

Public Document Pack

ADDITIONAL CIRCULATION



Community Planning Aberdeen Management Group

The undernoted item is circulated in connection with the meeting of the **COMMUNITY PLANNING ABERDEEN MANAGEMENT GROUP** to be held here in the Town House on **MONDAY, 14 JULY 2014 at 2.00 pm.**

BUSINESS

- 9 Draft Minute of the CPA Board Meeting of 2 July 2014 - for information (Pages 1 - 16)

Should you require any further information about this agenda, please contact Allison Swanson, tel. (52)2822 or email aswanson@aberdeencity.gov.uk

COMMUNITY PLANNING ABERDEEN BOARD

2 JULY 2014

Present:-

Adrian Watson, Vice Chair, Police Scotland,
Councillors Graham and Laing,
Ken Eddie, Civic Forum,
Angela Scott, Aberdeen City Council,
Duncan Smith, Scottish Fire and Rescue Service,
Linda Smith, NHS Grampian, (as a substitute for Richard Carey),
John Tomlinson, ACVO

Also Present:-

Anthony Clark, Zoe McGuire, Rebecca Seidel (Audit Scotland),
Sir Lewis Ritchie, (NHS Grampian),
Neil Carnegie (for items 1 to 4), Martin Murchie, Hugh Murdoch (for item 8 only), Liz Taylor (for items 4 to 7 only), and Allison Swanson (Aberdeen City Council)

Apologies:-

Councillors Allan and Kiddie, Richard Carey, Gordon McIntosh, Charles Muir and Francesca Osowska.

Topic	Discussion/Decision	Action By
1. Welcome and Introductions	The Vice Chair welcomed all present to the meeting, in particular he welcomed Councillor Laing, Leader of Aberdeen City Council, to her first meeting of the Board and explained that he would Chair today's meeting.	
2. Community Safety Hub	<p>The Chair advised that the first item of business would be for the Board to observe the daily tasking and co-ordination group meeting which was normally held at the Community Safety Hub.</p> <p>Prior to the daily briefing commencing Neil Carnegie, Community Safety Manager and lead officer for the Community Safety Partnership, provided a background to the establishment of the Community Safety Hub, as well as an overview of its function.</p> <p>He advised that the Community Safety Hub, which was established last year, provided a dedicated office environment for community safety partners and was located in the Frederick Street Centre.</p>	

Topic	Discussion/Decision	Action By
	<p>He explained that co-locating services enabled greater collaboration towards the delivery of more effective and sustainable solutions to enhance community safety in Aberdeen. Specifically regarding the daily tasking and co-ordination group meeting which the Board would observe, he explained that this process was central to Hub operations. The 'short and sharp' daily meeting enabled all relevant partners to review community safety incidents that had occurred over the previous 24 hours. This enabled quicker identification of emerging problems and therefore improved responses. The daily tasking meeting principally focused on fire safety, violence, domestic abuse and antisocial behaviour incidents.</p> <p>The Board then observed the daily tasking and co-ordination group meeting chaired by Sergeant Karen Main.</p> <p>Following the end of the daily meeting, Board members asked a number of questions of the group regarding the following matters: data sharing between all partners; key factors which had led to the reduction in anti-social behaviour and the use of case conferences following from the information presented at the daily meetings.</p> <p>Thereafter, the Board asked the Group if there were any areas it wished to challenge the Board on; whether there were any challenges currently being experienced and whether there were any barriers stopping the further development of the Hub and, if there were, how could the Board support it to overcome these issues. In response, Neil Carnegie advised that sustainability of the approach was important, he highlighted that the process implemented was achieving outcomes and to ensure those outcomes were sustained partners needed to continue to invest in the Hub. He also highlighted the clear links to health and social care and in this regard advised that the Group needed regular attendance and input from health and social care, however unfortunately participation by that sector at present was not consistent</p> <p><u>The Board resolved:-</u> (i) to thank the daily tasking and co-ordination group; and</p>	Angela

Topic	Discussion/Decision	Action By
<p>3. Health of the City – Public Health</p>	<p>(ii) to note the issues raised regarding participation at the Group and the importance of sustainability and that respective partners would explore these outwith the meeting.</p> <p>The Board welcomed Sir Lewis Ritchie, Director of Public Health, NHS Grampian, who was present to provide a presentation on improving health and reducing inequalities in partnership.</p> <p>Sir Ritchie provided an overview of the economic profile of the city, namely a wealthy city; a city with low unemployment; a city with a rich heritage, a city with a significant pool of assets; and a city with an economy where wealth was closely correlated with health at an individual level. However, despite this overview, he explained that the evidence indicated that overall economic health did not necessarily translate into healthy communities.</p> <p>He advised of the changing public health needs of the city's population and the change in service delivery required to meet these needs.</p> <p>With regards life expectancy, he explained that Grampian's life expectancy, with 77.3 years for men and 81.3 years for women, was above the European Region average. However, the gap between life expectancy and healthy life expectancy was wider in the most deprived areas. In this regard, he explained that on comparing the most deprived with the least deprived 10% of the population, healthy life expectancy for the most deprived was more than 22 years shorter (men and women).</p> <p>Specifically, regarding inequalities in public health in Aberdeen City, he advised that Aberdeen was a tale of two cities. Aberdeen had the lowest life expectancy of the three Grampian Community Health Partnerships. Male life expectancy at birth was just above the Scottish average at 76.3 years and 80.9 years for female life expectancy. Aberdeen ranked 21st out of the 36 Community Health Partnerships across Scotland for male life expectancy and 20th for female life expectancy. For those in the 15% most deprived areas of Aberdeen, born since 2006, life expectancy at birth remained around 6 years less than for their most affluent neighbours for males and around 5 years less than for females.</p> <p>Sir Ritchie explained that in order to reduce the inequality within the city and to improve the life expectancy of the most deprived, the Community Planning Partnership needed to support and embed partnership working towards this matter, as well as supporting prevention and earlier</p>	<p>Scott/Richard Carey</p>

Topic	Discussion/Decision	Action By
	<p>detection of illnesses to meet the needs of all in the most cost effective manner. With regards the importance of partnership working, Sir Ritchie provided examples of achievements within public health which had been delivered as a result of partnership working and again emphasised the importance of individual, community, organisation and collaborative partnership. He also highlighted areas where partners could assist, i.e. the sharing and collation of data more effectively to predict the future and potentially achieve savings. As an example, he explained that at present the NHS only collated alcohol brief interventions, however it would strengthen the data set and assist in achieving potential savings surrounding this area if this was applied by all partners.</p> <p>With regards alcohol consumption, he explained that there was a known association between alcohol consumption and health and wellbeing, with increasing consumption associated with over fifty health conditions (physical and mental) and a range of negative social, legal, and economic outcomes. Brief interventions in primary and secondary care were effective at reducing alcohol consumption and associated harms. The inclusion of opportunistic delivery of brief interventions as a HEAT target was in recognition that alcohol was now a significant enough social problem to warrant being put to the top of the clinical agenda. Thereafter, he provided a detailed analysis of the potential savings which could be achieved if the average alcohol consumption could be reduced. Sir Ritchie, highlighted other areas where partnership working could assist in achieving healthy lives and reducing costs.</p> <p>Finally, he advised that although most health indices were better for Grampian than the Scottish average, this did not mean that partners should be complacent. The health inequalities within the city remained a challenge requiring our attention. In addition, pressures of an aging population were upon us and set to increase. Evidence indicated that effective collaboration was working to good effect and should be progressed to achieve benefits for all. He explained that moving forward, if the City was to reduce health inequalities, then efforts needed to be concentrated on those whose needs were greatest.</p> <p>Thereafter, the Board asked a number of questions regarding health inequalities in the city to Sir Ritchie.</p> <p>The Board resolved:-</p>	

Topic	Discussion/Decision	Action By
	<p>(i) to thank Sir Ritchie for his attendance and informative presentation; and (ii) to request Angela Scott to discuss with Sir Ritchie and Charles Muir (1) the regular involvement of public health in Community Planning and (2) the potential for Partners to apply alcohol brief interventions.</p>	Angela Scott
<p>4. Audit Scotland – Follow Up</p>	<p>With reference to item 5 of the minute of the CPA of 28 January, the Board welcomed Anthony Clark, Zoe McGuire, Rebecca Seidel, Audit Scotland, to today's meeting who were present for an informal follow-up visit following the audit of the Partnership undertaken last year.</p> <p>Mr Clark explained that he would welcome some feedback from the Board in relation to the following three areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What were the key areas where significant progress had been made over the last year in Aberdeen; 2. What were the main challenges or barriers that were limiting further improvement? 3. What were the major successes in delivering improvements through partnership working and community planning in Aberdeen? <p>In relation to question 1, the Board advised that the leadership and governance of the Partnership had progressed significantly over the last year and all key actions in this regard had been undertaken. This current structure, with explicit roles and responsibilities, had brought renewed commitment and confidence to invest time and resources to community planning.</p> <p>During the course of the discussion regarding the Partnership's structure, it was highlighted that there was no business sector representation on the Board. However, it was noted that the business sector participated through ACSEF, the Partnership's Economic Growth Thematic Group and that the business sector was also represented on the Reference Group.</p> <p>The Board advised that the Partnership had started to identify the implications of the Community Empowerment and Renewal Bill and that the discussions held by the Board would then be fed back to each Partner's respective organisations.</p> <p>With regards question 2, the Board advised that despite Partners going through extensive and challenging structural change, the Partnership had continued not only to commit to community</p>	

Topic	Discussion/Decision	Action By
	<p>planning during this time, but had also implemented extensive improvements and continued to further develop.</p> <p>Partners also highlighted difficulties arising from new legislation not tying up with or reflecting existing legislation, as well as challenges experienced when decisions taken locally in accordance with policy and priorities were overruled by the Scottish Government.</p> <p>In relation to question 3, the Board highlighted a number of successes, including (1) the establishment of the Community Safety Hub; (2) the business model adopted by the Community Safety Partnership; (3) the early intervention and preventative spend pilot being undertaken by the Community Safety Partnership in Torry; (4) the strategic workforce planning group funded by the Change Fund and (5) Partners participation in Community Councils.</p> <p>The Board emphasised Partners' commitment to community planning and to working collaboratively to add real value for all.</p> <p>The Board resolved:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) to thank Anthony Clark, Zoe McGuire, Rebecca Seidel, Audit Scotland, for attending today's meeting. (ii) to request all Thematic and Multi-lateral Priority Group to clarify the involvement of the business sector on their respective groups. 	Thematic and Multi-lateral Priority Groups
5. Minute of Previous Meeting of 19 March 2014	<p>The Board had before it the minute of its previous meeting of 19 March 2014, for approval.</p> <p>The Board resolved:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) to approve the minute as an accurate record; and (ii) in relation to item (Minutes of Previous Meetings of the CPA Management Group), resolution (ii), to note that the matter of public transport improvements had been referred to Nestrans and once a response had been received this would be circulated to the Board by way of email. 	Martin Murchie
6. Communication and Engagement	With reference to item 6 of the minute of its meeting of 19 March 2014, the Board had before it the draft Communication and Engagement Group Action Plan 2014-2015 for approval.	

Topic	Discussion/Decision	Action By
<p>Group Action Plan 2014-2015</p>	<p>Speaking in furtherance of the Action Plan, Joyce Duncan provided an overview of the role and remit of the Group, namely to ensure effective engagement on and communication of local priorities set out in the Joint Single Outcome Agreement and Development Plan and the progress made on improving outcomes for citizens in Aberdeen.</p> <p>She advised that the Group had arranged a workshop to clarify ideas and actions regarding engagement and any actions resulting from that session would be added to the action plan. She also highlighted that the updated website had now gone live, albeit was still a work in progress and provided updates on other areas contained in the action plan.</p> <p>With regards engagement, she explained that a cross sector group was looking at appropriate engagement methods to ensure that the method adopted provided an easy to understand route map for engagement with the Partnership and assured consideration of the comments received and a response issued. The aim was, by this time next year, for public participation to have increased and new views to have been considered and acted upon if appropriate.</p> <p>The Board welcomed the update and thanked Joyce and the Communication and Engagement Group for all of the progress achieved to date.</p> <p>Partners discussed extensively the benefits and practicalities of each Thematic and Multi-lateral Group having service user representation. During the course of the discussion, Partners noted that it was the intention of officers leading the establishment of the Older Peoples' Thematic Group that the membership of the group would be older people who would take ownership of the work of the group and would invite officers to attend. It was also noted that each Thematic and Multi-lateral Group had a representative from the Civic Forum, and that they would represent Community Councils and service users and that third sector representatives were also currently being identified for each group. On this basis, it was proposed that the Civic Forum be asked to demonstrate how they were representing service users, as well as communities.</p> <p><u>The Board resolved:-</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) to approve the Communication and Engagement Group Action Plan 2014-2015; (ii) with regards item 10 (Monitoring and Evaluation) of the Action Plan, to note that the key measures for community engagement (item 10.1) and the community engagement 	<p>Joyce Duncan</p> <p>Joyce Duncan</p>

Topic	Discussion/Decision	Action By
	<p>standards (item 10.2) would be submitted to a future meeting of the Board for consideration; with regards item 3 (Planning), to note that the Communication and Engagement Strategy for the Partnership, which would set out the commitments and approach locally and meet the requirements of the Community Empowerment Bill, would be submitted to a future meeting of the Board for consideration;</p> <p>(iii) to agree that, in the first instance, that the Civic Forum be asked to demonstrate how they were, and if they were able to, represent service users, as well as communities on each of the Thematic and Multi-lateral Priority Groups; and</p> <p>(iv) to thank Joyce Duncan and the Communication and Engagement Group for all of the progress achieved to date.</p>	<p>Joyce Duncan</p> <p>Joyce Duncan</p>
<p>7. Reshaping Care for Older People – Change Fund Update</p>	<p>With reference to item 8 of the minute of its meeting of 19 March 2014, the Board had before it a report which (a) provided an update on progress to date with the Reshaping Care for Older People Change Fund; (b) outlined the plans for the final year of the Change Fund and (c) aimed to give assurance regarding the exit strategy from projects funded by the Change Fund.</p> <p>The report explained that a Change Fund was created by Scottish Government to provide four year funding to allow significant redesign of the model of care to progress. 2014/15 was the fourth and final year of the fund.</p> <p>Appended to the report was a report submitted to the national Joint Improvement Team giving an update on progress in addition to outlining the plans for using the fund during 2014/15.</p> <p>The report advised that one of the biggest challenges with the Change Fund had been spending the money. Due to recruitment difficulties and capacity issues, it had not always been possible to achieve the timelines intended. However, the Cabinet Secretary had indicated that no further slippage would be tolerated and any unspent funding would have to be returned to the Government on 31 March 2015. To ensure that all agencies progressed their plans on time, the Aberdeen Health and Social Care Partnership had identified a lead manager to oversee the use of the fund during 2014/15</p> <p>With regards moving forward, the report advised that the Government had announced the creation of the Integrated Care Change Fund which would be available in 2015/16. The Health</p>	

Topic	Discussion/Decision	Action By
	<p>and Social Care Partnership was developing a process for creating a plan for use of this funding and this plan must be completed by December 2014. This fund (reflecting the focus of the integration agenda) would be available to support redesign and change in all adult services, but was not to be considered an extension of the present Change Fund.</p> <p>In relation to risks, the report explained that there was a risk that all funds were not utilised in 2014/15 and that spending was returned to the Scottish Government. To mitigate this risk the Change Fund Group was meeting regularly to review actual spend against the plan and would reallocate slippage in year. There was also a risk that some organisations might not implement their exit strategy. Work was ongoing with all partner organisations to get assurance that exit strategies were being pursued.</p> <p>The report recommended: that the Board -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) note the joint effort by all four sectors (Local Authority, NHS, Third and Independent Care Sectors) to work together to oversee the allocation and use of the Change Fund and that decisions on Change Fund allocation had been made by the four partners together and all had participated to ensure services for older people were improved; (b) note the progress that had been achieved in moving from traditional services to more innovative flexible models of care and also the increased focus on early intervention and prevention and joint working with the third and independent sectors; (c) note the approach taken to ensuring an effective exit strategy was in place; and (d) note the evidence of increasing spend on early intervention and prevention, and the plans for spending the fund in 2014/15. <p>There followed an extensive discussion regarding the risk that all funds would not be utilised in 2014/2015 and therefore might have to be returned to the Scottish Government. In this regard, Liz Taylor assured Partners that the Change Fund Group was seeking updates on spend against the plan from all projects on a regular basis and where it had been identified that a project was not going to be able to utilise their full funding allocation this money was being reallocated by the Group as per an agreed criteria. During the course of the discussion, it was acknowledged that clarification from the Scottish Government regarding whether all funds had to be spend in the financial year and if not returned, and whether funding which had been committed but not spent</p>	

Topic	Discussion/Decision	Action By
	<p>by a project could be retained.</p> <p>The Board resolved:-</p> <p>(i) to approve the recommendations; and</p> <p>(ii) to request Liz Taylor (1) to collate more robust data on the outcomes under the various themes and that this information, along with an indication of the projects which the Health and Social Care Partnership might wish to continue to support by way of the Integrated Care Change Fund which would be available in 2015/16 be submitted to the Board this financial year and (2) once the Transitional Leadership Group had determined the delivery model for services post integration to submit a story board on the emerging model.</p>	Liz Taylor
8. Smarter Places Reviews	<p>With reference to item 8 of the minute of its meeting of 19 March 2014, the Board had before it a report which set out the process followed during the recent Smarter Places review of the four communities to the south of the River Dee (Cove, Kincorth, Loirston and Torry), the findings and the potential uses of such reviews in supporting collaborative working, transformational change to services and asset rationalisation of publicly owned assets across the city.</p> <p>The report explained that as part of the wider assessment of the potential uses/occupancy of the new secondary school to replace Kincorth and Torry academies a 'Smarter Places' review was arranged. The review was facilitated by Scottish Futures Trust, who had undertaken a number of similar exercises elsewhere in Scotland. In parallel with this task, a masterplan was developed to establish the likely building/uses which could be strategically established in the area around the new school given the future expansion of the Loirston area and the planning approvals surrounding Aberdeen FC's new stadium.</p> <p>The workshops were progressed over three half day sessions during December 2013 and January 2014. All of the operational services were invited to participate by having service representatives present. In addition Police Scotland, Fire Services Scotland, Aberdeen College, SNH, SEPA, and NHS Grampian Service were invited to participate. In the end most services/organisations were able to contribute to the review and its outputs.</p> <p>With over one million square feet of public building in the area the first inclination was to make spontaneous decisions around possible rationalisation and closures however the approach taken</p>	

Topic	Discussion/Decision	Action By
	<p>concentrated on the services available in the communities, whether they are likely to change with time and what likelihood there is for services at a local or strategic level to move into or out of the area. This provided a basis of looking forward at each community needs and how properties, and especially what was available within them, could assist in delivering benefits and outcomes.</p> <p>The key factors, as well as outputs, that were in play across the four communities (three existing and one to be developed) and the influences/considerations of a local context were set out in the report.</p> <p>Following the workshops, officers had continued the discussion with SFT's who had indicated a willingness to continue supporting the city in such reviews until we had developed our own resources/expertise to conduct such reviews in future. The report explained that this approach had been well used elsewhere in Scotland and avoided the inclination to look at asset management and property rationalisation separate from improving or indeed transforming service delivery through a more joined up approach to improve outcomes. The first stage required officers and representatives of the wider public sector to identify possible next steps without having to have a defined action plan. Future stages would use the evidence gathered at this first stage to forward plan more strategically across the public sector and to bring community representatives into the debate and planning phases.</p> <p>The report recommended:</p> <p>that the Board -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) note the outputs from the 'Cove, Kincorth, Loirston, Torry' review; (b) acknowledge that this diagnostic approach could provide a possible means of strategically approaching the future delivery of services, and the consequences for public assets, in communities across the city; and (c) agree that officers develop a preliminary programme of reviews to reflect the wider opportunities being progressed by the various public sector parties across the city. <p>The Board welcomed the report and discussed the proposed approach to services and asset rationalisation of publicly owned assets across the city extensively, during which it was highlighted that each Partner would require to discuss the proposal, along with the outcome of the initial review, with their respective organisations and thereafter advise whether they would commit to the</p>	

Topic	Discussion/Decision	Action By
	<p>process. Partners also discussed the appropriate forum for discussing this proposal moving forward. In this regard, it was suggested that the Hub Scotland North Territory Partnership Board (HSNTPB) could undertake this role.</p> <p>The Board resolved:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) to approve recommendations (a) and (b); (ii) to agree that officers develop a preliminary programme of reviews, including communities just outside the city boundary, to reflect the wider opportunities being progressed by the various public sector parties across the city; (iii) to request Hugh Murdoch to advise the Board of the appointed representatives on the HSNTPB to enable the Board to determine whether the HSNTPB was the appropriate body to discuss and potentially oversee the proposed approach; and (iv) to agree that each Partner discuss the proposal with their respective organisations and that Hugh Murdoch liaise with each organisation in this regard and report back to the next meeting of the Board on how the public sector collectively wished to take this proposal forward. 	<p>Hugh Murdoch Hugh Murdoch</p> <p>Hugh Murdoch</p> <p>Partners/Hugh Murdoch</p>
<p>9. Minutes of the Community Planning Aberdeen Management Group of 13 January and 24 February 2014</p>	<p>The Board had before it the minutes of meetings of the Community Planning Aberdeen Management Group of 13 January and 24 February 2014, for information.</p> <p>The Board resolved:- to note the minutes.</p>	
<p>10. Community Planning Aberdeen Management Group Progress Report</p>	<p>With reference to item 4 of the minute of its meeting of 19 March 2014, the Board had before it a report which provided an update from the Community Planning Aberdeen Management Group which advised of the agreed governance and reporting timeline for all Community Planning Thematic and Multi-lateral Priority Groups.</p> <p>The report advised that at the Management Group meeting on 24 February 2014, lead officers were asked to provide an update on progress made on the following key tasks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of groups 	

Topic	Discussion/Decision	Action By
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attendance of Chairs and Lead Officers at meetings • Approval of role, remit and membership • Complete story board materials • Update on membership attendance • Approval of work plans • Submission of performance reports within the timeline <p>A summary of the current status of each of the above areas was provided.</p> <p>With regards opportunities and risks, the report advised the new governance arrangements had provided a clear framework and timeline for reporting which therefore had enabled the CPA Management Group to be aware of slippage at the earliest opportunity. The key risk was that agencies / services had not fully embedded the delivery of the SOA within lead roles in each senior management team or allocated adequate support capacity to support the Thematic and Multi-lateral Priority Groups. There was also a risk that the delivery of key tasks was not fully set out in detailed delivery plans with clearly identified resources to ensure the delivery of the SOA as a core business priority across all partner organisations.</p> <p>The report recommended – that the Board –</p> <p>(a) note the progress to date in relation to the establishment of new governance and reporting arrangements; and</p> <p>(b) give consideration to the capacity issues that might continue to impact on the delivery of the SOA over the next six months and possible resolution.</p> <p>The Board resolved:- to approve recommendation (a) and to thank all Partners for the progress to date.</p>	
11. Joint Inspection of Services for Children and Young People in the Aberdeen	<p>The Board heard from Angela Scott who thanked all Partners for their involvement in the preparation for the Joint Inspection of Services for Children and Young People in the Aberdeen Community Planning Area and advised that there had been a change in the timeline for the inspection and therefore the inspection would be commence on 27 October 2014, two weeks later than originally reported.</p>	

Topic	Discussion/Decision	Action By
Community Planning Area	<p>The Board resolved:- to note the update and that a report on the outcome of the inspection would be submitted to the Board in due course.</p>	
12. CPA Board Development	<p>With reference to item 9 of the minute of its meeting of 19 March 2014, the Board had before it a report which presented the output from the informal evening meeting of the Board on 26 May 2014.</p> <p>The report recommended: that the Board –</p> <p>(a) note the value of the informal evening meeting; and</p> <p>(b) formally agree the “commit to’s” and continue to follow these up.</p> <p>The Board resolved:- to approve the recommendations.</p>	Martin Murchie
13. Board Blether	<p>The Board heard from the Chair who advised that Partners had welcomed the opportunity for informal discussion and challenge held at the informal Board meeting (item 12 refers), to continue with this approach ‘Board Blether’ would be a standing item at the end of Board meetings to enable Partners to share information. On this basis, the Chair asked Partners if they had any matters to bring to the Board’s attention.</p> <p>The following matters were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was to be a Best Value audit of Aberdeen City Council in December 2014; • Discussions regarding an Aberdeen Weighting Allowance continued and Public Sector partners would be invited to join a public sector group to discuss a range of potential solutions, one of which would be a weighting allowance; • The Scottish Parliament’s Local Government and Regeneration Committee had issued a call for evidence in relation to the Community Empowerment and Renewal Bill, with a deadline for submissions of 5 September. Martin Murchie would update the Partnership’s previous submission and circulate to the Board, by way of email, for approval; • The Scottish Government and COSLA had established a transition group to look at the arrangements for the transfer of Community Justice Authority’s to Community Planning 	Martin Murchie

Topic	Discussion/Decision	Action By
	<p>Partnerships; although CPA was not participating on the Group a questionnaire had been issued to all Partnerships for completion. Martin Murchie would draft a response to the questionnaire and send to the Board, by way of email, for approval prior to submission;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Items to be considered by the Board; • Aberdeen Division of Police Scotland had been entered for 14 awards in the national policing awards; • To remind all Partners of the importance of participating fully on the Communications and Engagement Group; and • Communication Releases. <p><u>The Board resolved:-</u> to note the information and actions to be undertaken as recorded above.</p>	
14. Date of Next Meeting	<p>The Board noted that its next meeting was scheduled to be held on 1 October 2014 at 4pm.</p> <p>With regards the next meeting, Duncan Smith advised that the Scottish Fire and Rescue Service would like to host the next meeting at its headquarters on North Anderson Drive, Aberdeen and, if agreeable, by the Board the Service would provide a case study overview of its service delivery at the commencement of the meeting.</p> <p>The Board thanked Duncan for this offer and welcomed the opportunity to receive the case study and asked that the case study be provided to all partner agencies in advance of the meeting.</p>	Duncan Smith

This page is intentionally left blank