely to be passed to the Mayor of London to develop the skills strategy for London. Boroughs have some influence in this are through the Skills Strategy for London work.

- 7.4.16 In the area of health, the Sustainability and Transformation Plans (STPs) are the long term vision for the NHS. The emergence of STPs has given impetus to Hackney to do something different locally. The concern is Hackney could end up with services that are designed and commissioned for East London. Although the benefits could be specialist services there is the risk of losing local focus. STPs are based on a regional setting and the risk is Hackney's health economy could lose local funding.
- 7.4.17 The Hackney health devolution pilot needs approval from NHS England so they need to ensure the pilot is aligned. The devolution pilot offers some protection from losing local resources and dedicated focus.
- 7.4.18 The business case for the pilot was submitted to the London Health Board in October 2016 and this pilot focuses on early intervention, self - care and single point of co-ordination. The vision is to deliver joined up adult social care with NHS services. The view is the unique characteristics of social care make devolution to a borough level more feasible than at a regional or pan London level.
- 7.4.19 There are a number of ambitious requests for local power such as control over NHS estates. The initial work will involve getting devolution of London's NHS estate devolved at a pan London level. Devolution of NHS estates will allow better co-ordination and management of primary care estates, leading to better care for residents and alignment of services. The Hackney health pilot is currently working up plans for how devolved estates would operate in practice. Devolution of NHS estate would sit at a Pan London level. Then locally through business cases Borough and CCGs could be given flexibility and freedoms.
- 7.4.20 To commence this request they are in discussions with Government departments. The current position is all partners are sign-up to the vision and at the table for discussion.

7.5 Discussion, Questions and Answers

- (i) **Members raised concern about the changes devolution would make to the engagement of citizens with services e.g. access to services and accountability of services.**
- (ii) **Members queried if the health pilot was in danger of being Hackney specific but not transferable for other areas in the health economy to adopt.**

The Cabinet Member for Health, Social Care and Devolution advised in recent years other approaches like one size fits have been tried and nothing has been successful. Hackney is very conscious the pilot needs to be workable for other areas. Hackney wants to make sure the services being designed deliver better services for the people who use the services the most but flexible for all.

In the NHS a national body decides the programme of work for local NHS estates. In relation to NHS estates they have encountered frustration with the quality of primary care estate and this is affecting staff sustainability.

The chief Executive explained if Hackney could be given the freedom, flexibilities and levers, they are confident through the pilot they could take health services to another level and deliver the benefits stated in the business case. Taking the strain out of the other parts of the system in London. In essence this is giving people access to the right care, in the right place at the right time. The aim of the Hackney health pilot is to demonstrate this can be achieved locally.

- (iii) **Members advised there have been concerns raised by local people about the NHS plans. The response to date has been to provide them with the issued statement by the Cabinet Member for Health, Social Care and Devolution from LBH. Members expressed concerns about the level of risk and if local authorities were fully aware of the risks they would be taking on for devolution.**

The health devolution business case tries to protect resources. LBH is one of the few areas with a sustainable local health economy. The Cabinet Member for Health, Social Care and Devolution advised the health sector could choose to top slice the budget for local CCGs.

There are plans to run local community engagement events for the devolution pilot proposals.

The key issue is STPs came along after the devolution pilots were agreed. The STPs are part of a national strategy / system. LBH are responding to requests for information to support the process but the Council is monitoring the plans and has not endorsed any proposals.

The Chief Executive pointed out the separation of the two processes was evident when the first draft of the North East London STP did not include or take into consideration the outcome of Hackney's health devolution pilot. Following comments from LBH this has now been included. Hackney has expressed concern about the STP. It highlights the gap in resources however there is no plan or details about how the gap in resources will be resolved.

- (iv) **Members commented on the devolution debate needing to change. Highlighting that a key task for London was to demonstrate to Government how services could be changed and improved to make the case for devolution. Members cited the City of Manchester as an example whereby they produced an analysis of benefits from devolution for their region.**

- (v) **Members suggested Hackney should construct analysis of how Hackney residents would benefit from the devolution process. This should be constructed from options they have consulted on and talked to residents about. Members highlighted that citizens' involvement could provide solutions. Combining vision and democracy.**

The Cabinet Member for Health, Social Care and Devolution confirmed they have plans to consult on the changes and what it means for citizens. The Cabinet Member also advised the vision is for all residents to get access to the same level of service provision. The STP will now allow stakeholders to consider the proposals and outcomes from the devolution pilots in London.

There are only 3 health devolution pilots in London.

- (vi) **Members commented a vision for change is needed despite the change being long term.**

The Chief Executive explained the difference between London and Manchester is they do not have the additional layer of government that London has. The closest London boroughs will get to influence the skills devolution is their

involvement in the production of the sub regional skills strategy. It is unlikely housing and business rates will get devolved to borough level.

- (vii) **Members enquired if the Council had principles or Hackney aspirations it would like taken into consideration if a devolution was reduced to a borough level. In terms of vision and approach Members asked for the Council's aspirations in relation to Hackney's influence at the high level discussions. It was pointed out there is business rates, skills strategy and health devolution (the most advanced).**

The Cabinet Member explained devolution is fluid therefore it was difficult to develop some kind of principles for Hackney people or set a plan. The Cabinet Member pointed out councils need to make sure they are not given areas of responsibility without resources.

In relation to accountability this is viewed as being either pan London level (Mayor) or borough level. The challenge would be if sub regional structures were used, as this would be the weakest level of accountability.

As devolution becomes clearer having some principles that has been developed in conjunction with Councillors and local citizens.

- (viii) **Members discussed including suggestions for principles as an outcome area from their devolution review.**

- (ix) **Members suggested the boroughs need the involvement of citizens to get solutions for devolution challenges. Hackney should look at finding solution and not wait for Government to provide them with the solutions.**

The Cabinet Member expressed that Hackney has a long history of partnership and joint working and this was probably one of the reason the Borough was successful in its devolution pilot bid.

The Commission agreed to ask the Group Director Finance and Corporate Resources to give an update on the progress of devolution for business rates.

ACTION	The Group Director Finance and Corporate Resources to give an update on the progress of devolution for business rates.
---------------	---

8 Governance and Resources Scrutiny Commission - 2016/17 Work Programme

- 8.1 The work programme for G&R on pages 35 – 42 of the agenda was noted with the following comments, requests and amendments.
- 8.2 At the last meeting the Commission discussed revisiting previous reviews to receive updates on.
- 8.3 From the list considered the Commission concluded they would like to revisit 2 reviews the Governance review especially in light of the restructure and Procurement review (2006/07) 10 years on.
- 8.4 The review updates will be requested and scheduled into the work programme.

ACTION	Overview and Scrutiny Officer to send the Commission the last update for review and to request for an update from the Cabinet Member on recommendations made in that review.
---------------	---

- 8.5 Members discussed the evidence from the devolution review and concluded the review was ready to report. The report should include suggestions for local devolution principles. The 3 key areas of the report are:
- Summary of key points
 - Plan and process
 - Principles.
- 8.6 Commission members were asked to provide their views on principles for the report.
- 8.7 Members agreed to discuss the draft report with the Cabinet Member for Cabinet Member for Health, Social Care and Devolution and Cabinet Member for Finance and Customer Services once the report was drafted.

ACTION	Overview and Scrutiny Officer to set up a meeting with the Cabinet Member for Health, Social Care and Devolution and Cabinet Member for Finance and Customer Services to discuss how the draft recommendations resulting from the review will be taken forward.
---------------	--

- 8.8 For the Joint discussion item in December 2016, the Commission discussed asking for the new Scrutiny Panel (in the new municipal year) to continue monitoring temporary accommodation and its pressure on the Council's budget.
- 8.9 The Commission discussed the work programme item on commercialisation and income generation. Members discussed wanting to find out how the Council will become a successful business in the new financial climate. This would require a culture change and a change in the organisation's attitude to risk and it was not just about fees and charges. Members discussed holding 2 sessions on this item in January and February 2017. Members also discussed sending a request to Directors before the first discussion session to ask for an outline of the opportunities, challenges and plans to generate income. Members would want to know about their approach to risk, system change, culture change, workforce mind-set and mitigating action.
- 8.10 In addition to the Group Director Finance and Corporate Resources providing an overview about the organisation's risk in relation to the culture change, new system and ways of working. The Commission also agreed to ask discussed having a list of the services councils provides that could potentially be an opportunity for the organisation to enter into the commercial market.

ACTION	Request Group Director Finance and Corporate Resources to provide an overview about the organisation's risk in relation to the culture change, new system and ways of working for January meeting.
---------------	---

9 Any Other Business

9.1 None.

Duration of the meeting: 7.00 - 9.20 pm