

1. FIELD / THEME - COMPLEXITY

WILLIAMS ANALYSIS	WILLIAMS RECOMMENDATIONS	COMMENTS / POSSIBLE RESPONSE
<p>(i) There is a suggestion to reduce the abundance of specific grants as the current system creates a negative “grant culture” and creates complexity in terms of financial management arrangements which does not add value (It is suggested that this should be operational by 2016/17)</p>	<p>5. We therefore recommend that funding arrangements must be simpler and focused on achieving outcomes. By the end of the 2016-17 financial year, all specific grants which the Welsh Government pays to other public sector bodies must be either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Included in unhyphenated funding; or • Subject to much clearer and outcome-focused conditions which ensure specific • grants are spent in a way that contributes to national or local outcomes; or • Retained in their current form in genuinely exceptional cases only(paragraph 2.33) 	<p><u>COMMENT</u> – This is something that Local Government in Wales has been calling for, for years. This type of freedom in England has enabled local authorities to more easily cope with a level of savings which has been higher than those in Wales. It is a shame that the report leaves the door open for some specific grants but this is unavoidable due to the nature of the relationship between national and local government (there are further comments on this under Section 5 about performance management and in response to Recommendation 54 specifically).</p>
<p>(ii) It is suggested that organisations which have a clear focus on outcomes should have more autonomy on grants which they receive (It is suggested that this is operational by the start of 2015/16)</p>	<p>6. We therefore recommend that, by the start of the 2015-16 financial year, the Welsh Government must set out how recipients of each specific grant can earn greater autonomy in their use by demonstrating their ability to deliver positive outcomes through strong performance. (para2.34)</p>	<p><u>COMMENT</u> – Strengthening the Council’s discipline on focusing on outcomes for citizens is becoming more and more important. It is a matter of opinion as to the extent of our success with the opinion of our auditors being a factor.</p>
<p>(iii) The argument for structural merger between Health and Social Services was refused. The opinion is that it is possible to integrate without doing so and that the current mission statements are a step in the right direction.</p>	<p>17. Urgent action is required to ensure that seamless, integrated and high-quality health and social services are provided across Wales:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All local authorities and LHBs must immediately prepare clear and robust plans for integrating their services; • These must include detailed proposals, milestones, targets and outcomes for • Improved and integrated delivery for all 	<p><u>COMMENT</u> – The “mission statements” on collaboration and integration are light on specific plans at present. <u>RECOMMENDATION</u> – It is suggested that specific integration schemes should be called for. In doing so, it could facilitate practical discussions should the Health Boards structure their management arrangements to recognise the authorities’ boundaries.</p>

	<p>relevant services. The Welsh Government must monitor their implementation; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If these proposals are not implemented well or quickly enough, the Welsh Government must consider directing local authorities and local health boards to integrate, either using existing powers or those in the Social Services and Wellbeing Bill, if enacted. (paragraph 2.66) 	
<p>(iv) Collaboration and partnership working is inconsistent and complex as suggested by the Beecham Report. However, the current encouragement for collaboration and partnership working has not borne fruition and the partnership pattern is overly complicated.</p>	<p>21. We therefore recommend that local partnership structures must be radically streamlined and made more effective. To do so:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All local service boards (LSBs) must ensure that they themselves fulfil and manifest the criteria we set out for effective partnership working; • All LSBs must maintain a single register of local partnerships; • All LSBs must overhaul local partnership structures to bring them into line with these criteria and with the clearer national and local priority outcomes which we also propose. This should begin immediately and conclude within one year of those priorities being articulated. Partnerships which compound complexity or do not add value should be disbanded; and • Single Integrated Plans must also reflect these outcomes and identify the main cross-sectoral pressures and pinch points which need to be addressed; they must set out clearly the actions which need to be undertaken, by whom and by when (paragraph 2.107) 	<p><u>COMMENT</u> – It would be possible to build on the work that this Council and Anglesey Council has done through the Partnership Rationalisation Project in order to confirm the focus for the work of the Local Services Board and agree on strategic objectives that everyone works towards. (NB This is a challenge when dealing with regional bodies which work to different objectives).</p>
<p>(iii) It is said that the “shared services” partnership in the Health Service has been successful and that it is a model for various</p>	<p>22. We therefore recommend that, building on the achievements of NHS Wales Shared Services Partnership, a single shared services operation</p>	<p><u>COMMENT</u> – Given the failure to realise any of the “shared services” improvements through collaboration work across north Wales, it is doubtful whether it will</p>

services including employment and human resources, procurement, legal, insurance and risk, audit etc. (It is suggested that this must be in place by the end of the 2016/17 financial year)	must be established to provide back office functions and common services across the public sector by the end of the 2016-2017 financial year. The Welsh Government must co-ordinate and oversee its development and establishment. (paragraph 2.116)	succeed on a national level, certainly within the type of timetable proposed. There might be an opportunity to consider collaboration across authorities again when any reorganisation comes about as the structure will be broken down and recreated in any case, but it is doubtful whether this is possible across each one of the services noted.
--	--	---

2. FIELD / THEMES – SCALE AND CAPABILITY

WILLIAMS ANALYSIS	WILLIAMS RECOMMENDATIONS	COMMENTS / POSSIBLE RESPONSE
(i) The capacity arguments for the challenge ahead, cost and overheads and the importance of maintaining boundaries which already exist are strongly in favour of creating larger establishments through mergers.	23. We therefore recommend merging the 22 local authorities we have into larger units. This should be done by amalgamating local authorities already in existence rather than re-drawing boundaries. (paragraph 3.72)	<u>COMMENT</u> – There is an argument as to whether the new units the report suggests are large enough and amended proposals might go to this direction. The report’s argument for working within existing boundaries is a pragmatic one rather than logical.

3. FIELD / THEME – GOVERNANCE, SCRUTINY AND DELIVERY

WILLIAMS ANALYSIS	WILLIAMS RECOMMENDATIONS	COMMENTS / POSSIBLE RESPONSE
(i) Good scrutiny is a crucial element of any governance arrangement. Work on what is good scrutiny has been in the pipeline. BUT there are fundamental weaknesses in the existing scrutiny arrangements and they must be developed.	31. We recommend therefore that the importance, status and value of scrutiny must be prioritised, continually sustained and reinforced. To support this: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All elected members, independent members, non-executive directors, and officers must acknowledge the importance and value of scrutiny in improving services for people and organisations in Wales. The independence of scrutiny must be strongly asserted and 	<u>COMMENT</u> - Agree, but there are capacity problems (in terms of members and officers) facing every Council in particular with dwindling resources. <u>RECOMMENDATION</u> – The work on good scrutiny characteristics completed recently in Wales is a starting point but we must move forward. It is suggested that there should be collaboration with the Public Scrutiny Centre possibly to move on from those characteristics to practical proposals for improving the quality of scrutiny on individual council level.

	<p>protected as must its essentially constructive and positive nature;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive members, non-executive directors, and officers, must similarly acknowledge the value of scrutiny in helping them to deliver services better. They must publicise and explain their decisions clearly, and invite scrutiny of them, including pre-decision, willingly and openly. They must also acknowledge and respond to scrutiny reports promptly and in good faith; and • As part of raising the stature and profile of scrutiny, and engaging citizens, there must be increased visibility of the outputs and outcomes from local government scrutiny. (paragraph 4.47) 	
<p>(ii) Local Services Boards and others need to have clear and definite plans about the difference they want to make (It is recommended that the Welsh Government introduces the new governance model by 2015)</p>	<p>36. The Welsh Government, in consultation with LSB members, must reform LSBs so that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They have clear, ambitious and realistic purpose and vision; • By 2015 there is a national single, robust, governance model in place which is equitable and transparent and which ensures that decisions are based on identifiable responsibilities and actions, joint rights and obligations, creating clear accountability for delivery; • They are empowered to take significant and meaningful decisions which will contribute to attaining their purpose and vision; and • They comprise senior representatives from each organisation who have relevant authority and influence. (paragraph 4.66) 	<p><u>COMMENT</u> – There is an opportunity for the Gwynedd and Anglesey Local Services Board to take advantage of the fact that it has already been rationalised to move on soon to agree a definite and clear vision for its work and to show clearly what difference it will make to citizens.</p>

4. FIELD / THEME – LEADERSHIP, CULTURE AND VALUES

WILLIAMS ANALYSIS	WILLIAMS RECOMMENDATIONS	COMMENTS / POSSIBLE RESPONSE
(i) Public sector officers require a set of values	<p>50. We therefore recommend that in order to drive this change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The new public service leadership and development centre must establish a time limited project to promote and embed a consistent set of public service values; • These values must be developed within two years through a collaborative and meaningful process involving staff from across public service organisations and at all levels; • Once agreed, the leaders of all public service organisations in Wales should adopt these as the core values to which any local or sector specific variations are added; and • The public service leadership and development centre must use values-based development as a principle of all training and development opportunities, demonstrating the shared values in all aspects of learning. (paragraph 5.96) 	<p><u>COMMENT</u> – The idea of common values is to be welcomed and it would be good to see a national move to this direction with a similar focus to the work of the Council’s Gwynedd Way placing the citizens at the centre of everything</p>

5. FIELD / THEME – PERFORMANCE AND PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT

WILLIAMS ANALYSIS	WILLIAMS RECOMMENDATIONS	COMMENTS / POSSIBLE RESPONSE
(i) There are robust examples from other countries (e.g. New Zealand) and a clear focus on national and local levels (It is	54. We therefore recommend that, by the end of 2014, the Welsh Government must bring greater clarity and distinction between different measures,	<u>COMMENT</u> – There is room to have a new national pattern of performance indicators which is clear and coherent along the following lines:-

<p>suggested that the Welsh Government ensures better clarity on this by the end of 2014)</p>	<p>indicators and targets in use. At the national level, performance measurement and management should focus on what needs to be done, not on how it is done. So in particular, these reforms must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draw out clearly the key outcomes and priorities the Welsh Government wishes to see delivered; and • Create more streamlined and consistent ways of measuring service performance below that, without prescribing the detailed measurement of operational and delivery matters. (paragraph 6.65) 	<p>a) A small number of indicators determined on a national basis b) A number of indicators which are the subject of discussion and agreement between the Assembly and the councils and their partners c) A number of other key indicators agreed by individual councils</p> <p>NB b) and c) should be subject to local discussion with citizens</p>
<p>(ii) Proposals to encourage performance amongst local partners should be developed</p>	<p>55. We recommend that the Welsh Government develops and concludes high-level agreements with each local service board, setting out how the board and its members will contribute to national strategic outcomes while also addressing local needs and priorities. (paragraph 6.80)</p>	<p><u>RECOMMENDATION</u> – An early decision should be sought to see whether this will be implemented or not. If it will be, the Local Services Board should be encouraged to look at determining key indicators for the area so that the local partners are ready for any national discussion.</p>