

Region	Strategic Partnership/ Lead Council	County/ Unitary/ Metropolitan/ District	Reviewing Structural/ Governance Arrangements	Reviewing Work Programme/ SCS	Reviewing Support Arrangements	Notes
East Midlands	Derby City	Unitary	Yes	Yes	Unknown	Currently reviewing their vision for Derby. Aim is to have new vision and supporting priorities in early September. In parallel to this process, their leadership group is considering the key outcomes that are needed in Derby against each priority, to give direction to a delivery planning process which will start from October. Both these streams of work will then help shape how the partnership needs to be structured to achieve the vision, priorities and key outcomes and also what the support function to the partnership should look like. Their aim is to really hone in the focus of their partnership work with a more 'nimble' structure that can respond more easily and flexibly to changing workstreams.
	Leicestershire	County	Yes	Yes (shift towards efficiency)	Unknown	Leicestershire Together Executive Group recently agreed that a radical change in the way partners work together was required in response to the substantial reductions in public expenditure if public service performance is to be maintained at currently high levels; and that a pooled budget joint commissioning model would provide the basis of this radical change. Desire to move LSP from 'soft' partnership towards 'hard' partnership - managing the public service budget for Leicestershire as a virtual single budget. Governance is organised around 6 commissioning hubs (one of which could potentially be the LEP in the future). Also, very interested in a possible Community Budget (formerly Place-Based Budget) for Leicestershire.
East of England	Norfolk	County	Yes (a Sub Group has been set up to develop the work around 'preparing for the future')	Yes	Unknown	The LSP held a 'challenge session' on 27th June - to review how they work and identify improvements. The following principles were identified as essential elements to LSP working across Norfolk; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • building trust is an essential building block to joint working • deep understanding of people and place • enabling communities to be in the driving seat • simplifying our joint working arrangements • creating a single budget for the public sector as a whole • results are more important than individual organisations The following possible actions were identified: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewing structures and ensuring clarity of role/purpose of partner representation • 'Participatory strategies' based on what communities know and organisational data • Establishing a single engagement tool for all agencies, combined gateway for public opinions e.g. Amazon.gov • Merging partnerships and/or reduce number of levels of partnerships • Moving to a single 'public sector' workforce, with single culture • Establishing a single budget for Norfolk. District LSPs are also now reviewing their role and structure.
	Essex	County	Yes	Yes	Unknown	Earlier this year the Partnership commissioned a Local Improvement Advisor (LIA) to help review partnership governance arrangements. However, at the last meeting (on 14th Sept) it was acknowledged that significant changes that would impact on partnership working had emerged since the Governance Review was commissioned, and were continuing to unfold. The Review, as envisaged, has therefore been put on hold while partners explore the implications of the changing policy landscape in more detail.
	Hertfordshire	County	Yes	Yes	Yes	Currently reviewing its SCS. Herts CC is also reviewing its support arrangements. RIEP has provided support to work with their Herts' 'top team' to develop a joint strategy to minimise the impact of the imminent budget cuts (aligned to the revised SCS)

St Albans	District	Yes – clear about need to keep LSP but likely to have leaner sub-structure. Waiting for localism bill and CSR before major change	Yes (work programme); No (SCS). Partnership clear that SCS remains agreed long term vision/ direction. But reviewing work programme in light of previous PRG cuts. More emphasis on work around joining up services and rationalising estates/workforce	Yes - especially because previously funded through PRG top slice. Considering whether partnership support resource could be delivered through proportion of savings through joint work on services	The LSP has prepared a more detailed thinkpiece on future direction which has previously been submitted to the LGA, and this is the basis for future work. CLG have also seen it and given a positive response. Key point is that LSP/partnership working may take a different form in future but should be more not less important in era of austerity. A number of Herts Districts have reported a similar message. Thinking about future in 4 ways: - strategy - engaging neighbourhoods and communities (Big Society) - joining up delivery - governance and operational management
Cambridgeshire	County	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cambridgeshire Together (their LSP) has developed a clear set of partnership working 'principles' (to underpin future arrangements). Their 1st principle is that of subsidiarity (i.e. issues should as far as possible be addressed at the lowest appropriate spatial level) Partners have also developed a Framework where they are plotting the priorities for the county/locality as being high-low and the nature of the partnership required for delivery (e.g. could be via Task and Finish approach). Partners have recently discussed disbanding current partnership arrangements in favour of a more streamlined approach - comprising of the Public Service Board (the 6 Leaders + Police and Health) + three Thematic Partnerships - the LEP (or equivalent), the statutory H&W Board and a more slimline Childrens' Trust. There is an appetite for 'one budget' for Cambridgeshire and a desire 'to work virtually or practically as one organisation'. Partners have also been exploring a geographical approach to 'Total Place' in two neighbourhoods - Arbury and March (fenland market town).
Suffolk	County	Yes		Yes	Suffolk SP is in the process of replacing its traditional LSP architecture with the 'Suffolk Collaborative' (http://www.transformingsuffolk.co.uk/partnerships/suffolk-collaborative). The Suffolk Collaborative is a new grouping of chief executives of public, private and voluntary sector organisations in Suffolk. This includes councils, NHS trusts, police, businesses and umbrella organisations. They have also reduced the size of their secretariat. They have developed a public sector Leadership Academy (with support from RIEP)
Peterborough	Unitary	Yes (recommendations are currently being implemented)	Yes	The LSP support team is a private sector company working under contract, with staff seconded from partners to work alongside them.	Peterborough council and its partners carried out a review of their LSP last year to improve its efficiency and effectiveness. Recommendations from the review included a strengthened Executive (evolving into a 'One Place' Board), new strategic commissioning teams, more focused partnership boards and a more integrated GPP secretariat. Partners are currently working on developing a 'single business plan' for Peterborough.
London	Ealing	London Borough	Yes (shift towards efficiency)	Yes	Started review early this year - moving towards being a largely action-focussed partnership, with a focus on a maximum of three to four key priorities in any given year. The three priorities for the coming year will be health, crime and worklessness and poverty. Underpinning these priorities will be the fundamental principles of empowerment and equality, including seeking to increase the role of volunteering and using the goodwill of local people in co-producing and delivering services. Also, believe that the LSP has a considerable and fundamental role to play in facilitating delivery of value for money and efficiency across partners, and that a key piece of work for the partnership over the coming year should be to develop a 'Total Place' approach-based project considering the potential for cross-partner work to generate savings. They have recently agreed that the focus of the LSP Executive will be on - identifying and delivering to high need families, considering joint assets, and collecting and using data better as partners.

	Enfield	London Borough	Yes	Unknown	Unknown	Undertaking a short review - looking at how the Partnership could remain 'fit for purpose' and 'future proofed' in the new local and national policy environments.
	Hackney	London Borough	Yes	Yes	Yes	Absolute commitment to partnership working and now thinking about how to move their LSP onto the 'next level' - so that it can do more than influence. Also, thinking about accountability - looking at increasing the Member involvement (further democratising partnership working). Not so concerned with the 'structures' as such - they see this as being more about a shift in thinking and behaviour e.g. how can we move towards a virtual 'one team' mindset - where teams are accountable to the partnership (and therefore the 'place') rather than individual organisations? Thinking of retaining thematic partnerships much as they are but moving to a 'Design & Delivery' approach to strategic commissioning below these (i.e. instead of having thematic sub-partnerships) - taking account of LEPs and H&W Boards. Very much still work in progress - with a paper due to go to their LSP Board in November.
	Barnet	London Borough	Yes	Yes	No	Barnet has a major transformation programme - 'One Barnet' - which seeks to deliver better services for less money, works closely with other public sector and voluntary partners, and moves to more focused, efficient and interactive relationships with customers. The programme is overseen by a One Barnet Programme Board chaired by the Leader and which includes many of our key partners. Barnet also has a long-established LSP which has tended to focus on 'traditional' LSP duties such as the Sustainable Community Strategy (which is currently being revised in the light of changing circumstances) and the LAA. There is substantial overlap membership between the two bodies. A review of partnership governance is in progress to reduce any duplication, but more importantly to ensure that partnership governance arrangements are fit for purpose and provide options for partners to share authority jointly within a framework of democratic accountability. A major barrier with both LSP and One Barnet Programme Board at present has been the lack of authority to make collective decisions; instead they are advisory bodies with relevant powers reserved to the council and other individual partners. This deficit could be addressed by moves towards a community (place-based) budgeting system. Barnet is keen to take forward a community (place-based) budget, in which the revised One Barnet Board/LSP would act as a single commissioner overseeing the allocation of all resources locally, while still having democratic accountability at its heart.
	Harrow	London Borough	Yes	Yes	No (not at the moment)	They are holding a session with their Executive Group on the 8th November to consider future role - particularly in relation to the following: . Monitoring and Performance Management . Networking and Relationship Building . Commissioning - Community Engagement/Involvement and Innovation Further work will be carried out in the new year on the other elements of the partnership, which will then impact on the need for a review of the SCS.
North East	Durham	Unitary	No	Yes (shift towards greater focus on efficiency)	No	Governance (since the council's transition to a unitary in 2009): the County Durham Partnership (CDP) is the countywide Local Strategic Partnership. It is made up of the CDP Forum, CDP Board, five thematic partnerships and 14 Area Action Partnerships. There is a strong track record of working in partnership. Area Action Partnerships: they asked local people to define the boundaries - so the 14 vary in size and population. They each have 21 members (made up of three groups) - 7 partners (Council, Health, Fire, Police etc), 7 Councillors and 7 members of the public. Each AAP has a Chair and 2 vice chairs (one from each of the three 'groups' of members) - which they rotate on an annual basis. Each AAP has a devolved budget. They see community (place-based) budgets potentially being channelled through the AAPs in the future. Work programme: they've recently refreshed their SCS (2010-2030) and their Delivery and Improvement Group (which advises the CDP Board) is likely to take on responsibility for the efficiency agenda (shared services etc).

	Darlington	Unitary	Yes	Yes	Unknown	<p>It is worth noting that in Darlington the desire for a partnership preceded the previous Government's requirement for LSPs (it grew out of the Employers' Forum, formed in 1992 by Darlington's M.P. and the Leader of the Council to engage and work with the main private sector companies in Darlington). Strong commitment to working in partnership remains - however, the partnership is currently reflecting on what roles it should take on in the future and how best it could be structured to perform them.</p> <p>Also, in the Tees Valley there is an established mechanism for the 5 constituent LAs and private sector partners to cooperate in developing strategic plans and delivery arrangements - Tees Valley Unlimited (TVU). All of the work undertaken to produce the Tees Valley Business Case and work leading to the Multi Area Agreement arrangement has established a framework to embrace large regeneration projects, inward investment, support for business and skills and elements of transport and other infrastructure. A bid to become a LEP has been submitted on behalf of Tees Valley Unlimited.</p>
	North Tyneside	Metropolitan	Yes	Refreshed the SCS in June 2010.	Yes (as part of overall review of council services)	<p>Discussions on how the NTSP should develop have been on going for around 12 months, since the election of a new Mayor (who chairs the LSP) and the start of the process to refresh the SCS.</p> <p>The work is underpinned by the need for a) smarter working that can deliver better outcomes for less resource b) transparency and c) mutual trust and support.</p> <p>Instead of creating a Public Service Board the NTSP is moving the focus of the work to Theme Partnerships. They will be responsible for driving performance and highlighting barriers or obstacles to the Executive.</p> <p>Work is ongoing, including with the local GP consortia, to establish a shadow Health & Wellbeing Board as soon as possible. Discussions are also ongoing around how the Partnership can slim its structure by engaging more effectively with external bodies, e.g. the LEP, elected members, area forums etc. This principle is based on the Connecting Communities project from the CLG commissioned work last year.</p>
	South Tyneside	Metropolitan	Yes	Yes	Unknown	<p>Undergoing a restructure at the moment alongside a refresh of their SCS. Partners are very aware that there is a need for change and that the partnership has to be fit for purpose in the future to deliver successful outcomes for the people of South Tyneside.</p>
	Newcastle	Metropolitan	Yes	Yes	Unknown	<p>Consensus that partnership working is still important but that arrangements need to be refocused to reflect local needs rather than central prescription.</p>
North West	Cheshire East	Unitary	No	No	No	<p>Not done anything formally about reviewing arrangements. However, discussions are taking place internally as there is recognition that there needs to be a change. The discussions at present are primarily about: the role/need for thematic partnerships; the adoption of a project management approach to priority projects rather than standing partnership groupings; more streamlined processes to recognise the reduction in capacity across all partner organisations; the importance of the SCS in driving the work of the LSP; and local working/community (place-based) budgets.</p>
	Cheshire West	Unitary	Yes	Yes	Likely to follow	<p>Started to discuss the effectiveness of the current LSP architecture in the light of the growing significance of sub-regional partnership working; changes within partner organisations; the move towards local integrated service delivery and community (place-based) budgeting; and against the context of resource constraints. Whilst discussions are at an early stage, it is clear that they are moving towards a leaner and more tightly focused structure at borough level and below. Specifically the thematic partnerships are likely to morph into task and finish project groups around priority issues. Also likely to see a significant and potentially swift evolution of Area Partnership Boards with a greater emphasis on commissioning.</p>

Cheshire West (continued)					<p>Delivery planning around the priority issues in SCS, which was launched in April 2010, is currently supporting the above process. From the range of 15 commitments identified within the SCS, a reduced number of top priorities (3-5) will be identified over the next few months, along with the performance indicators required to track progress. Consideration will then be given to whether these issues are best addressed at local, borough and/or sub-regional level in order to feed into the review of structural and governance arrangements.</p> <p>Following a significant re-structuring of the Council last year (six months into the existence of the new authority) there are no plans at present to further review support arrangements. Inevitably, this will happen as an outcome of the review of partnership structural arrangements but not at that point yet.</p>
Warrington	Unitary	Yes	Yes	Yes	Just about to implement a revised structure and Partnership Agreement following some challenge sessions held in May/June. Also just about to start refreshing SCS, with a view to having streamlined priorities by Feb/Mar, ready for the start of financial planning cycles around July. Also looking at support arrange at a variety of levels.
Rochdale	Metropolitan	Yes - planned	Yes (shift towards efficiency)	Not at present	Rochdale LSP has agreed to a review of partnership working. Partners are anxious to be in a position to access the implications of the Comprehensive Spending Review and any emerging policy and guidance, and the councils own cross cutting review and so a full away day is planned in January to do just that. However in the mean time they are starting to look at what can be done to help reshape and refocus, including looking at current activity and mapping this against emerging policy etc, looking at community (place-based) budgeting etc, and where they can work across agencies to achieve even greater efficiencies through working together differently.
Bolton	Metropolitan	No	Yes	No	Governance - recently updated governance/ constitution. Work programme - overview/leadership of changing context; reviewing community strategy priorities – what is achievable/will have impact
Salford	Metropolitan	Yes	Yes	No (already done so)	<p>Have been 'refocusing' LSP for many months now. Have created a set of roles for the different governance levels and now in the process of looking at how to update the format of some groups.</p> <p>Also looking at priorities - for 2011-14 - given that LAAs will no longer be with us, and also trying to prepare for the announcement of the Government's Comprehensive Spending Review.</p> <p>The LSP team has significantly changed - only one dedicated member of staff looking after the LSP, and much of the work is now undertaken by other officers across the council.</p>
Wigan	Metropolitan	Yes	Yes (shift towards efficiency)	Yes	Did a detailed peer review exercise with IDeA late last year which was helpful with re-shaping and thinking. Good learning, although the impact was more on approach than on wholesale reshape / restructure. Some new work on local vision and strategy with a new regeneration prospectus is really important at the moment. The LAA systems have moved to the background even though nominally they remain the core objectives. Got ongoing conversations about locality work / governance and its place within the wider LSP (feels like this influence may grow). Just set up a shared project office (Office for a civil and enterprising society) - shared piece of work between LSP team, Economic regen and the local CVS. Trying to accelerate work around innovation in partnerships - alongside a very pragmatic approach to solutions with the 3rd sector (buildings, social enterprise, service re-design etc., etc..) Very early days - but the pragmatism in the approach seems to be gaining a lot of interest.
Sefton	Metropolitan	No (already done so)	Yes	Yes	Have reviewed and re-established as of May 2010 - now have robust structure for the new challenges. Still in a transition year so there are changes to thematic groups and area working which have to be fully implemented and the potential of further SBP structure change during this period. Looking to have a new SCS and approach by next year.

Liverpool	Metropolitan	Yes	Yes	Yes	In the process of reviewing arrangements (starting with a review of their LSPs functions). Liverpool is one of the Big Society Vanguard.
St Helens	Metropolitan	Yes	Yes	Likely	Proposals for a Health and Well-being Board with a Joint Commissioning sub-group as a replacement LSP Thematic Group are going forward. A complete review of Performance Management Framework arrangements to introduce simpler, clearer, dashboard style reports with integrated intelligence data is underway and includes the interface between the Council and the LSP in the era of Localism. Adjustments will also be needed to CDRP work post elected Commissioners, to Children's Trust arrangements and to a LCR LEP. The next meeting of the LSP Board will focus on the budget to analyse and debate how the Partnership could work together by the sharing of information and resources, whilst protecting front line services.
Wirral	Metropolitan	Yes	Yes (more emphasis on co-design with residents)	Unknown	Wirral LSP reviewed the LAA in April - a number of aspects were developed to bring about change/improvement. In April the Annual Partnership review using the Council's Partnership Toolkit commenced. This covered Executive, Assembly and Management Groups. This detailed work considered many structural elements to the partnership and its details have been developed into a draft improvement plan for the partnership. Given the changing and challenging social, political and economic context since May this work has taken more relevance to the changing landscape but also had to be balanced with the consideration and real impetus to move decision making closer to residents through Wirral's Localism agenda. As a consequence the governance review and future partnership challenges paper will be presented to the LSP Executive on 29th September. This will develop the debate further with partners asking questions of our partnership arrangements now the changing social, political and economic pictures have become clearer and as we approach the CSR in October. The Executive will receive further reports post CSR likely in November and January 2011
Lancashire	County	Yes	Yes	No	During the recent review of the partnership, partners have been considering the questions 'what is the unique value of county-wide collaboration' and 'what can be done jointly at this level that cannot be achieved elsewhere?' Comments made through the review process indicated that the new partnership arrangements should be characterised by commitment to action and directive leadership. The approved proposal is to have a Public Service Board establishing task and finish groups as required and inclusive forum called the Lancashire Summit. These arrangements have replaced the previous Executive and Board. Seven essential 'operating principles' have emerged from the review discussions, that will determine the design of future arrangements: Exercise directive and focussed leadership; Make a commitment to action; Do a small number of things supremely well, Build strong relationships; Establish lean and flexible structures for communication and decision making and eliminate duplication of activity; Hold each other to account; Review and learn. By focusing on a small number of issues, and holding smaller meetings, consistently attended by same individuals we expect the PSB to be in a position to apply the operating principles and make a considerable difference to the issues of importance to the people of Lancashire.
Pendle	District	Yes	Yes	No	
Preston	District	Yes	Yes	No	
Chorley	District	Yes	Yes	No	Have recently refreshed SCS and now embarking on a full review of structures and governance over the next quarter, to fit with the new SCS and meet the changing policy and financial requirements - to be implemented for the new financial year.

Wyre	District	Yes - planned	Yes - planned	Yes - planned	Review to take place over next 6 months
Hyndburn	District	Yes	Yes	Unknown	Direction of Travel potentially similar to county. Report going to Cabinet on 30 November
Blackburn with Darwen	Unitary	Yes (they are in the process of making some changes - but these are not just in response to changing national context - the key driver for them is that it is the right thing to do for the partnership - the next logical step)	Yes (but had planned to in any case - they have just produced their 2030 Vision)	No (partnership working support function has always been mainstreamed)	History of strong partnership working and firm commitment to continue to build on already strong foundations. Their LSP Board has well-balanced representation from each of the sectors - the membership is drawn from the three networks that 'sit' underneath (Community and Voluntary, Private and their Public Services Board). They have just consulted on their 2030 Vision and are considering whether or not to restructure their existing thematic partnerships around the 4 priorities. They have a strong focus on integrating services across agencies and have already made a good deal of progress - but are keen to go even further (and are hoping that Community (Place-Based) Budgets could provide them with the means to do so). They also have robust integrated service delivery/engagement arrangements at the neighbourhood level in the form of 5 Agency Area Partnerships, alongside 5 Neighbourhood Boards. Also, they already have a Pennine Lancashire MAA - with a focus on supporting economic growth and have submitted a LEP proposal to potentially cover the same 'footprint'.
Blackpool	Unitary	No (it is functioning well)	No	No (already done)	Planning Conference around Feb when able to digest CSR implications future of ABG and look at SCS going forward. Partner discussions have already started to accept that the future is different. This may have some future consequence on Governance but reluctant to change governance at present, as it is now functioning well Already lost support arrangements as part of ABG cuts. Currently putting adhoc in place but will put future in place from April when it is known what the partnership needs its focus to be on.
Cumbria	County	Yes	No	No	Current focus is on the leadership part of the full CSP Partnership with, for example, the Cumbria Leaders Board and the Cumbria Chief Executives' Group (CCEG) leading the development of the Cumbria LEP submission - meanwhile the broader partnership continues to meet through themed meetings and is, for example, holding 'Focus On' events looking at transport policy in October and "ageing well" in November. The work started to develop a single Community Strategy for Cumbria has been paused at the moment until there is more clarity about implications for the delivery of public services post CSR. A small working group (commissioned by CCEG) is considering how Cumbria might approach area based performance management in the absence of CAA.
Barrow	District	No	No	No	
Carlisle	District	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Copeland	District	Yes	Yes	Yes	Under the West Cumbria Partnership there had been a decision to move to locality approaches (about 4 years ago). Have taken a bottom up approach to locality development, running three pilots, now moving on with their 6 locality areas. Start from three tiers of community leadership and expand into wider partnership working around issues and projects. Each locality will by end of this year have agreed their own governance – partnership arrangement – have an agreed locality plan and priorities drawn from the parish, town and ward plans in each locality area. Have used WNF to underpin this work and recruit a team to work with localities and link back to Council and other public service and local providers. Have used external LIA resource over the past 6 months and have consulted, investigated through local meetings, the best approach for a Copeland LSP. Are nearly there and have a framework using the localities as the core engagement with public services and wider engagement taking place at the relevant point on the framework. Won't have a LSP Board but quarterly localities together and two Copeland Partnership Conferences per year. Launching LSP conference by end of year. The LSP framework is minimizing meetings and focusing on tasks and engagement at appropriate level. Alongside this are strategic liaison arrangements and officer and member advisory groups. Have reviewed thematic and other partnerships in the light of funding changes and the potential for a Cumbria LEP.

	Eden	District	No	No	Unknown	LSP structural / governance arrangements are fine, having been refreshed last year. Have just refreshed SCS with a new 3 year action plan agreed. Unclear on future of support arrangements
	South Lakes	District	Yes	Yes	No	Have been contributing to the development of a Single Community Strategy for Cumbria based on an outcomes framework reflecting the 6 districts variations on the main themes. This work has been paused pending the CSR announcement on 20 Oct. South Lakeland LSP has agreed to continue work on its part of the outcomes framework whether or not the Cumbria Single Community Strategy restarts. They feel this work effectively refreshes the current Community Strategy. As form follows function - will be looking at how the LSP can be better 'outcomes delivery focussed' through joint projects and pooled resources to compensate for cuts. This will result in a more dynamic less static structure in due course. South Lakeland District Council has recently had a restructure which incorporated LSP work with other partnership and community activity as part of several jobs. This has kept capacity and provides flexibility. It may however need to be reviewed again as part of service reviews to address budget issues.
	Trafford	Metropolitan	Yes	Yes	Yes	
South East	Buckinghamshire	County	Yes	Yes	Yes	Bucks is reconsidering how partners can best work together and which of the priorities identified from the sustainable communities strategies should be the focus of their joint work. This will inevitably result in some changes. E.g. one of the LAA thematic partnerships has already disbanded as a standing committee and has transformed into a task and finish style of working to support the already good work that is being undertaken on the ground. At the Bucks Strategic Partnership (BSP) Board meeting in July, partners took the opportunity to review and refocus their top priorities going forward, based on a paper produced by the BSP implementation Group (BSPIG) which comprises officers from the various public, private and voluntary sector. BSPIG have been invited to develop a work programme which matches capacity for the identified priorities and agreed that if capacity were inadequate then the number of priorities would have to be reviewed. BSPIG are also undertaking a review of partnership working structures to establish an efficient delivery model for the agreed priorities for consideration by the Board.
	Kent	County	Yes	Yes	Unknown	Currently revising their SCS and taking a fresh look at their partnership architecture with a view to rebalancing it to strengthen the democratic element.
	Southampton	Unitary	Yes	Yes	Unknown	At its 1st July 2010 meeting the SP Delivery Board agreed, in response to a raft of Coalition Government announcements and local challenges, to commission a fundamental review of the Southampton Partnership to: 1) Identify and agree the key challenges facing the city that need to be tackled over the duration of this Parliament (May 2015). 2) Reconfigure (if needed) their partnership structures to ensure that they are fit for purpose to address the key city challenges thereby maximising resource allocation across partners. New arrangements will be in place by April 2011.
South West	Gloucestershire	County	Yes	No	Unknown	Working group set up in June to scope a review of governance arrangements and Shared Intelligence commissioned to undertake this work. Focus is on slimmer partnership arrangements to reflect our new reality. Deadline 31st December 2010. Note that Gloucestershire has previously introduced a joint partnership planning process (RIEP funded)
	South Gloucestershire	Unitary	No - waiting until after CSR	No - waiting until after CSR	No - waiting until after CSR	South Gloucestershire will look at its priorities in light of the impact of Coalition government changes in key sectors, the spending review and the Localism bill. It is anticipated that themes and priorities are likely to change and that future partnership structures and support arrangements ought to follow the final agreed themes. Later this year, the LSP plan to look at the above in more detail once the impact of the CSR is known.

	Cheltenham	District	Yes - through community (place based) commissioning project. They will take on board recommendations coming out of the county review into partnership structures.	Yes - the current SCS runs until 2011. This will evolve to be a much tighter statement of joint-commissioning priorities for Cheltenham.	Yes - CBC provides support for the LSP and the 6 thematic partnerships. This support will be reviewed as part of the council's budget setting process and as part of the development of our commissioning programme.	Keen to develop a community (place-based) commissioning model to complement work being undertaken by Cheltenham Borough Council. Project currently underway to develop more of a community (place-based) commissioning role for the partnership to improve structures and incorporate learning from the Gloucestershire Total Place project. This will be completed by March 2011.
	Devon	County	Likely to follow work programme review	Yes (shift towards efficiency)	Likely to follow work programme review	<p>Devon Strategic Partnership – has commissioned 2 multi-sector/multi-agency Task and Finish Groups to develop and plan the implementation of specific areas for future partnership working:</p> <p>Task and Finish Group 1: Locality Service Re-design including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - links with community capacity and self reliance - role of other sectors e.g. VCS - public sector service delivery/ use of assets (not just Local Authorities also other agencies) <p>This group will consider options for localities to pilot work in and develop proposals, with a view that if successful a template can be created for use elsewhere. This group is currently developing proposals in the following areas of work; (however all proposals have to be taken to Devon Strategic Partnership before they can be implemented):</p> <p>Alcohol misuse – the effects of alcohol misuse cost most partners significant sums of money; a multi agency approach will build on existing work and lessons learned from national Total Place pilots.</p> <p>Families in crisis – ditto; will probably use a systems thinking approach and very targeted localities</p> <p>Asset rationalisation – mapping of assets (if poss. also including social value) in Devon across the partnership to facilitate the asset rationalisation that will happen following CSR. May include consideration of a Special Purpose Vehicle.</p> <p>Unintended Consequences – it is recognised that decisions made by one organisation may have an unforeseen impact on other partners or communities. A process is being developed to try to ensure decisions are being made in full knowledge (NB not necessarily to mitigate them).</p> <p>Task and Finish Group 2: This group's focus is on managing the transformation to a smaller Public Sector. The primary tool that is being developed is the broadening of the remit of the existing Area Action Force (http://www.southwestrda.org.uk/working_with_you/working_with_business/planning_for_recovery/area_action_forces.aspx) to make it proactive rather than reactive and focussed across Devon rather than in particular hot spots. Other areas of work that may be pursued are around the effects of the smaller public sector on various vulnerable groups e.g. families with low wages facing possible redundancy.</p>
	East Devon	District	Yes	Yes	No	Plan to look at VFM from all their partnerships with a view to possibly reducing numbers. These will be looked at against East Devon District Council's corporate priorities.

Somerset	County	No - current debate about future and LSP meetings paused. Review likely following CEXs meeting in November.	No - as per governance arrangements.	No - as per governance arrangements.	<p>There has been debate locally between the County Council and Districts about the continuing role of LSPs going forward. Given the new context, the LAs in Somerset feel it is timely to consider whether the current pattern of partnership working, though LSPs, will enable the public sector to move forward with sufficient pace and agility to address these challenges. Several partners have also indicated that it will be difficult to sustain their input into the current multiple structures of partnerships due to resource constraints, and would welcome a review. Following local discussions, the County Council has recently agreed with the SSP Joint Board that it would be sensible to pause its current arrangements and suspend further meetings of the Somerset Strategic Partnership beyond September 2010 to allow the Council and partners space to determine the structure and style of joint working required for the future.</p> <p>A number of thematic/delivery/co-ordination partnerships exist below the formal SSP structure of the Forum and Joint Board. Some of these groups will have a clear purposeful role to play in the future and will continue. E.g Children's Trust. The groups that will need to remain in place will be confirmed following the review.</p> <p>Executive leaders of public services in Somerset are meeting together in November to share insights into the scale of change individual organisations are facing and how this will impact locally on services. Building on a shared understanding Somerset will then look at how it might work together on a shared agenda and how best to engage with wider stakeholders beyond the public sector. Each District Council has agreed to review the effectiveness of its own local LSP and determine whether it should continue to proceed in its current form. The overall approach will be based on what suits each authority and their circumstances</p>
Taunton Deane	District	Yes	Yes (shift towards efficiency)	Yes	<p>Undertaking a fundamental review of LSP re. structures, priorities and performance management. The aim is to become 'an efficient, effective and ambitious partnership'. The challenges ahead necessitate effective partnership working i.e. developing innovative ways of delivering services that improve community outcomes whilst also delivering savings. This work started in April. Taunton Deane has a workshop with all the LSP board members later this month, and hope that after that they will have new priorities, structure, and partnership agreement. They hope to have achieve their main objectives by the end of this year/ early next.</p>
North Somerset	Unitary	Yes	Yes - once more is known on the scale of public sector cuts, and what it means in terms of work priorities.	Yes - in line with governance review	<p>Review planned to consider arrangements, with the primary intention of reducing the time spent in meetings, and more effectively splitting strategic and operational activity - agreement of scope scheduled for September (but at early stages). Full implementation planned April 2011.</p>
Plymouth	Unitary	Yes - reviewed in 2008 but realise further review will be necessary due to the health changes.	Yes - have reduced priorities and now looking at targets etc.	Not yet - but realisation that this will be part of the process and that the partnership office is unlikely to remain in its current form	<p>Plymouth re-shaped their governance framework following a review at the end of 2008. One of the recommendations was to re-shape the partnership, particularly the Board and Executive Group which took place in 2009. A new Board and Exec has been operating since, with a revised governance framework. There is now much more clarity around the purpose of these two bodies and the next step is to make the Partnership Thematic Bodies more fit for purpose.</p> <p>One of the most noticeable changes is stopping using the acronym LSP. They now talk about 'organisations working together' and 'the 2020 partnership'. This is to make it easier for the public to understand and to break with what might be seen as a 'New Labour' concept. It is also a recognition that the partnership does not have its own resources or policies but rather is a marshal of those of its member organisations.</p>

	Plymouth (continued)				<p>Questions around the future of the LAA and the demise of the CAA, together with the impending major budget pressures have led the partnership to develop an integrated approach to planning and budget-setting between particularly the four main public sector LSP partners (Police, Council, NHS and Fire). Planning timetables have been aligned this year and there is shared agreement over the key issues for the city (set out in a 'state of the nation' report - The Plymouth Report). This report is now the basis for joint priority-setting across the partnership and will frame an update of the Sustainable Community Strategy as a 'Plymouth Plan' is developed. Priorities have been reduced to 4 areas and these are what Plymouth will be focussing on over the next few years. The City Council has aligned itself to these four priorities (from 14 Corporate Priorities last year). Now that there has been confirmation of the end of LAAs, these locally developed priorities will form the basis for the new local performance framework for the partnership.</p> <p>They identify that there is more to do re governance following changes to the structure of health service delivery but believe they have a strong foundation due to shared set of priorities. Plymouth has confirmed the priorities, a set of high level indicators for the partnership, and are moving on to the next level of organisational indicators and improvement targets. Detailed delivery planning will follow.</p> <p>The prioritisation and integrated planning work within the partnership is being jointly developed in the Corporate Planning teams of the partners supported by the partnership office but it is not expected that the partnership office to remain at its current size and capacity. Anticipation that here will be more 'mainstreaming' of partnership work and less dedicated resource.</p>
	Cornwall	Unitary	Yes	Yes (shift towards efficiency)	<p>Yes</p> <p>Work already underway on reviewing partnership working arrangements: Workshop with strategic thematic partnership lead officers supported by LGID in August to collectively consider what a new partnership model might look. Consensus on a simple model, although membership not considered at that stage.</p> <p>Consensus by Cornwall's Public Services Group on 4 high level themes (at the end of August) that were essentially around driving efficiency and improving service delivery. These themes, together with previously agreed priorities from the Sustainable Community Strategy have been brought together into a tentative, very high level new work programme. In addition, successful activity and models from the LAA are being recommended to be carried forward into the work programme as building blocks and a transition to new ways of working. Much of the detail covered by the programme will be dependant on the outcome of the CSR for the Council and partner organisations, although the high level themes should remain the same.</p> <p>The proposed new partnership model has been more widely shared and refined in light of discussions and is due to be debated by the Cornwall Strategic Partnership Board shortly. In addition to the creation of a new Health and Wellbeing Board (a "people" Board), in line with the Government White Paper and a Local Enterprise Partnership (a Place") Board, the overarching management would be provided by an integrated senior leadership team, with membership appropriate to the programme of work, rather than standing structures with fixed membership. There will be a strong focus on enhanced communication channels, engagement and joint commissioning.</p>

	Bristol	Unitary	No - wholesale review not required because Bristol Partnership already has a streamlined structure (following earlier review in 2008)	No - reviewed in 2009	No - not currently	<p>Governance - Bristol Partnership was reviewed in 2008, and a streamlined structure and support was brought in at that time (1 Exec Board, 5 Partnership Boards and a Governance Group made of public sector agencies which manages the business part of the BP). Partnership Boards now at various different stages of review, e.g:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Health and Wellbeing - work underway re new requirements. - Prosperous and Ambitious - will review in light of LEP proposal. <p>Work programme - The Community Strategy (the Bristol 20:20 Plan) was reviewed in 2009. This is a ten year vision. Bristol is currently into 1 year into the delivery of this plan. Exec Board is going to review progress to deliver 20:20 plan in Nov - and review any potential structural changes at that stage. Early in New Year, and probably by March will agree any changes for the coming year. Support arrangements - 4 public agencies (Fire, Police PCT and Council) jointly fund the small Bristol Partnership team with in kind support from various other partners.</p>
	Dorset	County	Yes	Yes	Unknown	Officers are currently working up a proposed future structure and performance framework for the Dorset Strategic Partnership (for partners to consider at their meeting in November)
	Bournemouth	Unitary	Yes - planned. New Chair will be in place from 1st December and will start review then.	Yes - reviewing SCS and priorities	Yes - will be reviewing the support arrangements once the structural review has taken place.	<p>Bournemouth are currently revising their Sustainable Community Strategy with a view to having a few (approx 5) key priorities for partners to focus on over the next 3 years. The Strategy will include an action plan for actions for individuals, community & voluntary sector groups, businesses, as well as public sector orgs. There is a recognition that the public sector will have much more limited resources and that our Big Society has a key role to play.</p> <p>Focusing on the impact of the government changes eg CSR, Big Society, Health White Paper, Policing consultation – they are holding a Development Workshop in early November to focus on these issues and a conference at the end of November for approx 200 partners to look at impact of changes on the community and the priorities for the next 3 years. Bournemouth has identified 4 golden threads to run through our Strategy: Reducing Inequalities, Prevention, Earth Charter, Influencing Decisions.</p>
	Swindon	Unitary	Yes	Yes	No	<p>Governance - Swindon is in the process of reviewing their governance arrangements for the partnership in light of the end of their LAA in March 2011. A paper went to their Board in September with suggestions of what a new governance structure would look like. Discussion focused on the functions of the blocks and if these need to be reviewed in the first instance. A further paper is going back to the Board in December to answer some of the queries raised. Work programme - Swindon will be reviewing the work programme in light of the end of LAA and the introduction of One Swindon which is our 4 year partnership plan for Swindon which will be launched in January 2011 and is being pulled together now.</p>
West Midlands	Birmingham	Metropolitan	Yes	Yes	In hand (NRF ending)	Governance: review in hand - although lots depends on the future of community (place-based) budgeting. Work programme: Total Place dominates. Drive to develop a SCS which is 'for real'.
	Coventry	Metropolitan	Yes	Planned	Not at present	<p>Governance: new Chair of the Coventry Partnership - desire to strengthen cross-theme partnership working and challenge. Work programme: planned review of the Sustainable Community Strategy</p> <p>Improvement priorities: 'at risk' groups and work with their families – seeking to understand behaviours and characteristics of households that require intensive support, and how partners can collaborate/ co-ordinate better in response</p>
	Herefordshire	Unitary	Yes	Yes	Yes	Governance: improvement Grant spend includes a review of structure and governance of LSP. Work programme: HPS working on localities work stream. This includes Partnership agreement to focus on 9 localities from which partners will deliver services jointly. LEP shared with Telford and Shropshire.

Sandwell	Metropolitan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Governance: commissioned a review of arrangements back in June - this is now nearing completion - looking to streamline and to move to more flexible arrangements. Work programme: clear about new agenda - focus on a limited number of priorities (emphasis on 'better for less'). Support: new arrangements due to be in place Feb 2011
Shropshire	Unitary	Changed early in 2010	Yes (being updated to include PBB and more locality focus)	To follow	Partnership Structure and Governance: changed early 2010 to strengthen public agency input, create strong Chief Exec Group and reflect priorities in new SCS. Work programme: new SCS completed early 2010 and associated work programme developed. WP being updated to include Community (Place-Based) Budgets and more locality focus. Support: Partnership and support staff are integral to County approach to service change and local transformation programme. This is where the Partnership is seen to have a key future role.
Solihull	Metropolitan	Yes	Yes	Unknown	Governance: within last two months - creation of Coordination & Performance Management Group to improve cross-cutting working; Prosperous Communities Strategic Group of the Solihull Partnership have revised ToR and priorities; and proposal to set up a Solihull Climate Change Group. Work programmes: project outline for SCS refresh agreed on 22/07/10. Unified Needs Assessment. Work programme up to late November, followed by public consultation. Current partnership priorities include tackling worklessness and integrated neighbourhood services (focus on challenging families, ASB and use of assets – Total Capital)
Staffordshire	County	No	Yes (shift towards efficiency)	Likely to follow	Governance - Very light structures - but recent (13th Sept) agreement to set of priorities for joint efficiency activity. Work programme: joint programme of efficiency projects between local authorities. Broad brush discussions between County & NHS and police. Support: Likely, but not yet acted on.
Stoke	Unitary	Likely	Yes (shift towards efficiency)	No	Governance: Likely to change - review called for by CX. Work programme: SCS revised. Drive to work out a set of collaborative tasks for efficiency. Changes in health service will make huge difference to coherence of LSP agenda. Strong interest in Stoke version of neighbourhood working - called 'Local Matters'. Support: based on secondments so likely to remain.
Telford & Wrekin	Unitary	Yes	Yes	Yes	Governance: Improvement Grant being used for simplifying governance and structure. Discussion underway on restructure of Health and Wellbeing Board and Revision of the Children's Trust. LEP shared with Herefordshire and Shropshire. Work programme: review and refresh of the SCS underway. Improvement priorities include: prolific services users and their families. At present this work is focused on prolific offenders, children in care and adult social care although other groups are likely to be included High risk/need localities. Support: Partnership Information and Intelligence function centralised
Walsall	Metropolitan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Governance: a central aspect of the Place Adviser role to conduct an Appreciative Inquiry into Partnership working. The rationale being - changing circumstances provide an opportune moment to assess value (or otherwise) of Partnership; enables partners to identify complex priorities demanding a partnership approach that will enable savings to mitigate against reduced resources. Work programme: see aforementioned. Support: Place adviser also offering support work to Area Managers as part of the Area Partnership development.
Warwickshire	County	See notes	See notes	Yes	Public Service Board meeting on 20 September to discuss the way forward. Improvement and Efficiency West Midlands (IEWM) Learning to Deliver (L2D) funded partnership development programme on hold; status report to be provided to IEWM shortly. Some resources freed up in support of Coventry/ Solihull/ Warks sub-regional working post-Total Place. Considerable uncertainties in the light of LEP for Coventry & Warwickshire; intention to progress the Health & Wellbeing Board asap; and considering possible implications of an elected Police Commissioner.

	Wolverhampton	Metropolitan	Yes	Yes	To follow	Wolverhampton Partnership has nearly completed a post-recession, pre-CSR refresh of the SCS and established an approach to the development of a two-year delivery plan. On the basis of form following function, it has been agreed by the Partnership Executive that staffing/resourcing levels should be finally decided once this has been agreed. Given that two-thirds of the costs of the current partnership are born by WNF (the other third by the Council), it is assumed that the LSP will be smaller (and more agile, nimble etc) from April. Alongside this process, there has also been a review of our neighbourhood structures, which are also substantially funded by WNF. Partners are keen to see the LSP continue and have a clear sense of its worth and added value.
	Worcestershire	County	Yes	Yes (shift towards greater focus on efficiency)	To follow (as part of the LSP review as a whole)	Governance: Currently consulting on new arrangements. Streamlining - to be more costs effective and time efficient. One of the proposed changes is that the Public Services Executive Group (which was originally set up independent of the LSP) should be brought in under the new streamlined structure. Work programme: refreshing of SCS at present – new launch this Autumn (single community strategy for the county rather than the 7 they had previously). Place Adviser support with Areas of High Need (AoHN) and Big Society, plus developing a partnership approach with Children's Trust. Linkage to Neighbourhood Resource Centre Central England support which is being focussed on sustainability in the AoHN – especially around Social Enterprise. Also, increased emphasis on efficiencies and strategic integration (e.g. managing any "single budget" for Worcestershire which may be proposed by the Government) - the remit of the Public Services Executive Group. Also, currently considering relationship with a possible county-wide LEP.
	Dudley	Metropolitan	Yes	Yes (existing focus on efficiency)	Yes	Governance: The Dudley Community Partnership (LSP) is currently undertaking a review of its role and function. Also, in addition to undertaking the mandatory work of CAA, LAAs, SCS etc in common with other LSPs, the Executive Support Team has sought to use the partnership structures to try to develop new ways of working. At the moment it is leading work on asset management as well as systems thinking, alongside the more traditional work of delivering the SCS. Work programme: SCS revised 2009, work programme to be developed Autumn. Support: linked to work prog, some support resource committed to 2012.
Yorkshire & Humber	Barnsley	Metropolitan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Current LSP arrangements include a Partnership Board chaired by the Council Leader with good cross-sector representation, a Partnership Performance Clinic (PPC) to monitor progress against LAA targets and SCS priorities, as well as a number of Delivery Partnerships and Task and Finish Groups. The Partnership has a Memorandum of Understanding. Work is well underway on how a Community (Place-Based) Budget (focused on Thurnscoe) would deliver faster and better outcomes. A thematic approach to 'Think Family' is also developing. A review of the LSP is underway to streamline the arrangements, reflect the changing national and local context and ensure added value. A Community (Place-Based) Budgeting approach will underpin the work of the LSP going forward.
	Doncaster Together (Doncaster MBC)	Metropolitan	Yes - the LSP now has a dedicated Partnership Director who has been working closely with the Mayor (LSP Chair) and others to review structures, governance and ways of working etc. The LSPs priorities will now more closely align with the Mayor's Top 10 priorities for Doncaster	Yes - a new Borough wide Strategy is being developed ('Doncaster's Big Plan') and due to be approved by the end of October 2010.		Since his appointment, the Doncaster Together (DT) Director has undertaken a radical overhaul of the LSP and it's themed sub-groups. Clarity of role between the strategic board and theme boards has improved, and it is now more focused on the delivery of key targets and priorities with greater responsibility for delivery and with timetabled action plans. A new performance management system has also been developed by the partnership. A submission on improving the "the role of elected members in Doncaster Together" was agreed at the September Board meeting and this will now be discussed at the council's Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee in October. The director has invited LGID to review its structure and governance at the end of the year so it can assess what else it needs to do such as supporting the emergence of the Sheffield City Region Local Enterprise Partnership. In the light of the budget deficit, DT is also starting preliminary work on how partners can 'close the gap' between the best and worst outcomes for people in the borough, with associated work on the 'Big Society'.

Rotherham LSP (Rotherham MDC)	Metropolitan	Yes	Yes	Yes	The LSP Manager and independent Chair have recently completed a series of 1:1 interviews with Board members to discuss what works and what does not. A report, including draft, restructure proposals, goes to a CEOs meeting on 7 October 2010 before discussion at the next LSP Board meeting (11th November). Rotherham also secured funding from the RIEP to employ a Local Improvement Adviser (LIA) to help with the LSP review. An invite to part of the special Board meeting on 11 November has been extended to a wider set of stakeholders. The meeting will be dedicated to considering future vision and objectives for the LSP as well as governance arrangements to match. An LSP refresh process will follow in line with the timetable for producing Rotherham's next Sustainable Community Strategy.
Sheffield First (Sheffield City Council)	Metropolitan	Yes	Yes	No (not yet)	Sheffield First Partnership (SFP) carried out a review of its function and structure in late spring. Members of the Sheffield First Partnership agreed to a new approach at its September meeting, with a City Executive Board replacing the SFP Board, members and terms of reference to be agreed by the Executive Board at its first meeting in October. A fundamental change is the emphasis on "Community Partnerships" to provide governance and accountability at a level closer to citizens, and an emphasis on a "task & finish" approach, rather than standing thematic partnerships to tackle priority issues for the city. The commitment to devolution and to localism is also evident in the decision to make the City Executive Board accountable to a "Sheffield Assembly". At its first meeting in October, the Executive Board committed to making progress towards a City Budget and Community Budgets to support integrated public services. Priority outcomes will be agreed at the next meeting of the Executive Board in November. Further work on the detail of the proposal is underway.
Bradford	Metropolitan	Yes	Yes	Yes - 'Task and Finish' group set up to carry out a review on behalf of the Bradford District Partnership (BDP) Board.	<p>The review of current BDP governance arrangements to determine how best to strengthen and make efficient the way in which partners (public, private and voluntary sector) come together to deliver improved outcomes for the Districts citizens has been commissioned. It is being carried out in parallel with the development work on the Sustainable Community Strategy (Big Plan II). The review to ensure structures are affordable, robust and fit for purpose to delivery the new priorities and are flexible enough to respond to key external and internal drivers.</p> <p>Main criteria and principles are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · building on existing strengths of partnership working, improve efficiency, reduce duplication, and develop an LSP structure and supporting arrangements that are efficient and affordable. · engage all key public, private and voluntary sector partners required in order to drive delivery and development of the Big Plan and other district priorities (eg total place, collaborative working) with clear focus on outcomes. A fully costed and risk assessed proposal for a new partnership and governance structure expected by January 2011.
Calderdale	Metropolitan	Yes	Yes	Unknown	The Board has recently agreed to review partnership arrangements in light of changing policy developments and ensuring it is fit for purpose
Kirklees	Metropolitan	Yes	No	Yes (as part of Council efficiency programme)	The Kirklees Partnership Executive on 27 July considered a report outlining the changing context for partnerships and partnership working, including, for example, a move to greater outward accountability, Total Place/Community (Place-Based) Budgets and resource constraints. It discussed proposals to shift the focus of partnership boards from performance management to performance improvement using workshop and task and finish group approaches. It also sought to distinguish between mainstream and strategic boards, recognising statutory requirements (eg. in relation to the CDRP) and policy changes which may suggest different arrangements for the future (eg. the creation of LEPS and Health and Wellbeing Board). The report additionally raised questions around the Executive's role and membership, to enable it to become a driver of strategic transformational change.

Kirklees (continued)						A paper to the 7 October Executive summarises current thinking and issues outstanding, and suggests a special session of the Executive on 18 November to establish working arrangements for the Partnership and a core work programme for the next 6 months.
Leeds	Metropolitan	Yes	Yes	Yes		A review of the Leeds Initiative is likely to see a major streamlining of the current structure, with a new strategic plan for the city, with fewer key outcomes and targets, and a new high level Board. There are likely to be only four sub themed partnerships under this Board. These proposals are currently being developed and discussed with stakeholders. They are going to the Leeds Initiative Executive for discussion in October.
City of York	Unitary	Yes	Yes	Yes		York LSP - Without Walls held their annual conference on 30th September. This focused on York's key priorities going forward and the partnership structures needed to deliver this. Table top discussions considered whether the five current SCS visions statements were still the correct ones going forwards, then agreement on the top strategic challenges, ambitions and issues facing the city. The conference was concluded by saying that once the various discussion points were collated and clear priorities identified, this would inform the partnership structures necessary to deliver this. The CEO also made reference to public sector funding reductions and an awareness that other local authorities were cutting their partnerships budgets, therefore it is quite possible that rationalisation of structures in York may follow.
North Yorkshire Strategic Partnership (NYSP) / NY County Council	County	Yes	Yes	Yes - Will follow on from review of structural / governance arrangements		<p>Governance - Partners have agreed informally that a review is needed - formal decision to be taken at Local Government North Yorkshire and York on 8 October 2010. Detail of review will be linked to outcome of LEP proposals; changes being proposed by the government with regard to children's trusts / health and well-being boards / community safety partnerships; and the outcomes of SCS priority discussions. Work programme - In June the NYSP Exec agreed that work on refreshing their SCS would be suspended based on the current climate (i.e. unclear future of LAAs as delivery mechanism/likelihood of significant cuts in public sector expenditure). However there was general acceptance that NYSP partners should have an agreement in place which defines the key issues for NY, though it would not be sustainable in the longer term to continue to try to direct efforts/resources towards the full range of current priorities.</p> <p>Further discussion took place amongst Thematic Partnership Chairs who reached a consensus that there is a need to revise the SCS to ensure that NY has a plan which better reflects the current climate and aspirations for the future. However, this would need to focus on three or four really critical priorities for NY; those things which will not be done anyway and which are perhaps the most difficult to tackle as partners. This approach has been agreed by the NYSP Executive (7 October 2010) and thematic partnerships are being asked to spend some time in coming months considering what the 3 or 4 key priorities for NY might be, and feeding these thoughts in to the next NYSP Executive (10 February 2011).</p>
North Yorkshire Coast Community Partnership/ Scarborough Borough Council	District	Yes	No (already done so)	Depends on outcomes of ongoing discussions		<p>Governance: Discussion at December Board meeting about new partnership structures e.g. LEP, Health and Wellbeing Board, Public Sector Board and implications for the LSP. Work programme: The SCS has already been refreshed, completed early 2010, covering the period 2010-2013. Additionally the decision was taken, starting in Jan 2010, to structure meetings slightly differently whereby the focus would be on a couple of discussion items, followed by a smaller amount of time on general business. It is worth noting that the LSP is informed and influenced by four Area Forums, including via the Forum Chairs who sit on the LSP Board. The Area Forums provide an opportunity for members of the community - who set the agendas, elected representatives and service providers to work together to try and find solutions to local issues.</p>

Ryedale Strategic Partnership/ Ryedale District Council	District	No (This has recently taken place - see notes)	Yes (just completed)	This has recently taken place - see notes	Governance: Since April 2010 the Boards of the Strategic Partnership and Safer Ryedale have been amalgamated. The decision was taken for several reasons, including that membership was almost the same with just two members of the CSP not on the LSP Board; the relatively low crime rate and good track record of Safer Ryedale. The first amalgamated board meeting took place in June 2010, and will continue to be supported by the Safer Ryedale Delivery Team and the Ryedale SP Delivery Group. Work programme: The Action Plan for the SCS 'Imagine Ryedale' has recently been reviewed, to cover 2010-2013, as presented to the LSP Board at their September 2010 meeting. It retains the four headline priorities that have been in place since the last review in 2006.
Richmondshire Local Strategic Partnership/ Richmondshire (also with reference to Hambleton)	District	Yes	Yes	Yes - a shared services programme across Hambleton and Richmondshire District Councils is looking at how support can be provided for the two LSPs	There are currently two initiatives being considered by the partnership. Governance: The first is a project looking at joint working with Hambleton LSP to increase efficiency and effectiveness of the two LSPs. Hambleton and Richmondshire District Councils share the same executive management team. The two councils are rolling out a shared services project to increase efficiency across the two councils. The LSPs are also looking how best they can work together and the current option being reviewed is to have a joint Strategic Partnership Board. This will reduce the number of meetings that partners have to attend. In addition there will be some joint projects and task and finish groups where priorities in the two districts are common. Each LSP will retain its own constitution and identity. Work programme: The second is the refresh of the Sustainable Community Strategy, which involves reducing the previous comprehensive strategy into a short two page document that enables the LSP to focus on key priorities.
Craven LSP/ Craven District Council	District	Yes	Yes	To follow - Will be considered as part of Craven/NY review	Governance: awareness amongst partners that the financial and changing political situation will mean a rethink of organisation's priorities and partnership arrangements. This issue is on the agenda for the next LSP Board meeting (25 October) for discussion. Work programme: linked to the aforementioned, the Community Strategy was due to be reviewed during current year however this will be a much more major review due to political/financial changes.
Selby	District	Yes	Yes	Unknown	Governance: moving towards becoming a commissioning authority with leisure services managed by the Wigan Leisure and Culture Trust, a not for profit organisation. Work programme: setting up five Community Engagement Forums, each with its own head of service and community development plan, which will feed into the SCS & LDF. SCS will be renewed yearly in line with needs assessments. Focus-ing on four priorities in 2010: deprived communities; health / access to services; alcohol related harm reduction and increase in access to sport, art & culture (initially aimed at children).
Harrogate District Strategic Partnership	District	No (recently done so)	No	Possibly	Governance: Governance reviewed within 2009/10, moved to a new structure 1st April 2010, however in light of the current uncertainty that we are all working within and prioritising focus it maybe decided to review the thematic group structure to more of a projects based approach but this is for discussion. Work programme: no scheduled review however this will be impacted on if the governance is reviewed. Support: Harrogate Borough Council provide officer time to support the partnership but does not have a dedicated resource for it and never has. As priorities take shape internally within the Council the support input may change accordingly.

	East Riding of Yorkshire	Unitary	No - whilst no formal review of structures, governance, workplan and support arrangements has been embarked upon, officers involved in supporting the work of the LSP are conscious of the need to ensure that the LSP is fit for the new, post-election, world.	No (not yet)	Unknown	<p>Thought is, accordingly, being given to how best the LSP should function and through that process, how best it could be configured to take account of the likely effects of, for example, the CSR, 'Big Society', the forthcoming Localism Bill and the changes to arrangements regarding the provision of local health services. This work will reference and build upon work carried out over the last two years which included a review of the LSP Board's membership and terms of reference. It is likely that, in the future, there could be scope for a larger role for the LSP's Resource Advisory Group - acting more as a public sector board, for example - and that revisions could be made to the structure of the thematic action groups to achieve more focused activities to help secure efficiencies. Taking onboard the need to embed greater citizen involvement in agreeing outcomes and priorities for an area, together with the requirements of the Big Society, it is possible that the role of the LSP's local action teams will be further developed to help deliver this.</p> <p>The LSP is keen to progress area based working initiatives and has recently agreed that two projects be progressed, one covering the whole of the East Riding and the other focused on a specific geographic area. Related to this, the East Riding is a sub-regional participant in a RIEP funded project to support 'Total Place' type activities which will be informed by customer insight methodologies. As part of the 'new world', it is likely that the LSP's current ten year sustainable community plan (2006-16) will need to be the subject of a major revision in 2011 to ensure that the LSP's vision for the East Riding can still be delivered in the 'age of austerity' presaged in the CSR and proposed legislation. The strength of the East Riding LSP and its strong commitment to partnership working will, hopefully, enable it to effectively manage its collective resources should, as seems likely, community (place-based) budgeting becomes established.</p>
	Hull	Unitary	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>ONE HULL (LSP) Exec Group has agreed to a review of the function and form of the LSP in response to changes in Government policy and economic conditions. Initial work on 'function' has started with the development of a 'City Plan' to replace the current SCS. The city plan will set out up to 10 customer focussed outcomes (aspirations) for Hull that all partners will work towards. A draft of the City Plan is being developed for wide consultation, together with an outcome based accountability perf framework (to replace current LAA perf arrangements). ONE HULL hosted a Peer Review (led by ICOCO) of the city's VCS capacity to respond to the Big Society agenda, the results of this will feed into work that is underway on reviewing how the VCS and private sector contribute to the Big Society & what needs to be put in place to maximise their contributions. In terms of 'form' - the Exec Group is due to review partnership arrangements after the CSR has been announced. Work is also underway to explore community (place-based) budgeting approaches & Hull is leading one of the country's Capital & Asset Pathfinders.</p>
	North East Lincolnshire	Unitary	No	No	No	<p>NELSP had ID&eA review late 2009 and have been implementing the recommendations from that review. Recently the partnership has agreed support arrangements and a set of principles for working in the current tough times. The SCS went through a review finishing in July this year so this is now fit for purpose.</p>