

RESOURCES, REMUNERATION AND REGENERATION COMMITTEE 6 JANUARY 2011

ITEM B6

PARTNERSHIP REGISTER 2010/11

Report of the Director of Housing and Customer Service

1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 The partnership register is used by Derby Homes to monitor and evaluate its involvement in partnerships and identify any possible risks or benefits.
- 1.2 The register is reviewed on an annual basis. This review covers the period 2010/11. A further development to the register is the review of significance and relevance of each partnership in relation to achieving the strategic objectives.

2. RECOMMENDATION

The Committee is requested to note the content of this report.

3. MATTER FOR CONSIDERATION

- 3.1 The Partnership Register was created in 2008/09. Each year the document is reviewed by Executive.
- 3.2 The Partnership Register 2010/11 is attached at Appendix 1 and has been updated with current financial and personnel resources input into each of the partnerships by Derby Homes.
- 3.3 The register has also been updated to align with the new strategic objectives of Derby Homes.
- 3.4 This year we have extended the review to include an evaluation of each partnership using the Derby City Council Partnership Toolkit which has been amended for use by Derby Homes.
- 3.5 The toolkit requires lead managers to review and assess the inputs/resources for each partner and assess the contribution in terms of risk management and attainment towards the strategic objectives. The evaluation document is attached at Appendix 2.
- 3.6 The evaluation of significance of each partnership takes into account the following issues:
 - Resources these can be financial and/or employee inputs
 - Relationship to Strategic Objectives of Derby Homes any partnership arrangement should link into the strategic objectives of Derby Homes to have relevance and/or significance within the business.

Version: 7.0 Title: FO-Board Report Modified: 30 April 2010 Page 1 of 2

- Risk does the partnership contribute to the management of either a strategic or operational risk?
- Contribution to the Management of Risk either strategic risk or operational risk
- Outcomes of the partnership, perceived or measurable, working towards or meeting targets
- Reputation the effect of ceasing the partnership.
- 3.7 With the exception of the Derby City Partnership, Job Centre Plus and YMCA, all partnerships scored over 50% in terms of significance. Executive has agreed that all three of the above partnerships still have relevance and significance in delivering our work and will continue to work with each organisation.
- 3.8 Further work will continue to develop the partnership register. A partnership policy will be finalised which will give guidelines for managers on managing partnership working and measuring outcomes from partnerships.

The areas listed below have no implications directly arising from this report

- Consultation
- Financial and Business Plan
- Legal and Confidentiality
- Personnel
- Environmental
- Equalities Impact Assessment
- Health & Safety
- Risk
- Policy Review

If Board members or others would like to discuss this report ahead of the meeting please contact the author, or the Chief Executive, phil.davies@derbyhomes.org - Tel 01332 711010

Author: Maria Murphy, Director of Housing and Customer Service, Telephone 01332 888522, Email maria.murphy@derbyhomes.org

Linaii <u>mana.murphy@derbynomes.or</u>

Background Information: None.

Supporting Information: None.

Version: 7.0 Title: FO-Board Report Modified: 30 April 2010 Page 2 of 2

DERBY HOMES PARTNERSHIP REGISTER 2010/11

Version: 1.0

INTRODUCTION

What is partnership?

A partnership can be formed between a number of individuals, agencies or organisations with a shared interest. There is usually an overarching purpose for partners to work together and a range of specific objectives. Partnerships are often formed to address specific issues and may be short or long term.

The key principles of partnership working are, openness, trust and honesty, agreed shared goals and values and regular communication between partners.

What are the benefits of partnership working?

- Partnership working allows services to be delivered in a joined up way. This has benefits both strategically, in terms of providing
 a well-balanced service and operationally in terms of pooling resources
- Bringing together the various parts of service delivery provides a unique opportunity to develop new and innovative approaches to service provision
- Economies of scale can be achieved as service providers pool not only resources, but effort and managerial time
- Through coming together and focusing on a common goal, a shared vision is formed of what partners want to achieve and how they want to achieve it
- Partnership working co-ordinates action between organisations which can provide additional momentum to get things done
- Partnership working also allows many organisations to access funding and comply with Government requirements
- In time, partnership working can add a 'special touch' to the delivery of a given service, over and above the time and resources that have gone into its provision

What are the challenges?

• Competition between organisations: although some competition between organisations can be motivating, excessive competition can result in an unwillingness to co-operate

Version: 1.0

- **Authority:** it is important that all staff involved in partnership working have the necessary authority to take decisions. Lack of authority slows up decision making and frustrates progress
- **Purpose:** the broad ranging responsibilities of partner organisations can mean that the specific purpose of the partnership can be forgotten. Also partnerships can often be overtaken by events and lose sight of their main function
- **Communication:** it can be difficult to get the balance of communication right. Too many meetings can put partners off attending. Too little communication can result in duplication of effort, lack of understanding and mistrust amongst partners
- **Funding:** there is a danger that some organisations get involved in partnership simply to access funding or to meet statutory requirements
- Culture clash: when different organisations work together it can be difficult to adapt to each other's style of working. Each
 partner's expectations of partnership working may be different, which can lead to conflict when attempting to establish priorities
 and goals
- **Time:** the partnership working approach often takes longer to produce results than most organisations anticipate. For example, it takes time to develop trust between partners which can slow up the process of making decisions and using resources.

Outcomes from Partnership Working.

Full details of the initiatives and corresponding targets to be delivered through partnership working are contained within the Annual Delivery and Business Plan. The plan shows corresponding links from Derby Homes activities and our contributions to the Derby City Partnership Local Area Agreement.

(Adapted from: Top 10 Partnership Killers, Improvement Network)

Version: 1.0

DERBY HOMES REGISTER OF PARTNERSHIPS.

COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP

Lead Contact Details	Commencement Date	Termination Date	Links to Strategic Aims	Performance Indicators	General Notes
Karen Johnson Director of CSP.	Pre July 2008		Decent Homes & Successful Neighbourhoods. Excellent Customer Services	Links to a range of PI's which include overall satisfaction and ASB statistics Local Area Agreement	Contribution is in terms of both match funding on projects and posts, joint working to deliver workstreams.

OCT 2010

Family Intervention Project – funding from management fee – total 16,900 in terms of management and support service costs Family Justice Centre – Staff resources on Management Board. Staff resources delivering support through centre.

Multi-Agency Gangs Team - Staff resources, Neighbourhood Safety Manager. DH secured one demotion order in the Allenton area of the city as a result of this secondment/partnership. Enhanced joined up working. Completed several joint home visits to reinforce tenancy agreement in relation to criminal/gang related activities being carried out by DH's tenants or dependants of tenants. Improved information sharing with partners like Probation, Police as was able to demonstrate the value and effectiveness of DH's contribution/intervention. Divisional Commander for Derby Division delivered keynote speech at a conference facilitated by Derby Homes on Effective Partnership working as a result of the partnership commitment by DH at the strategic level to the gangs' agenda in the city.

Partnership Operation Group – Attendance at Group by Principal Officer – no other financial contribution. Benefits of attendance is interms of information sharing which contributes to the management of tenancy and estate issues.

Burglary Reduction Project – Funding of one post to deliver services to Derby Homes Tenants. £40,000. Performance information reported to Local Housing Boards.

Version: 1.0

ENTHUSIASM					
Lead Contact	Commencement	Termination Date	Links to Strategic	Performance	General Notes
Details	Date		Aims	Indicators	
Paul Brookhouse	Pre July 2008		Decent Homes &	Links to a range of	Work with
Senior Manager			Successful	PI's which include	Enthusiasm is both
			Neighbourhoods	overall satisfaction	as a link
				and ASB statistics	partnership with
			Excellent Customer		CSP and direct
			Services		partnership in terms
					of Entry to
					Employment and
					other estate based
					initiatives.

This is a long standing partnership which we are now better able to validate outcomes through joint performance frameworks with Derby Homes and Community Safety Partnership. Outcomes are reported to the Local Housing Boards and are reviewed prior to continued engagement/funding.

Estates Pride Contribution to Youth Inclusion Programme 2010/11 - £212,000 - Commitment for 2011/12 - £109,000

July - Sept 2010

During this reporting quarter we have engaged young people in all the areas that we work in:

- 379 different young people were engaged during this period
- As new people are referred onto the programme and also exited the programme throughout the quarter, it is easier to show an average figure for the number of young people from the core group that we work with on the Triple R (Youth Inclusion Programme) Programme. So throughout the quarter we worked with an average of:
 - 28 young people from Alvaston/Boulton
 - 48 young people from Osmaston/Allenton
 - 45 young people from Morley/Mackworth/Stockbrook
- 2466 engagements were delivered during this period and these range from individual mentoring sessions to group workshops.

Version: 1.0

DERBYSHIRE FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE

Lead Contact	Commencement	Termination Date	Links to Strategic	Performance	General Notes
Details	Date		Aims	Indicators	
Bob Bridger	Pre – July 2008		Decent Homes &	Links to a range of	Partnership through
			Successful	PI's which include	joint working
Kingsway Fire			Neighbourhoods	overall satisfaction	initiatives,
Station				and ASB statistics –	marketing through
			Excellent	also Fire Service	Derby Homes
			Customer Services	statistics on	News. Staff
				reduction in	secondment
				Domestic Fires and	opportunities to
				Fire Prevention.	support Home Fire
					Safety Campaign.
					Bi-annual Fire
					Safety Meetings to
					progress strategic
					initiatives.

July 2008 - Review/Actions

No further actions required – documented evidence of partnership initiatives through minutes of six monthly meetings.

Contribution to employee costs £10,000 2010/11. This financial contribution is to be discontinued from the end of 2010/11. Housing Officers receiving training and ongoing support from DFRS to carry out Fire Safety Checks on new tenancies from April 2011. This will carry a resource implication which is to be contained within existing budgets.

Performance is evaluated at Fire Safety Meetings which are held six monthly.

Version: 1.0

DERBYSHIRE CONSTABULARLY

Lead Contact	Commencement	Termination Date	Links to Strategic	Performance	General Notes
Details	Date		Aims	Indicators	
Various. St Mary's Wharf	Pre July 2008		Decent Homes & Successful Neighbourhoods Excellent	Links to a range of PI's which include overall satisfaction and ASB statistics	An ongoing partnership intrinsically linked through both strategic and
Secondees based			Customer Services		operational level meetings.
within CSP.					Shared use of facilities at a number of local housing offices to enable effective neighbourhood
					management.

July 2008 – Revew/Actions. Partnership is documented through strategic and operational meetings at DCC, CSP and DH.

- Several court orders secured by DH as a result of the Police sharing information with DH in a timely manner which allowed DH to ensure criminal action by the Police was then followed up by civil action on the tenancy by DH.
- Joined up early intervention practices by Police and DH have ensured that serious problems are dealt with effectively and avoiding the costly route of legal/court action i.e. crack house closure.
- DH staff (NSOs) have key membership at Police tasking meetings which are closed meetings often discussing confidential information that then allows both partners to join up when sharing information and taking action. Previously, only the manager of this service had membership in only one section out of the three Police sections in Derby.
- DH staff have been asked to train safer neighbourhood police officers on the tools available to us as a housing provider to tackle ASB. This request was based on increasing the Police's understanding of how we can join up more effectively as partners.

Version: 1.0

DERBY CITY COUNCIL LIBRARY SERVICE

Lead Contact	Commencement	Termination	Links to Strategic	Performance	General Notes
Details	Date	Date	Aims	Indicators	
Mr David Potten Head of Library Service	2005		Excellent Customer Services	Links to a range of PI's which include overall satisfaction	Co-location at Sinfin and Alvaston already in operation. Planned for Mackworth during late 2008/09 2009/10.

July 2008 - Review/Actions

Initial negotiations with the Library Service secured a form of SLA to deliver co-located working .

Contributions to co-locations - New Sinfin, Alvaston and Mackworth total £12,000 for 2010/11

Version: 1.0

AUSTIN COMMUNITY ENTERPRISE

Lead Contact Details	Commencement Date	Termination Date	Links to Strategic Aims	Performance Indicators	General Notes
Carl Taylor Chair	2006		Excellent Customer Services	Links to a range of Pl's which include overall satisfaction	Co-location with voluntary organisation at Austin.

July 2008 - Review/Actions

Initial negotiations with the ACE were through Derby City Partnership.

Contribution to rent and revenue costs £6,724 for 2010/11.

Version: 1.0

DERBY ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY PARTNERS

Lead Contact Details	Commencement Date	Termination Date	Links to Strategic Aims	Performance Indicators	General Notes
Management Board	1992		Decent Homes & Successful Neighbourhoods Excellent Customer Services	Links to a range of PI's which include overall satisfaction. Tenants Top Ten indicators are chosen and reviewed by the DACP through the Housing Focus Groups.	Long standing partnership between Derby Homes and its customers. Provides the framework for all consultative mechanisms. The relationship is managed through a Service Level Agreement. Regular meetings with DH and DCC.

Rent for Resource Centre Offices £27,000 2010/11 Other office costs £6,000 2010/10 Grants to other groups - £1,500 (Special Interest Groups) 2010/11. Grant to DACP £2,000. Miscellaneous - £2,300/Miscellaneous Income £1,000.

Tenants Conference Costs - £2,500 2010/11.

Version: 1.0

DERBY CITY PARTNERSHIP

Lead Contact Details	Commencement Date	Termination Date	Links to Strategic Aims	Performance Indicators	General Notes
Hazel Limbury	Pre July 2008		Decent Homes & Successful Neighbourhoods Excellent Customer Services	Links to a range of PI's which include overall satisfaction.	Various arrangements in place which include part funding of external fund raising post.

External Funding - ~Contribution towards costs of one post.

Version: 1.0

MIDLAND COMMUNITY FINANCE

Lead Contact Details	Commencement Date	Termination Date	Links to Strategic Aims	Performance Indicators	General Notes
Melanie Andrews	Pre July 2008		4 – Excellent Customer Services 5 – Value for Money 6 - Equalities	Links to a range of PI's which include overall satisfaction and rent arrears.	Promotes social inclusion and antipoverty strategy to assist low income tenants and leaseholders.

Establish current funding streams and report on outcomes in relation to Derby Homes customers – Report to City Board – February 2011.

Derby Homes financial contribution - £17,000 2010/11

Version: 1.0

JOBCENTRE PLUS Lead Contact Details	Commencement Date	Termination Date	Links to Strategic Aims	Performance Indicators	General Notes
Sue Bainborough Local Partnerships Manager Jobcentre Plus Derbyshire District Office 1st Floor St Peters House Gower Street Derby DE1 1SB 01332 714736 Sue.Bainborough@jobcentreplus.gsi.gov.uk	Pre July 2008		Decent Homes & Successful Neighbourhoods	Links to a range of PI's	partnership to identify and support residents eligible to join the Home 2 Work placement scheme. Partnership through the Jobs and Skills group, Worklessness action and strategy group.

Comments

Support in implementing home to work scheme including recruiting candidates and signposting to employment and training.

Family Intervention Group steering group members.

Version: 1.0

YMCA					
Lead Contact Details	Commencement Date	Termination Date	Links to Strategic Aims	Performance Indicators	General Notes
Gillian Sewell Chief Executive YMCA Derbyshire 07921264026 01332 348278 ext 209 gillian.sewell@ymcaderbyshire.org.uk	Pre July 2008		3 – Investing in People 4 - Equalities	Links to a range of Pl's.	The organisation works in partnership with Derby Homes to tackle the Worklessness. The YMCA offers employment initiatives advice and guidance to Derby Homes residents.

Comments

Implemention of Crash pads idea

To assist in delivering Employment Iniciatives advice and guidance sessions as part of the Home 2 Work scheme.

As a referral agent providing Employment iniciatives advice and skills assessments through "Working Links" for all new residents who are in a worklessness situation as identified by the Tenancy Suistainment team.

Working together on the delivery of Work clubs.

Version: 1.0

CHILDREN AND	YOUNG PEOPLE'	S SERVICES			
Lead Contact Details	Commencement Date	Termination Date	Links to Strategic Aims	Performance Indicators	General Notes
Jotinder Atwal	April 2007		1 – Estates Pride 2 – Excellent Customer Services 6 – Equalities	Links to a range of PI's which include outcomes under the corporate priority	Works with Housing staff and FIP in order to safequard children
Rita Sylvester			·	'Every Child Matters' and LAA	
Assistant Director				indictor Proportion of Children in Poverty	
David Finn	2008/09				Joint funding initiatives through Estates Provide to provide recreational activities for young people on our estates.

Member of the FIP Steering Group

Supports essential training for staff.

Other CYP involvement includes: membership of the Parenting Commissioning Group under Think Family and Contact Point, national children's data base. Commissioning body for the Family Intervention Project

Version: 1.0

	EN	ITHUSIASM			ESTIMATED IMI Score 1-5	PACT		
7	ota	1 Score 23/30 76%	INSIGNIFICANT(1)	MINOR INSIGNIFICANCE (2)	MODERATE SIGNIFICANCE (3)	MAJOR SIGNIFICANCE (4)	HIGHLY SIGNIFICANT (5)	SCORE
	1.	Resources	<£5,000	£5,000 - £10,000	£10,000 - £50,000	£50,000 - £100,000	>£100,000	5
MEASURES	2.	Strategic Objectives	Not linked	Indirectly linked to the successful achievement of strategic objective	Directly linked to delivering a single strategic objective	Directly linked to delivering more than one strategic objective	Directly linked to delivering strategic objectives and contribution to corporate priorities.	3
유		Risk – partnership is identified on strategic or operational risk register	Not identified	-	-	-	Identified	5
SIGNIFICANCE	4.	Risk – Contribution to risk management	Does not contribute to managing risk	Indirectly contributes to managing operational risk	Directly contributes to managing operational risk	Indirectly contributes to managing strategic risk	Directly contributes of managing strategic risk	4
	5.	Outcomes – contribution to delivering services	No outcomes	Perceived outcomes but not measured	-	Measured outcomes which are working towards targets	Measured outcomes which achieve performance targets	4

ENTHUSIASM	ESTIMATED IMPACT Score 1-5					
Total Score 23/30 76%	INSIGNIFICANT(1)	MINOR INSIGNIFICANCE (2)	MODERATE SIGNIFICANCE (3)	MAJOR SIGNIFICANCE (4)	HIGHLY SIGNIFICANT (5)	SCORE
6. Reputation	Ending the partnership would have no impact on reputation or ability to deliver non- core services	Ending the partnership would have some minor impact on reputation or ability to deliver non-core services	Ending the partnership would have moderate impact on reputation or ability to deliver core or non-core services	Ending the partnership would have major significance in terms of either reputation or ability to deliver core services	Ending the partnership would have major significance in terms of reputation and ability to deliver core services	3

		SYSHIRE FIRE RESCUE			ESTIMATED IMI Score 1-5	PACT		
SE To	SERVICE Total Score 15/30 50%		INSIGNIFICANT(1)	MINOR INSIGNIFICANCE (2)	MODERATE SIGNIFICANCE (3)	MAJOR SIGNIFICANCE (4)	HIGHLY SIGNIFICANT (5)	SCORE
MEA	7.	Resources	<£5,000	£5,000 - £10,000	£10,000 - £50,000	£50,000 - £100,000	>£100,000	2
MEASURES OF S	8.	Relationship to Strategic Objectives	Not linked	Indirectly linked to the successful achievement of strategic objective	Directly linked to delivering a single strategic objective	Directly linked to delivering more than one strategic objective	Directly linked to delivering strategic objectives and contribution to corporate priorities.	3
SIGNIFICANCE	9.	Risk – partnership is identified on strategic or operational risk register	Not identified	-	-	-	Identified	1

-		RBYSHIRE FIRE D RESCUE			ESTIMATED IMI Score 1-5			
	SERVICE Total Score 15/30 50%		INSIGNIFICANT(1)	MINOR INSIGNIFICANCE (2)	MODERATE SIGNIFICANCE (3)	MAJOR SIGNIFICANCE (4)	HIGHLY SIGNIFICANT (5)	SCORE
		10. Risk – Contribution to risk management	Does not contribute to managing risk	Indirectly contributes to managing operational risk	Directly contributes to managing operational risk	Indirectly contributes to managing strategic risk	Directly contributes of managing strategic risk	1
		11. Outcomes – contribution to delivering services	No outcomes	Perceived outcomes but not measured	-	Measured outcomes which are working towards targets	Measured outcomes which achieve performance targets	4
		12. Reputation	Ending the partnership would have no impact on reputation or ability to deliver non- core services	Ending the partnership would have some minor impact on reputation or ability to deliver non-core services	Ending the partnership would have moderate impact on reputation or ability to deliver core or non-core services	Ending the partnership would have major significance in terms of either reputation or ability to deliver core services	Ending the partnership would have major significance in terms of reputation and ability to deliver core services	4

	DERBYSHIRE CONSTABULARLY		ESTIMATED IMPACT Score 1-5						
	Total 21/30 70%		INSIGNIFICANT(1)	MINOR INSIGNIFICANCE (2)	MODERATE SIGNIFICANCE (3)	MAJOR SIGNIFICANCE (4)	HIGHLY SIGNIFICANT (5)	SCORE	
CHBE	MEA	13. Resources	<£5,000	£5,000 - £10,000	£10,000 - £50,000	£50,000 - £100,000	>£100,000	2	

	RBYSHIRE NSTABULARLY			ESTIMATED IMI Score 1-5	PACT		
To 70	tal 21/30 %	INSIGNIFICANT(1)	MINOR INSIGNIFICANCE (2)	MODERATE SIGNIFICANCE (3)	MAJOR SIGNIFICANCE (4)	HIGHLY SIGNIFICANT (5)	SCORE
	14. Relationship to Strategic Objectives	Not linked	Indirectly linked to the successful achievement of strategic objective	Directly linked to delivering a single strategic objective	Directly linked to delivering more than one strategic objective	Directly linked to delivering strategic objectives and contribution to corporate priorities.	4
	15. Risk – partnership is identified on strategic or operational risk register	Not identified	-	-	-	Identified	5
	16. Risk – Contribution to risk management	Does not contribute to managing risk	Indirectly contributes to managing operational risk	Directly contributes to managing operational risk	Indirectly contributes to managing strategic risk	Directly contributes of managing strategic risk	4
	17. Outcomes – contribution to delivering services	No outcomes	Perceived outcomes but not measured	-	Measured outcomes which are working towards targets	Measured outcomes which achieve performance targets	2
	18. Reputation	Ending the partnership would have no impact on reputation or ability to deliver non- core services	Ending the partnership would have some minor impact on reputation or ability to deliver non-core services	Ending the partnership would have moderate impact on reputation or ability to deliver core or non-core services	Ending the partnership would have major significance in terms of either reputation or ability to deliver core services	Ending the partnership would have major significance in terms of reputation and ability to deliver core services	4

CC	RBY CITY OUNCIL –			ESTIMATED IMF Score 1-5	PACT		
	BRARY SERVICE tal Score 20/30 %	INSIGNIFICANT(1)	MINOR INSIGNIFICANCE (2)	MODERATE SIGNIFICANCE (3)	MAJOR SIGNIFICANCE (4)	HIGHLY SIGNIFICANT (5)	SCORE
	19. Resources	<£5,000	£5,000 - £10,000	£10,000 - £50,000	£50,000 - £100,000	>£100,000	3
MEASURE	20. Relationship to Strategic Objectives	Not linked	Indirectly linked to the successful achievement of strategic objective	Directly linked to delivering a single strategic objective	Directly linked to delivering more than one strategic objective	Directly linked to delivering strategic objectives and contribution to corporate priorities.	5
SOF	21. Risk – partnership is identified on strategic or operational risk register	Not identified	-	-	-	Identified	1
SIGNIFICANCE	22. Risk – Contribution to risk management	Does not contribute to managing risk	Indirectly contributes to managing operational risk	Directly contributes to managing operational risk	Indirectly contributes to managing strategic risk	Directly contributes of managing strategic risk	2
	23. Outcomes – contribution to delivering services	No outcomes	Perceived outcomes but not measured	-	Measured outcomes which are working towards targets	Measured outcomes which achieve performance targets	4

	CO	RBY CITY UNCIL –	ESTIMATED IMPACT Score 1-5					
•	LIBRARY SERVICE Total Score 20/30 66%		INSIGNIFICANT(1)	MINOR INSIGNIFICANCE (2)	MODERATE SIGNIFICANCE (3)	MAJOR SIGNIFICANCE (4)	HIGHLY SIGNIFICANT (5)	SCORE
		24. Reputation	Ending the partnership would have no impact on reputation or ability to deliver non- core services	Ending the partnership would have some minor impact on reputation or ability to deliver non-core services	Ending the partnership would have moderate impact on reputation or ability to deliver core or non-core services	Ending the partnership would have major significance in terms of either reputation or ability to deliver core services	Ending the partnership would have major significance in terms of reputation and ability to deliver core services	5

CC	STIN OMMUNITY	ESTIMATED IMPACT Score 1-5					
	TERPRISE tal Score 17/30 %	INSIGNIFICANT(1)	MINOR INSIGNIFICANCE (2)	MODERATE SIGNIFICANCE (3)	MAJOR SIGNIFICANCE (4)	HIGHLY SIGNIFICANT (5)	SCORE
MEA	25. Resources	<£5,000	£5,000 - £10,000	£10,000 - £50,000	£50,000 - £100,000	>£100,000	3
MEASURES OF S	26. Relationship to Strategic Objectives	Not linked	Indirectly linked to the successful achievement of strategic objective	Directly linked to delivering a single strategic objective	Directly linked to delivering more than one strategic objective	Directly linked to delivering strategic objectives and contribution to corporate priorities.	4
SIGNIFICANCE	27. Risk – partnership is identified on strategic or operational risk register	Not identified	-	-	-	Identified	1

1	CO	STIN MMUNITY TERPRISE			ESTIMATED IMI Score 1-5	PACT		
•	Total Score 17/30 56%		INSIGNIFICANT(1)	MINOR INSIGNIFICANCE (2)	MODERATE SIGNIFICANCE (3)	MAJOR SIGNIFICANCE (4)	HIGHLY SIGNIFICANT (5)	SCORE
		28. Risk – Contribution to risk management	Does not contribute to managing risk	Indirectly contributes to managing operational risk	Directly contributes to managing operational risk	Indirectly contributes to managing strategic risk	Directly contributes of managing strategic risk	2
		29. Outcomes – contribution to delivering services	No outcomes	Perceived outcomes but not measured	-	Measured outcomes which are working towards targets	Measured outcomes which achieve performance targets	4
		30. Reputation	Ending the partnership would have no impact on reputation or ability to deliver non- core services	Ending the partnership would have some minor impact on reputation or ability to deliver non-core services	Ending the partnership would have moderate impact on reputation or ability to deliver core or non-core services	Ending the partnership would have major significance in terms of either reputation or ability to deliver core services	Ending the partnership would have major significance in terms of reputation and ability to deliver core services	3

AS	RBY SOCIATION OF	ESTIMATED IMPACT Score 1-5					
PA	OMMUNITY .RTNERS tal Score 28/30 %	INSIGNIFICANT(1)	MINOR INSIGNIFICANCE (2)	MODERATE SIGNIFICANCE (3)	MAJOR SIGNIFICANCE (4)	HIGHLY SIGNIFICANT (5)	SCORE
MEA	31. Resources	<£5,000	£5,000 - £10,000	£10,000 - £50,000	£50,000 - £100,000	>£100,000	3

AS	RBY SOCIATION OF			ESTIMATED IMI Score 1-5	PACT		
PA	OMMUNITY ARTNERS tal Score 28/30 %	INSIGNIFICANT(1)	MINOR INSIGNIFICANCE (2)	MODERATE SIGNIFICANCE (3)	MAJOR SIGNIFICANCE (4)	HIGHLY SIGNIFICANT (5)	SCORE
	32. Relationship to Strategic Objectives	Not linked	Indirectly linked to the successful achievement of strategic objective	Directly linked to delivering a single strategic objective	Directly linked to delivering more than one strategic objective	Directly linked to delivering strategic objectives and contribution to corporate priorities.	5
	33. Risk – partnership is identified on strategic or operational risk register	Not identified	-	-	-	Identified	5
	34. Risk – Contribution to risk management	Does not contribute to managing risk	Indirectly contributes to managing operational risk	Directly contributes to managing operational risk	Indirectly contributes to managing strategic risk	Directly contributes of managing strategic risk	5
	35. Outcomes – contribution to delivering services	No outcomes	Perceived outcomes but not measured	-	Measured outcomes which are working towards targets	Measured outcomes which achieve performance targets	5
	36. Reputation	Ending the partnership would have no impact on reputation or ability to deliver non- core services	Ending the partnership would have some minor impact on reputation or ability to deliver non-core services	Ending the partnership would have moderate impact on reputation or ability to deliver core or non-core services	Ending the partnership would have major significance in terms of either reputation or ability to deliver core services	Ending the partnership would have major significance in terms of reputation and ability to deliver core services	5

	RBY CITY RTNERSHIP			ESTIMATED IMI Score 1-5	PACT		
Total Score 12/30 40%		INSIGNIFICANT(1)	MINOR INSIGNIFICANCE (2)	MODERATE SIGNIFICANCE (3)	MAJOR SIGNIFICANCE (4)	HIGHLY SIGNIFICANT (5)	SCORE
	37. Resources	<£5,000	£5,000 - £10,000	£10,000 - £50,000	£50,000 - £100,000	>£100,000	2
MEASURE	38. Relationship to Strategic Objectives	Not linked	Indirectly linked to the successful achievement of strategic objective	Directly linked to delivering a single strategic objective	Directly linked to delivering more than one strategic objective	Directly linked to delivering strategic objectives and contribution to corporate priorities.	4
S OF	39. Risk – partnership is identified on strategic or operational risk register	Not identified	-	-	-	Identified	1
SIGNIFICANCE	40. Risk – Contribution to risk management	Does not contribute to managing risk	Indirectly contributes to managing operational risk	Directly contributes to managing operational risk	Indirectly contributes to managing strategic risk	Directly contributes of managing strategic risk	1
	41. Outcomes – contribution to delivering services	No outcomes	Perceived outcomes but not measured	-	Measured outcomes which are working towards targets	Measured outcomes which achieve performance targets	2

	RBY CITY RTNERSHIP	ESTIMATED IMPACT Score 1-5					
Total Score 12/30 40%		INSIGNIFICANT(1)	MINOR INSIGNIFICANCE (2)	MODERATE SIGNIFICANCE (3)	MAJOR SIGNIFICANCE (4)	HIGHLY SIGNIFICANT (5)	SCORE
	42. Reputation	Ending the partnership would have no impact on reputation or ability to deliver non- core services	Ending the partnership would have some minor impact on reputation or ability to deliver non-core services	Ending the partnership would have moderate impact on reputation or ability to deliver core or non-core services	Ending the partnership would have major significance in terms of either reputation or ability to deliver core services	Ending the partnership would have major significance in terms of reputation and ability to deliver core services	2

CC	DLAND DMMUNITY		ESTIMATED IMPACT Score 1-5					
	NANCE tal Score 20/30 %	INSIGNIFICANT(1)	MINOR INSIGNIFICANCE (2)	MODERATE SIGNIFICANCE (3)	MAJOR SIGNIFICANCE (4)	HIGHLY SIGNIFICANT (5)	SCORE	
MEA	43. Resources	<£5,000	£5,000 - £10,000	£10,000 - £50,000	£50,000 - £100,000	>£100,000	3	
MEASURES OF S	44. Relationship to Strategic Objectives	Not linked	Indirectly linked to the successful achievement of strategic objective	Directly linked to delivering a single strategic objective	Directly linked to delivering more than one strategic objective	Directly linked to delivering strategic objectives and contribution to corporate priorities.	3	
SIGNIFICANCE	45. Risk – partnership is identified on strategic or operational risk register	Not identified	-	-	-	Identified	5	

MIDLAND COMMUNITY FINANCE Total Score 20/30 66%		MMUNITY	ESTIMATED IMPACT Score 1-5					
		al Score 20/30	INSIGNIFICANT(1)	MINOR INSIGNIFICANCE (2)	MODERATE SIGNIFICANCE (3)	MAJOR SIGNIFICANCE (4)	HIGHLY SIGNIFICANT (5)	SCORE
		46. Risk – Contribution to risk management	Does not contribute to managing risk	Indirectly contributes to managing operational risk	Directly contributes to managing operational risk	Indirectly contributes to managing strategic risk	Directly contributes of managing strategic risk	3
		47. Outcomes – contribution to delivering services	No outcomes	Perceived outcomes but not measured	-	Measured outcomes which are working towards targets	Measured outcomes which achieve performance targets	4
		48. Reputation	Ending the partnership would have no impact on reputation or ability to deliver non- core services	Ending the partnership would have some minor impact on reputation or ability to deliver non-core services	Ending the partnership would have moderate impact on reputation or ability to deliver core or non-core services	Ending the partnership would have major significance in terms of either reputation or ability to deliver core services	Ending the partnership would have major significance in terms of reputation and ability to deliver core services	2

	B CENTRE	ESTIMATED IMPACT Score 1-5					
PLUS Total 12/30 40%		INSIGNIFICANT(1)	MINOR INSIGNIFICANCE (2)	MODERATE SIGNIFICANCE (3)	MAJOR SIGNIFICANCE (4)	HIGHLY SIGNIFICANT (5)	SCORE
MEA	49. Resources	<£5,000	£5,000 - £10,000	£10,000 - £50,000	£50,000 - £100,000	>£100,000	1

JOB CENTRE PLUS				ESTIMATED IMI Score 1-5	PACT		
	al 12/30	INSIGNIFICANT(1)	MINOR INSIGNIFICANCE (2)	MODERATE SIGNIFICANCE (3)	MAJOR SIGNIFICANCE (4)	HIGHLY SIGNIFICANT (5)	SCORE
	50. Relationship to Strategic Objectives	Not linked	Indirectly linked to the successful achievement of strategic objective	Directly linked to delivering a single strategic objective	Directly linked to delivering more than one strategic objective	Directly linked to delivering strategic objectives and contribution to corporate priorities.	3
	51. Risk – partnership is identified on strategic or operational risk register	Not identified	-	-	-	Identified	1
	52. Risk – Contribution to risk management	Does not contribute to managing risk	Indirectly contributes to managing operational risk	Directly contributes to managing operational risk	Indirectly contributes to managing strategic risk	Directly contributes of managing strategic risk	1
	53. Outcomes – contribution to delivering services	No outcomes	Perceived outcomes but not measured	-	Measured outcomes which are working towards targets	Measured outcomes which achieve performance targets	4
	54. Reputation	Ending the partnership would have no impact on reputation or ability to deliver non- core services	Ending the partnership would have some minor impact on reputation or ability to deliver non-core services	Ending the partnership would have moderate impact on reputation or ability to deliver core or non-core services	Ending the partnership would have major significance in terms of either reputation or ability to deliver core services	Ending the partnership would have major significance in terms of reputation and ability to deliver core services	2

	ICA tal Score 13/30			ESTIMATED IMI Score 1-5	PACT		
43		INSIGNIFICANT(1)	NSIGNIFICANT(1) MINOR INSIGNIFICANCE (2) MODERATE SIGNIFICANCE (3) MAJOR SIGNIFICANCE (4)			HIGHLY SIGNIFICANT (5)	SCORE
	55. Resources	<£5,000	£5,000 - £10,000	£10,000 - £50,000	£50,000 - £100,000	>£100,000	1
MEASURE	56. Relationship to Strategic Objectives	Not linked	Indirectly linked to the successful achievement of strategic objective	Directly linked to delivering a single strategic objective	Directly linked to delivering more than one strategic objective	Directly linked to delivering strategic objectives and contribution to corporate priorities.	2
SOF	57. Risk – partnership is identified on strategic or operational risk register	Not identified	-	-	-	Identified	1
SIGNIFICANCE	58. Risk – Contribution to risk management	Does not contribute to managing risk	Indirectly contributes to managing operational risk	Directly contributes to managing operational risk	Indirectly contributes to managing strategic risk	Directly contributes of managing strategic risk	2
	59. Outcomes – contribution to delivering services	No outcomes	Perceived outcomes but not measured	-	Measured outcomes which are working towards targets	Measured outcomes which achieve performance targets	4

	/MCA Fotal Score 13/30	ESTIMATED IMPACT Score 1-5					
43%		INSIGNIFICANT(1)	MINOR INSIGNIFICANCE (2)	MODERATE SIGNIFICANCE (3)	MAJOR SIGNIFICANCE (4)	HIGHLY SIGNIFICANT (5)	SCORE
	60. Reputation	Ending the partnership would have no impact on reputation or ability to deliver non- core services	Ending the partnership would have some minor impact on reputation or ability to deliver non-core services	Ending the partnership would have moderate impact on reputation or ability to deliver core or non-core services	Ending the partnership would have major significance in terms of either reputation or ability to deliver core services	Ending the partnership would have major significance in terms of reputation and ability to deliver core services	3

	HILDREN AND OUNG PEOPLES	ESTIMATED IMPACT Score 1-5					
SE	RVICES tal 22/30	INSIGNIFICANT(1)	MINOR INSIGNIFICANCE (2)	MODERATE SIGNIFICANCE (3)	MAJOR SIGNIFICANCE (4)	HIGHLY SIGNIFICANT (5)	SCORE
MEA	61. Resources	<£5,000	£5,000 - £10,000	£10,000 - £50,000	£50,000 - £100,000	>£100,000	4
MEASURES OF S	62. Relationship to Strategic Objectives	Not linked	Indirectly linked to the successful achievement of strategic objective	Directly linked to delivering a single strategic objective	Directly linked to delivering more than one strategic objective	Directly linked to delivering strategic objectives and contribution to corporate priorities.	4
SIGNIFICANCE	63. Risk – partnership is identified on strategic or operational risk register	Not identified	-	-	-	Identified	5

	IILDREN AND OUNG PEOPLES	ESTIMATED IMPACT Score 1-5					
SE	RVICES tal 22/30	INSIGNIFICANT(1)	MINOR INSIGNIFICANCE (2)	MODERATE SIGNIFICANCE (3)	MAJOR SIGNIFICANCE (4)	HIGHLY SIGNIFICANT (5)	SCORE
	64. Risk – Contribution to risk management	Does not contribute to managing risk	Indirectly contributes to managing operational risk	Directly contributes to managing operational risk	Indirectly contributes to managing strategic risk	Directly contributes of managing strategic risk	4
	65. Outcomes – contribution to delivering services	No outcomes	Perceived outcomes but not measured	-	Measured outcomes which are working towards targets	Measured outcomes which achieve performance targets	2
	66. Reputation	Ending the partnership would have no impact on reputation or ability to deliver non- core services	Ending the partnership would have some minor impact on reputation or ability to deliver non-core services	Ending the partnership would have moderate impact on reputation or ability to deliver core or non-core services	Ending the partnership would have major significance in terms of either reputation or ability to deliver core services	Ending the partnership would have major significance in terms of reputation and ability to deliver core services	3

	OMMUNITY AFETY	ESTIMATED IMPACT Score 1-5					
PA	ARTNERSHIP otal 28/30	INSIGNIFICANT(1)	MINOR INSIGNIFICANCE (2)	MODERATE SIGNIFICANCE (3)	MAJOR SIGNIFICANCE (4)	HIGHLY SIGNIFICANT (5)	SCORE
MEA	67. Resources	<£5,000	£5,000 - £10,000	£10,000 - £50,000	£50,000 - £100,000	>£100,000	5

	OMMUNITY AFETY			ESTIMATED IMI Score 1-5	PACT		
PA	ARTNERSHIP tal 28/30	INSIGNIFICANT(1)	MINOR INSIGNIFICANCE (2)	MODERATE SIGNIFICANCE (3)	MAJOR SIGNIFICANCE (4)	HIGHLY SIGNIFICANT (5)	SCORE
	68. Relationship to Strategic Objectives	Not linked	Indirectly linked to the successful achievement of strategic objective	Directly linked to delivering a single strategic objective	Directly linked to delivering more than one strategic objective	Directly linked to delivering strategic objectives and contribution to corporate priorities.	5
	69. Risk – partnership is identified on strategic or operational risk register	Not identified	-	-	-	Identified	5
	70. Risk – Contribution to risk management	Does not contribute to managing risk	Indirectly contributes to managing operational risk	Directly contributes to managing operational risk	Indirectly contributes to managing strategic risk	Directly contributes of managing strategic risk	5
	71. Outcomes – contribution to delivering services	No outcomes	Perceived outcomes but not measured	-	Measured outcomes which are working towards targets	Measured outcomes which achieve performance targets	4
	72. Reputation	Ending the partnership would have no impact on reputation or ability to deliver non- core services	Ending the partnership would have some minor impact on reputation or ability to deliver non-core services	Ending the partnership would have moderate impact on reputation or ability to deliver core or non-core services	Ending the partnership would have major significance in terms of either reputation or ability to deliver core services	Ending the partnership would have major significance in terms of reputation and ability to deliver core services	4