

Public Document Pack

JOHN WARD

Director of Corporate Services

Contact: Carley Lavender Tel: 01243 521243
Email: democraticservices@chichester.gov.uk

East Pallant House
1 East Pallant
Chichester
West Sussex
PO19 1TY
Tel: 01243 785166
www.chichester.gov.uk



A meeting of the **Corporate Governance & Audit Committee** will be held virtually on **Monday 27 September 2021 at 2.00 pm**

MEMBERS: Mr F Hobbs (Chairman), Dr K O'Kelly (Vice-Chairman), Miss H Barrie, Mr J Brown, Mr A Dignum, Mr T Johnson, Mr D Palmer and Mr P Wilding

AGENDA

- 1 **Chairman's Announcements**
Any apologies for absence that have been received will be noted at this point.
- 2 **Approval of Minutes** (Pages 1 - 6)
The committee is requested to approve the minutes of its ordinary meeting held on 19 July 2021.
- 3 **Urgent items**
The chairman will announce any urgent items that due to special circumstances are to be dealt with under the Late Items agenda item.
- 4 **Declarations of Interest**
These are to be made by members of the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee or other Chichester District Council members present in respect of matters on the agenda for this meeting.
- 5 **Public Question Time**
The procedure for submitting public questions in writing by no later than noon 2 working days before the meeting is available [here](#) or from the Democratic Services Officer (whose contact details appear on the front page of this agenda).
- 6 **Fraud Prevention Report 2020/2021** (Pages 7 - 10)
The committee is requested to consider this report and the corporate approach to fighting fraud and to note that the Council will actively pursue potential frauds identified.
- 7 **Corporate Health & Safety and Business Continuity Management Report** (Pages 11 - 18)
The committee is asked to consider and note the Council's arrangements in place for monitoring and controlling the risks associated with health and safety and business continuity matters.

- 8 **Annual Partnerships Report 2021** (Pages 19 - 53)
The committee is requested to note the Annual Partnerships report.
- 9 **Complaints, Freedom of Information Requests and Data Protection Analysis 2020/21**
Report to follow.
- 10 **Exclusion of the Press and Public**
There are no restricted items for consideration.
- 11 **Late items**
The committee will consider any late items as follows:
a) Items added to the agenda papers and made available for public inspection
b) Items that the chairman has agreed should be taken as a matter of urgency by reason of special circumstances to be reported at the meeting

NOTES

1. The press and public may be excluded from the meeting during any item of business where it is likely that there would be disclosure of "exempt information" as defined in section 100A of and Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.
2. Restrictions have been introduced on the distribution of paper copies of supplementary information circulated separately from the agenda as follows:
 - a) Members of the Corporate Governance & Audit Committee, the Cabinet and Senior Officers receive paper copies of the supplements (including appendices).
 - b) The press and public may view this information on the council's website here [here](#) unless they contain exempt information.

NON-CORPORATE GOVERNANCE AND AUDIT COMMITTEE MEMBER COUNCILLORS SPEAKING AT THE MEETING

Standing Order 22.3 of Chichester District Council's Constitution provides that members of the Council may, with the Chairman's consent, speak at a committee meeting of which they are not a member, or temporarily sit and speak at the committee table on a particular item but shall then return to the public seating area.

The Chairman intends to apply this standing order at Overview and Scrutiny Committee meetings by requesting that members should normally seek the Chairman's consent in writing by email in advance of the meeting. They should do this by noon on the Friday before the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting, outlining the substance of the matter that they wish to raise. The word normally is emphasised because there may be unforeseen circumstances where a member can assist the conduct of business by his or her contribution and where the Chairman would therefore retain their discretion to allow the contribution without the aforesaid notice

Public Document Pack Agenda Item 2



Minutes of the meeting of the **Corporate Governance & Audit Committee** held in Virtual on Monday 19 July 2021 at 2.00 pm

Members Present: Mr F Hobbs (Chairman), Dr K O'Kelly (Vice-Chairman), Mr A Dignum, Mr T Johnson, Mr D Palmer and Mr P Wilding

Members not present: Miss H Barrie and Mr J Brown

In attendance by invitation: Mr K Suter (Ernst & Young LLP)

Officers present: Mrs H Belenger (Divisional Manager for Financial Services), Mr N Bennett (Divisional Manager for Democratic Services), Mr M Catlow (Group Accountant (Technical and Exchequer)), Mr A Forward (ICT Manager), Mr S James (Principal Auditor) and Mr J Ward (Director of Corporate Services)

77 **Chairman's Announcements**

Apologies were received from Cllr Barrie, Cllr Brown and Cllr Johnson for the first hour of the meeting.

78 **Approval of Minutes**

RESOLVED

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 March 2021 were agreed as a correct record.

79 **Urgent items**

There were no urgent items.

80 **Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

81 **Public Question Time**

There were no public questions.

82 **Audit Plan for year ended 31 March 2021**

Prior to Mr White outlining the report Mr Suter provided the following update. He confirmed that the Plan presented to members is later than usual due to the backlog from the Covid-19 Pandemic. He added that it will continue to effect the coming year

and as a result many audits including Chichester will have to be delayed. All audits have been reviewed and Chichester's will now take place at the rescheduled time of October. He confirmed that the delay does not relate to any concerns around the council's finance team.

Mr White then took the Committee through the report.

Cllr Wilding in relation to the timing of the audit wished to note that the council's finances appear are in good order and therefore the delay could be accepted on the basis of no concerns.

Cllr Wilding with reference to page 23 wished to note that going concerns should not be an issue for the council. Mr White explained that going concerns were unlikely to be a worry. He clarified that the reference relates more to the disclosure of a going concern rather than the going concern itself.

Cllr O'Kelly asked whether there is uncertainty over the time it will take to audit Covid-19 funding or whether lessons can be learnt from larger authorities who will be audited first. Mr White explained that this is likely to be the case by Chichester's audit.

Cllr Dignum with regard to the Statement of Fraud on page 5 asked what measures the council has in place to mitigate cyber security. Mr White explained that if specific weaknesses are identified specialists could be brought in to assist the council.

RESOLVED

The Committee noted the Ernst & Young LLP's Audit Plan for year ended 31 March 2021.

83 2020-2021 Treasury Management outturn report

Mr Catlow outlined the report and invited questions from the Committee.

Cllr O'Kelly requested clarification of the consultation return. Mr Catlow hoped the timing would be sooner rather than later.

Cllr Wilding requested the original questions alongside the responses detailed in the report. Mr Catlow explained that he had considered their inclusion but instead had summarised in section 7.6 of the report.

Cllr Hobbs with regard to inflation rates asked what impact an interest rate rise would have on the council. Mr Catlow explained that it is difficult to make firm recommendations due to the current uncertainty.

RESOLVED

The Committee reviewed the Treasury activity summarised and provided no further comments to Cabinet.

84 **Corporate Governance and Audit Committee Work Programme 2021-22**

Mrs Belenger confirmed that the S106 and CIL Annual Monitoring report and S106 annual exceptions report will move to the October meeting. The September meeting will receive the Complaints, Freedom of Information requests and Data Protection Analysis 2020-21 in its place.

85 **Housing Benefit Subsidy Audit Position**

Mrs Rogers introduced the report.

Cllr O'Kelly requested a comparison from last year and expectations for next year. Mrs Rogers explained that this year's position is overall more positive than last year. With regard to next year she agreed to include some of this year's figures in the report for comparison purposes.

Cllr Wilding congratulated Mrs Rogers on the achievements outlined in the report.

RESOLVED

The Committee noted the outcome of the 2019/20 Audit Report.

86 **Progress Report - Update on Audit Plans 2020/2021 and 2021/22**

Mr James introduced the report. He confirmed one follow up Audit with limited assurance was due to the need to implement actions that had been identified. He added that a part-time Auditor had retired on the 8th June and SLT had agreed to make another part-time Auditor up to a full time post, effective from the 26 July. Mr James outlined that the Auditor is inexperienced and is currently receiving on the job training plus also the 8 weeks that will not be covered it may be necessary for the 2021/2022 Audit Plan to be adjusted in the future. Mr James assured the committee that he would report back to committee if this was necessary.

Cllr O'Kelly requested clarification of the findings related to the Lone Workers Policy as 12 out of 18 addresses were not recorded in line with the Policy. Mr James clarified that the follow up had resulted in the HR Manager issuing reminder guidance to all staff. He added that a further action being considered is to require a postal code. Once this has been agreed it will be revisited at an appropriate time to review whether it has been implemented.

RESOLVED

The Committee noted performance against the audit plan for 2020/21.

87 **Update Following Global Microsoft Exchange Hack**

Mr Forward introduced the report. He introduced the item alongside the ICT Security Plan.

Cllr Wilding requested clarification on the term Zero day. Mr Forward explained that it means that it needs action now as there is no time to effect change.

Cllr Wilding shared concerns about the delay in notification of issues by Microsoft. Mr Forward explained that the issue can be clarification and validation of issues being real. He added that contacts have been developed over the last couple of years to aid intelligence for validation.

Cllr Wilding requested clarification that the council's print function is now back up and running. Mr Forward confirmed.

Cllr Hobbs asked what level of assurance there is that the council's assets would not be wiped out in an attack. Mr Forward explained that funding is not the sole answer as a server build from scratch would take nine months to complete. Mitigation measures are now almost complete for a replica of the server to go live at the site at the Depot. The server will have its own connectivity with data backed up every 20 minutes. Mrs Belenger added that the council is currently tendering for the council's insurances. Insurance providers are considering IT and cyber risk.

Cllr Dignum was reassured by the news of a full back up system. He asked how the back-up system can be protected too. Mr Forward clarified that there is always a chance a virus could spread however the site is a dark site which does not appear on architectural scanning. He explained a further strategy called Honeypotting which can monitor a hack. He confirmed that backing up to tape means that a link to the Depot can be severed immediately. He explained that there would be a split tunnel approach to separate the two systems.

Mr Ward confirmed that members have been kept up-to-date via the Members Bulletin.

RESOLVED

That the Committee are fully briefed on the circumstances, actions and outcomes following the Global Microsoft Exchange Hack in March 2021.

88 ICT Security Plan

This item was covered in the item above.

RESOLVED

That the Committee be advised of the approach being taken to strengthen our cyber defensive capabilities in light of the changing nature of ICT security threats and breaches.

That the ICT Security Plan provides sufficient corporate assurance against the increasing volumes and sophistication of cyber-criminal activity.

Cllr Johnson arrived at the meeting.

Members took a short break.

89 **Constitutional Amendments**

Mr Bennett introduced the report.

There were no questions.

RESOLVED

The Committee noted the amendments to the Constitution made by the Monitoring Officer in the period January 2019 to July 2021.

90 **Strategic Risk Group**

Mrs Belenger explained that this is an annual appointment. The current appointments are Cllr Brown, Cllr Tim Johnson and Cllr O'Kelly.

Cllr Tim Johnson explained that he would no longer be eligible due to political balance.

Cllr Dignum proposed Cllr Hobbs. Mr Tim Johnson seconded the proposal.

RESOLVED

The Corporate Governance and Audit Committee representatives appointed to Strategic Risk Group for the ensuing year are:

Cllr Brown, Cllr Hobbs and Cllr O'Kelly.

91 **Strategic Risk Management Update**

Mrs Belenger introduced the report. She confirmed that due to Covid-19 delays the report had only been seen by the Senior Leadership Team to date and was yet to be taken to members.

Cllr O'Kelly explained that the difficulty in how quickly some projects move in terms of risk and how the fluctuations can be picked up. Mrs Belenger explained that management would consider at monthly meetings where risks are occurring. It should be considered part of business as usual to mitigate risks. Mr Ward explained that in terms of self-isolating that many services can still be run from home. The main service area that had to be managed through Business Continuity Plans during the Pandemic was Chichester Contract Services who have been working in bubbles.

RESOLVED

That the Committee notes the updated Strategic Risk Register and the internal controls in place, plus any associated action plans to manage those risks, and raises any issues or concerns.

92 **Exclusion of the Press and Public**

The Committee was asked to consider in respect of agenda item 15 Strategic Risk Update appendix 1b, agenda item 17 Litigation Risk and appendix, and agenda item 18 Investigatory Powers Commissioners Office Inspection of Surveillance and CHIS Findings and appendix, whether the public, including the press, should be excluded from the meeting on the grounds of exemption under Parts I to 7 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, as indicated against the item and because, in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption of that information outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

The Committee resolved to go into Part II.

93 **Litigation Risk**

Mr Bennett introduced the report.

RESOLVED

The Committee noted that several ongoing matters carry litigation risk and the assessment of that risk by author to the report.

94 **Investigatory Powers Commissioners Office Inspection of surveillance and CHIS findings**

Mr Bennett introduced the report.

RESOLVED

The Committee noted that an inspection took place in March 2021 and that all recommendations from the recent inspection by the Investigatory Powers Commissioners office are being undertaken.

95 **Late items**

There were no late items.

The meeting ended at 3.56 pm

CHAIRMAN

Date:

Chichester District Council

CORPORATE GOVERNANCE & AUDIT COMMITTEE

27 September 2021

Fraud Prevention Report 2020/2021

1. Contacts

Report Author:

Jeremy Todd, Corporate Investigations Officer

Tel: 01243 785166 x4590 E-mail: jtodd@chichester.gov.uk

2. Recommendations

2.1. The committee is requested to consider this report and the corporate approach to fighting fraud to ensure that they fulfil their stewardship role and protect the public purse.

2.2. The committee notes that the Council will actively pursue potential frauds identified through ongoing investigations by the Corporate Investigations Team (CIT).

3. Background

3.1 In 2019/20 it was estimated that Local Authorities uncovered £239.4m of fraud, however this amount is thought to be the tip of the iceberg. Firstly, this is only the uncovered fraud, and secondly (from data in 2019) only 40% of Local Authorities employ dedicated Counter Fraud teams. This is due to the decision to transfer all investigators employed by Local Authorities to the Department for Work and Pensions from 2015. At that time the Council created the role of a Corporate Investigations Officer (CIO) so that it retained the required skills and knowledge to protect all services within the Council from potential fraud. The position was filled by an experienced investigator previously employed on the Housing Benefit Fraud Team. Due to an increase in the work required, additional resources were added to the team from November 2017 when an Assistant Corporate Investigations Officer (ACIO) was recruited (made up of two people in a job share).

3.2 There are a number of tasks that are the responsibility of the CIO. The National Fraud Initiative (NFI) is a biennial exercise that matches data from various sources both within the council and other public sector bodies. The matches are released in January and are reviewed on a calendar year basis. The CIO is the key contact for this; ensuring that all the data is uploaded on time and that when received all the matches are reviewed by the relevant service departments. The CIO gives advice as necessary on the evaluation of any data matches. Additionally there is a yearly NFI match that looks at Council Tax payers who receive a Single Person Discount.

- 3.3 Every year the Council needs to review any long term empty homes in the district to confirm whether the properties remain empty. This is because the New Homes Bonus paid from Central Government takes into account the empty homes within the district and a reduction is made to the bonus paid. Prior to 2016, this work was outsourced at a cost of £14,305 in 2015. Currently this work is done by the CIO in conjunction with Revenues.

4. Outcomes to be achieved.

- 4.1 This report aims to give assurance on the arrangements in place for the prevention and detection of fraud within the council.
- 4.2 To confirm that there are adequate resources available to carry out all investigations and identify the risks of potential frauds across all council services.

5. Proposal

- 5.1. For Councillors and others responsible for audit and governance to review the counter fraud arrangements on an annual basis.

6. Alternatives that have been considered

- 6.1. None.

7. Resource and legal implications

- 7.1. In order to fulfil legal requirements, the CIO is fully conversant with the Police and Criminal Evidence act (PACE), Fraud Act 2006 and Data Protection Act 1998. In addition the CIO has full knowledge of the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act (RIPA).

8. Consultation

- 8.1 None.

9. Community impact and Corporate risks

- 9.1 Having a Corporate Investigations Team (CIT) at Chichester District Council reassures the community that the Council is doing all it can to protect tax payers money.
- 9.2 Mitigating the risk of fraud and corruption is the responsibility of management. Corporate and service specific risks identified are recorded in a Corporate Risk Register. Internal Audit have a four year plan and an annual plan produced on a risk based approach which is reviewed and updated annually, thus responding to

new risks as they arise. However, audit procedures alone cannot guarantee that fraud or corruption will be detected.

- 9.3 Covid 19 has had a major impact on the work the investigation team has been able to undertake since March 2020. Face to face interviews have been stopped and joint working with the Department of Work and Pensions (DWP) has been postponed as the DWP investigators have been redeployed.

10. Main Report

Achievements to Date

- 10.1. In 2020 the CIO, working closely with the Revenue Inspectors on the Empty Home Review project, identified 177 properties that should not have been listed as long term empty because they had been brought back into use. This resulted in additional funding for the Council of £288,395.
- 10.2. The CIT is responsible for looking at the NFI matches that indicate that a Council Tax Single Person Discount of 25% may have been incorrectly awarded. Unlike the other NFI data matches this exercise is undertaken on an annual basis. Last year (2020) the Single Person Discount database was matched against credit reference data. The subsequent investigation of the matches has so far (with a few results to finalise) found £235,352 of incorrectly awarded Single Person Discounts and Council Tax Reductions. The 2021 match is currently underway. This year the check is matching against the electoral roll. So far it has identified £80,255 of incorrectly awarded discounts and benefits.
- 10.3. The biennial NFI matches have now been received and are currently being worked on. The first of the matches completed is a review of the Housing Waiting List. Working with the Homemove Officer, the CIO reviewed the match results and established that 53 people on the list should no longer be on there. They were subsequently removed from the list. The Cabinet Office estimates that removing somebody from a waiting list saves a council £3,240 in various costs, so it is estimated that this action has saved the council £171,720.
- 10.4. The CIT have been heavily involved in the checking of Covid Business Rates Grants, carrying out checks on applications and investigating any grant applications that have been flagged as suspicious. The pre payments checks have confirmed whether the grant applicant is eligible and that the grant is to be paid to the correct person. The investigations (following referrals) have so far prevented two grants being incorrectly paid saving the taxpayer £20,000.
- 10.5. In 2020/2021 the CIT identified a further £4,298 of incorrectly awarded Single Person Discounts, incorrectly awarded benefits and establishing new liabilities for Council Tax. These are cases where there was a referral direct from the Revenue Services team or from the public. One case was successfully prosecuted (jointly with the DWP) leading to a fine for the council tax payer.
- 10.6. With opportunities for fraud increasing due to the additional grants being made available, the CIO has carried out fraud awareness training with the revenues

teams to assist them in spotting potentially fraudulent applications from the outset.

11. The Year Ahead

- 11.1. The 2021 NFI matches will continue being worked on throughout the year.
- 11.2. The Empty Home Review is being carried out during August and September 2021.
- 11.3. In October 2018 the CIT started working jointly with the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) on cases of fraud that affect both CDC and the DWP. A number of investigations have already taken place. However Covid 19 has temporarily paused the joint working as DWP investigators have been moved to other duties and are unlikely to return to their roles before September 2021. Joint interviews under caution have been postponed and cases that are with the Crown Prosecution Service are on hold.
- 11.4. The CIT remains available for referrals from all departments, and to date the team have worked with; Housing Benefits, Revenues, Human Resources, Chichester Contract Services, Car Parks, Environmental Health, Housing and Finance.
- 11.5. Future resource plans will be drawn up to identify and prioritise all counter fraud work and will establish those areas with the biggest potential fraud risk.
- 11.6. The Council has a Whistleblowing Policy, which was reviewed and updated in April 2018. No cases were identified through this media during 2019/2020, although this does not include anonymous fraud referrals received by the CIT.
- 11.7. The CIT continues to have an important part to play in identifying potential losses and this has already been demonstrated by the estimated outcomes totalling £800,020 that have been detailed in this report.

12. Conclusion

- 12.1. Overall, the Council continues to operate within a robust framework of policies and procedures. This framework is intended to direct the activity of the Council and its officers and ensure transparency and accountability. Responsible officers are expected to ensure that effective internal control arrangements are in place. Internal Audit is responsible for reviewing these controls annually in order to give assurance to those charged with governance and the CIO is responsible for investigating and reporting on any offences against or within the Council.

13. Appendices

- 13.1. None

14. Background Papers

- 14.1. None

Chichester District Council

Corporate Governance and Audit Committee 27 September 2021

Corporate Health & Safety and Business Continuity Management

1. Contacts

Report Author:

Warren Townsend, Safety and Resilience Manager

Tel: 01243 534605 E-mail: wtownsend@chichester.gov.uk

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 **That the Committee considers and notes the Council's arrangements in place for monitoring and controlling the risks associated with health and safety and business continuity matters.**

3. Background

- 3.1. This report provides an update on the current position of Business Continuity (BC) management arrangements within the Council.
- 3.2. The report also covers a brief overview of the Council's performance in relation to the health, safety and welfare of its staff and anybody else affected by its undertaking.

4. Outcomes to be achieved

- 4.1. To ensure that the Council has a robust business continuity management system that is simple to use in the event of a business interruption, the aim being to ensure that as many services, particularly key services, can continue to operate with as little disruption as possible.
- 4.2. To ensure that the Council is assessing its performance for Health and Safety (H&S) adequately and is concentrating its H&S resources in the correct areas to make improvements.

5. Progress Report for Business Continuity (BC) Management

- 5.1 Plans covering business recovery for council activities that must be reinstated with the first 3-days and over 3-days, and the critical staff list, are stored on the Council's internal IT systems and also on Resilience Direct (Government website for emergency planning - hosted off site). There is a system in place for ensuring that these plans are reviewed on a 6-monthly basis and this continues to work well. BC plans were last reviewed in April 2021.
- 5.2 Clearly CDC is currently operating in one of the most significant business continuity events ever experienced. The key threats have been loss of staff (albeit we have been able to manage this well), lockdown both preventing the normal use of Council premises and social distancing measures preventing

normal capacity/occupancy in Council premises and interruption of normal service delivery. However, the key critical services and the majority of the 'business as usual' services have continued to operate effectively.

- 5.3 CDC's ability to reinstate IT functions after a major loss has always been the biggest challenge for the Council, as it is for many organisations. The project to create and commission our new duplicate server facility (located at the depot) is now in the final stages. Our IT team are creating and commissioning the new duplicate server facility. Current focus is on reconfiguring all (over 100) corporate servers, stretching their IP (Internet Protocol) ranges to include working from the new back-up facility at the depot. This work is scheduled to be completed on 25 September, ahead of a full test over the weekend of 9 October. Once fully functioning, the off-site IT disaster recovery will significantly improve the Council's ability to recover from a business interruption involving loss of IT.

On completion of the project, the off-site facilities will ensure continuation of the Council's key IT systems in the event of losing functionality of the servers at East Pallant House. Having the ability to switch over to back-up servers will put CDC in a much stronger position to recover quickly after a significant IT incident.

- 5.4 A business continuity exercise was due to take place this year – this is currently deferred due to the Covid-19 pandemic.

6. Health and Safety Management

Total accidents for each year

Year	No of incidents
2018 - 2019	106
2019 – 2020	155
2020 - 2021	82

- 6.1 Service areas are required to record and submit, to the Safety and Resilience team, all (including those that are minor) accidents, incidents and near misses. These are all included in the accident statistics in this report. It is important for all accidents, incidents and near misses to be recorded and reported to the Safety and Resilience team to enable trends to be identified. This can prevent significant accidents or incidents occurring in the future. There has been a significant decrease in the number of reported accidents and incidents in 2020/21 but this can probably be explained by the direct results of the Covid-19 pandemic including staff working from home and the lockdowns.

Total number of RIDDOR incidents for each year

Year	Total RIDDOR	>7 days absent	Public to hospital	Major	Dangerous Occurrence
2018 - 2019	3	2	0	1	0
2019 - 2020	9	7	0	2	0
2020 - 2021	6	4	1	1	0

6.2 RIDDOR (Reporting of Injuries Diseases and Dangerous Occurrences Regulations) are certain categories of accidents that are reportable to the enforcing Authority – HSE (Health and Safety Executive). These include:

- deaths at work
- specified injuries (broken bones etc.)
- over 7-day injuries (injuries that result in the person being unable to return to work within a 7-day period); and
- members of the public being taken from the scene to hospital due to an accident that was potentially caused by poor safety management or a physical defect with a building or equipment.

6.3 There were 6 RIDDOR reportable accidents in the 2020-21 period. One of these was an elderly member of the public who reported a laceration to her shin caused by sitting on a broken bench in Priory Park. The other five all affected members of staff at the Westhampnett Depot (mainly over seven day injuries with one “specified” injury).

- Streets operative suffered injury to lower back while removing a bag from a street litter bin
- Streets operative suffered back injury while removing dog waste bags from dog waste bin
- Streets operative was assaulted while he was waiting in his car about to start work
- Grounds Maintenance Operative had his leg trapped by his work vehicle which rolled back onto it trapping his leg against a bollard
- Waste & Recycling Loader tripped over trailing fuel hose at the depot and suffered fracture (specified injury)

6.4 These have all been investigated and discussed with CCS management and there are no common trends beyond the first two (lifting and handling task) that give rise to concern.

Accidents by Type

Accident Type	2018 – 2019	2019 – 2020	2020 – 2021
Burn/Scald	2	0	0
Exposed to, or in contact with, a harmful substance	1	3	0
Fell from a height	4	1	0
Hit by a moving, flying or falling object	14	16	8
Hit by a moving vehicle	4	2	2
Hit something fixed or stationary	14	17	8
Injured by an animal	1	3	2
Injured while handling, lifting or carrying	13	20	8
Near Miss	17	30	15
Not in connection with work activity	3	7	1
Other kind of accident	1	3	3
Pre-existing medical condition	-	0	1

Slipped, tripped or fell on the same level	13	25	15
Contact with electrical discharge	0	0	0
Contact with sharps	3	1	1
Contact with moving machinery or material being machined	3	2	2
Physically assaulted by a person	1	1	1
Stung by an insect	11	7	7
Verbal abuse and threats	1	7	4
Violence & Aggression Third Party (non-staff)	-	10	4

- 6.5 Slips, trips and falls remain the biggest cause of accidents this year but at a much reduced rate from last year and near misses have joined them again as the most recorded type of incident. This is encouraging as it remains an objective of the Safety and Resilience Team to ensure that near misses are recorded as a check for trends and to identify areas for audit and inspection or minor intervention to prevent future accidents/incidents. Directors and Divisional Managers have been asked to continue to encourage their teams to report near misses and this is highlighted in all induction training sessions.
- 6.6 A good proportion of near misses in previous years have been generated by the work of our traffic management team at CCS. To create the safest possible environment for litter picking activities, the team sets out signage, cones and uses stop/go boards, etc. on the highway. Unfortunately, some road users ignore these measures and create situations that result in a near miss incident. Despite our management team taking this very seriously, and the teams implementing appropriate safety measures (described in section 6.11 below), these incidents had been increasing to a concerning level over the last few years. Due to the pandemic, many of the traffic management crew have had to be redeployed in other more critical areas of CCS. This has resulted in fewer traffic management jobs. As we move out of lockdown and towards business as usual this will continue to be an area for close monitoring by the Safety & Resilience team.
- 6.7 The number of accident/incidents in the category of 'Injured while handling, lifting and carrying' have reduced significantly in 2020/21. The rising rate had been a concern last year and so the reduction this year was encouraging to see and testament to management training and vigilance in monitoring operative activities (which commonly include pushing, pulling, lifting and carrying) at the Westhampnett Depot.
- 6.8 All three of the categories which involve physical and verbal abuse and threats have reduced. It is likely that the Covid situation may have influenced this reduction. It should be remembered though that prior to Covid this was a growing area of concern particularly in the Housing area so we will need to retain a watching brief on these particular statistics. The Safety and Resilience team have attended Housing team meetings to reinforce the importance of reporting issues of concern.
- 6.9 The other categories with a higher rate of interest are 'Hit something fixed or stationary' and 'Hit by moving, flying or falling object'. These have reduced

compared with the previous 2 years but are still two of our main accident types. Most are attributable to CCS and none were particularly serious. These were typically accidents where refuse loaders had walked into stationary objects, e.g. lamp posts, bushes, contact with bins, etc. during refuse collection and resulted in a fairly minor injury. There were no common causes or trends that would be a cause for concern or require improvement work.

Accidents by location

	2018 – 2019	2019 – 2020	2020 -2021
Location	Total number of incidents	Total number of incidents	Total number of incidents
Novium	1	3	3
Car Park	5	3	5
Depot, Yard or Tip	10	15	8
External Building Feature	-	0	1
Foreshores	1	1	1
Internal Building Feature	1	0	0
Kitchen or Welfare Area	4	1	0
Office	2	9	0
Other	3	5	4
Parks & Open Spaces	2	12	1
Reception / Public Area	8	9	0
Third Party Premises	2	3	1
Vehicle, Roadside or Round	65	85	48
Westward House	0	0	6
Workshop	2	9	4
Total	106	155	82

- 6.10 As usual the highest figure relates to 'Vehicle, Roadside or Round' which is to be expected as it correlates to our highest risk work activities, closely followed by 'Depot, Yard and Tip' which also relate mainly to work activities at the Westhampnett Depot.
- 6.11 Dangers to operatives working on the highway is a national issue that authorities and private waste companies have run campaigns on to try to improve. This applies to operatives involved in waste collection as well as street cleansing. CDC takes appropriate action by reporting all cases that are captured on camera. Vehicles are fitted with CCTV cameras and body worn cameras are used by litter picking teams. All highway working is fully risk-assessed, our staff are fully trained in the dangers of highway working and we ensure operatives wear appropriate safety clothing for highway working. The Safety and Resilience Team work closely with CCS management to challenge the circumstances around each incident report that we receive.
- 6.12 The remainder of the locations are much as expected with fairly small numbers although it is noted that the incidents allocated to offices including kitchens, welfare areas and reception/public areas have reduced to nil as most of these types of locations have been closed throughout the whole of the year due to Covid-19.

Training Courses delivered in the 2020 – 2021 period

Course Title	Attendees
Health & Safety Induction	22
Asbestos Awareness	34
First aid – 2 day refresher	1
Risk assessment	2
Risk assessment Refresher	2
Conflict Management & Physical Intervention	33
Dealing with Difficult Situations	19
Legionella Awareness	6
Total Attendees	97

- 6.13 We provide a comprehensive range of health and safety training courses for CDC staff and operate an effective system for recalling staff for refresher training at the appropriate timescales. Training has been curtailed by Covid-19 during this last year due to lockdowns, following government guidance on home working and social distancing which meant it was difficult to bring groups of staff together. Courses that we are able to deliver effectively online have been delivered that way and where possible we have signposted staff to our H&S modules on Learning Pool as an interim measure. All training was up-to-date prior to the pandemic so this has meant that there is a minimal backlog of training to deliver once restrictions are fully lifted.
- 6.14 We have however taken the opportunity to refresh the offerings on Learning Pool and purchased a couple of DVD's for fire safety and COSHH (Control of Substances Hazardous to Health) which will ensure that a blended approach to learning is maintained going forward.

Health and Safety Compliance Monitoring – ‘Safetywatch’

- 6.15 The overall purpose of the Safetywatch scheme is not only to monitor that the workforce at CCS is working in compliance with the procedures/work instructions/risk assessments but to promote engagement with the workforce on health and safety matters. In addition to Safetywatch, formal ‘crew monitoring’ is undertaken by the supervisors in the waste team. We continue to find it extremely successful in engaging with the workforce; working with them to recognise good practice and improve safety.
- 6.16 Despite covid lockdowns, we have continued to conduct one Safetywatch visit per waste/recycling crew although many of these have had to be conducted remotely by using CCTV. Grounds maintenance, street cleaning and minor-works maintenance crews have had a very limited number of Safetywatch visits in the year due to Covid disruptions and difficulties. We issue green coloured cards to the crews for the good practices seen, yellow cards for practices that need improvement and red cards for any serious poor practices seen. We issued a green card to crews in most cases and several yellow cards; no red cards were issued.

Covid-19

6.17 As stated throughout the report, the pandemic has impacted on the Safety and Resilience team's ability to carry out all of our normal team functions. As the team deals with H&S, business continuity and emergency planning our focus quickly had to change. We have been continually involved in advising management and staff, writing new procedures, conducting risk assessments, establishing temporary processes, devising new forms, etc. since March 2020. We continue to be heavily involved in this but have managed to re-establish many aspects of business as usual over the last few months.

7. Resource and legal implications

7.1 There could be legal implications for the Council of not having a robust business continuity management system in place. If the Council is not adequately prepared for a business interruption then some of its statutory functions may not be capable of being performed.

7.2 There are potentially serious legal implications for the Council of not complying with Health and Safety legislation, i.e. imprisonment of individuals, fines for the organisation and/or individuals.

8. Community impact and corporate risks

8.1 There is a corporate risk of not having a robust business continuity management system as there would be financial, reputational and legal implications of not being capable of continuing to provide a service to the public.

8.2 There is a corporate risk of not complying with H&S legislation due to a risk of legal action against the Council. This is a financial risk to the Council through potential prosecution, fines, increase in civil claims, increased insurance premiums, risk of personal and/or corporate liability and reputational damage.

8.3 The Health and Safety Executive (HSE) are the enforcing Authority for Local Authorities. The HSE charges for its inspector's time under the 'Fee For Intervention' scheme. The scheme started in 2012 and its aim was to recover costs incurred in dealing with businesses which fail to comply with their legal obligations, as defined in health & Safety law. The rate is under review but is currently at £160 per hour per officer and is justified by the HSE as necessary to cover its operating costs. Just as a reminder an inspector needs to find a "material breach" to allow the fee clock to start running. The violation has to be serious enough for the inspector to deem it necessary to write to the duty holder to inform them that they must take action to address the breach.

9. Other Implications

	Yes	No
Crime & Disorder:		✓
Climate Change and Biodiversity:		✓
Human Rights and Equality Impact:		✓
Safeguarding and Early Help:		✓

General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR):		✓
Health and Wellbeing		✓

10. Appendices

None

11. Background Papers

None

Chichester District Council

CORPORATE GOVERNANCE & AUDIT COMMITTEE 27 September 2021

Annual Partnerships Report 2021

1. Contacts

Report Author:

Pam Bushby Divisional Manager Communities and Wellbeing
Tel: 01243 534801 Email: pbushby@chichester.gov.uk

2. Recommendations

- 2.1. That the Annual Partnerships report be noted.**
- 2.2. It is recommended that the partnerships annual report is an appropriate mechanism for ensuring our strategic partnerships have appropriate governance measures in place and should continue reporting to Corporate Governance and Audit committee on an annual basis.**
- 2.3. It is recommended that the new risk assessment template for partnerships is an appropriate document and should be completed by lead officers for partnerships over the next year.**

3. Background

- 3.1. At a special meeting of the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee on the 23 July 2012 the following recommendations were made:
 - (a) The committee should receive an Annual Partnerships report on the effectiveness of the council's strategic partnerships focussing on governance arrangements and risk monitoring.
 - (b) The council's partnerships, both strategic and operational, should be reviewed during the council's annual service planning process to ensure that they are still achieving their outcomes, that risk registers are up to date and regularly reviewed and the council's strategic objectives continue to be met.
 - (c) That the role of members who serve on partnerships is made clear in the partnerships guidance document particularly in relation to the requirements for annual reporting.
- 3.2. At the September meeting of CGAC 2017 members of the committee asked for the format of the report to be changed so that it considers governance arrangements and the exposure of the partnership to risks and the mitigation of those risks.
- 3.3. In 2018 CDC managers attended a training session on partnerships to remind them of the importance of having good governance in place and inform them that this report will monitor this on an annual basis.

- 3.4. In 2018 with regard to the risk assessment recommended by the committee that it should use the Council's 4x4 risk matrix as this was clearer, a template has been developed and sent to all lead officers to complete. (appendix 1) Due to the ongoing pandemic not all have been completed as many of the partnerships are on hold.
- 3.5. In 2019 the committee asked for the reinstatement of partnership membership lists. This has been completed where possible.
- 3.6. Please note that due to the ongoing pandemic not all officers have had the capacity to update their partnership information.
- 3.7. In 2020 Informal Cabinet made a policy decision to dissolve Chichester in Partnership (CIP). It was felt the projects no longer needed CIP oversight and much of the work could be delivered elsewhere. CIP was dissolved in September 2020.
- 3.8. In 2021 a new health Partnership, the Local Community Neighbourhood Network (LCNN) was set up to look at health inequalities and the impact of Covid 19 on these.

4. Analysis of Partnerships and recommendations

- 4.1. The annual review and report process is an appropriate method for ensuring our strategic partnerships have appropriate governance measures in place and should continue for the foreseeable future. This report will only look at the governance of partnerships and is not concerned about the delivery of outcomes, this would be the role of Overview and Scrutiny committee
- 4.2. There are currently 10 strategic level partnerships that the council is involved with, as set out in the annual partnerships report (Appendix 2). They all have appropriate governance arrangements in place. Some of the partnerships do not have exit strategies in place. This is because we do not lead or manage these partnerships but officers are satisfied with how the partnerships are being managed. All CDC facilitated partnerships have the appropriate governance in place.

5. Community impact and corporate risks

- 5.1. By not completing a review of the main strategic partnerships of the council we risk council resources being directed into partnerships that do not meet the council's priorities, waste our resources, do not have a clear goal, and could bring the council into disrepute. By ensuring that appropriate governance is in place for these partnerships and their risks managed we can ensure the quality of their work and their benefit to the local community.

6. Other Implications

	Yes	No
Crime & Disorder:		✓
Climate Change:		✓
Human Rights and Equality Impact:.		✓

Safeguarding:		✓
----------------------	--	---



Appendix 2 –Partnerships Report 2021

1. Manhood Peninsula Partnership

Completed by ; Jane Cunningham

Partnership Description; what is the partnership’s vision, and overall aims?

The Manhood Peninsula Partnership (MPP) is a Standing Conference for the Manhood Peninsula in which Chichester District Council is a key partner. The partnership puts adaptation to climate change and economic regeneration at the heart of its project work with the local community on the Manhood Peninsula, the coastal plain of Chichester District.

The MPP is an influential, community led initiative comprised of local communities, local and national government agencies, and other key organisations that share an interest in the issues and sustainable management of the Manhood Peninsula.

As such the MPP Project Officer plays a pivotal role in developing the Vision projects to shape towns for the future, reacting to issues raised by groups within communities such as the fishing industry, and increasing the climate change resilience of Chichester’s coastal plain. In the light of the current Covid-19 crisis, the parish links within the MPP can also help identify and deliver parish priorities for recovery.

The MPP remit is the recognition and mitigation of climate change, economic regeneration, and community benefit shown in the key areas that recur repeatedly as concerns for the peninsula

- Economy and social regeneration, including tourism
- Flood and coastal risk management
- Drainage, surface water management and environmental enhancement
- Access and sustainable development and transport

CDC has announced a Climate Change Emergency for the district. The MPP is an existing vehicle whose commitment to recognising and mitigating the effects of climate change make it an ideal delivery body for CDC’s aspirations in this respect on the peninsula. The Partnership provides a ready source of local knowledge on surface water and environmental management at strategic levels that would be difficult to source otherwise

The welcome appointment of CDC’s Climate Change Officer will expand the technical knowledge within CDC with regard to becoming carbon neutral and green energy efficient. The partners within the MPP can help unroll these initiatives across the peninsula. The parish partners in particular will be key to enabling this.

The Partnership is the ideal way for CDC to act as an exemplar for localism and community engagement. The MPP Project Officer post is employed by CDC on a part time basis, and receives contributions from the parishes to supplement employment costs.

Planned Outcomes for the financial year ahead 2021/22

East Wittering & Bracklesham Vision Project (BREW-Vision)

The EW&B Vision aims to re-imagine what the town could be, and what role it will take in the future. There is a desire to make a clear case for EW&B as a town for the future, a town with a future. The consultant Terra Firma was been engaged to work on a place shaping brief for the area to be progressed during 2020. However the Covid 19 outbreak put the project on hold and the consultation intended for summer 2020 has just been completed. This was a positive step because it allowed more time to develop the consultation approach, and include Booker Green, a highly valued community green space, in the process.

The next stage is to evaluate the consultation responses and prioritise projects into short, medium and long term categories. These will be considered for inclusion in the Vision work plan to be

Appendix 2 –Partnerships Report 2021

discussed by Cabinet in Sept 2021, and approved by Full Council for the financial year beginning March 2022.

Selsey Vision Projects

The new Selsey Vision aims to re-imagine what the town could be, and what role it will take in the future. There is a desire to make a clear case for Selsey as a town for the future, a town with a future. The initial Vision process lasted from April 2018 – March 2019, and further work has progressed projects informed by the Selsey Vision. These include Wayfinding and work with the Selsey Fishery on the Sea's the Day project. Selsey Town Council has incorporated a number of the Selsey Vision projects into their Business Plan for the town. A wayfinding project is being considered, but due to a lack of available resources at Selsey Town Council, further progress will be delayed until later in 2021.

Additional Vision Funds

To consolidate and expand the Visions, additional money has been provided by CDC. Parishes with Vision projects have been asked to consider suitable projects and submit bids for the additional funds. The MPP Project Officer is supporting towns and parishes on the peninsula in this respect.

CHASM (Crustaceans, Habitat And Sediment Movement)

This is a new MPP sub-group led by the MPP Project Officer to research and investigate the reasons behind reduced crab catch and increased sedimentation seen recently on the coast of the Manhood Peninsula. The two issues have been identified by the fishery as negative factors affecting the economy of the Selsey fishery. Should conclusions indicate pollution is responsible for the changes, there are implications for water quality, the visitor economy and the wider community to consider.

The CHASM Delivery/Steering group meets once a month, and the Stakeholder group meets once a quarter. The project helps deliver the CDC commitment to support Selsey and the Selsey fishery demonstrated by the Marshall Regen recommendations in their report on Selsey Haven that were also included in the Selsey Vision.

CHASM: Research: the Project Officer is supporting Channel Coast Observatory and Brighton University in leading the research. The two organisations are developing a plan to include student research input, and funding opportunities available only to the scientific community. A report of work to date is due in July 2021. Diving and GIS work is planned for summer 2021. Further research work will begin in the academic year 2021/2022.

CHASM: Fisheries and marine education: the Project Officer is supporting Mulberry Divers, who have produced a marine education and activities package. The projects include activities on the Bracklesham beds, and the marine environment off the Selsey coast with particular reference to the Selsey Bill & the Hounds Marine Conservation Zone. The aim is to seek funding in order to hold a Claws Week and other events.

CHASM Partners:

The CHASM project works closely with other local and national projects and organisations, sharing similar environmental and monitoring aims in the marine environment:

- Help Our Kelp – Sussex Wildlife Trust, Sussex IFCA
- CHaPRoN - Chichester Harbour Conservancy, Natural England
- Sussex Bay - Adur & Worthing, Arun DC

Active participants include:

- Selsey fishermen
- University of Brighton Engineering Department
- Channel Coast Observatory
- Southsea Sub-Aqua Club, Historic England licence holder on A1 submarine
- Mulberry Marine Experiences

Appendix 2 –Partnerships Report 2021

- Cefas
- Environment Agency National Water Quality Instrumentation Service
- Sea Search, Sussex Wildlife Trust
- Monteum Lobsters
- National Lobster Hatchery, Padstow

Seafood event 2022. This is in the early stages of discussion and is intended for Selsey or elsewhere on the Manhood Peninsula next year. John Pryde, organiser of the Portsmouth Seafood Festival has been approached and discussions will be followed up over the summer 2021. The project helps deliver the CDC commitment to support Selsey and the Selsey fishery demonstrated by the Marshall Regen recommendations in their report on Selsey Haven that were also included in the Selsey Vision.

Surface Water Issues & Solutions (SWISh):

The Surface Water Issues and Solutions Group (SWISh) arose out of discussions within the partnership, including CDC, into the impact of Operation Watershed, the emergence of flood groups across the peninsula in response to increased flood events, their relationship with parish councils and the emerging changes to the existing and newly responsible drainage organisations (eg WSCC as Lead Local Flood Authority) as a result of the Water Resources Management Act 2011.

SWISh is an MPP sub group that meets four times a year. The work of the group is based on the findings of the Defra Flood Resilience Community Pathfinder Scheme, the Manhood Peninsula Surface Water Management Plan (WSCC 2015) and the core of local knowledge and information assembled by flood groups.

SWISh members are working with the National Flood Forum; West Sussex County Council, Chichester District Council, Southern Water, the Environment Agency and other stakeholders to fulfil elements of the WSCC Manhood Peninsula Surface Water Management Plan 2015.

Work for 2021/2022: SWISh members are exploring a scheme of local management for surface water drainage and flood risk within the Peninsula. The main aim is to provide a unified system of land drainage across all the Manhood Parishes that, taking into account the amount of resources available, maximises the level of protection from flood risk for all communities. This model is unique to the coastal plain but can also be used across upland areas, an aspiration of the National Flood Forum. The National Flood Forum views the peninsula scheme as a pilot and intend to roll the scheme out nationally in a couple of years' time should it prove successful and resources become available.

SWISh Rain Gardens and rewilding management of grass verges is a new project that on which discussion has just begun. The purpose of a rain garden is to hold back rain water temporarily and slow its dispersion into a drainage system, to help prevent surface water flooding. In 2015 two rain gardens were installed in Selsey and Shoreham. Since then flooding on the peninsula has increased, and a new WSSC initiative to encourage pollinators in public spaces such as road verges has been initiated. This has resulted in renewed interest in looking at how maintenance schemes for private gardens and public green spaces can be revised to incorporate planting for pollinators in locations that can also serve as rain gardens.

Green Links across the Manhood (GLaM):

Cycling is part of the solution for a low carbon future on the peninsula. GLaM has been working to progress walking, cycling and horse riding on the peninsula that will reduce traffic congestion, encourage people to get out of their cars to improve health, and provide a focus for the visitor economy of the peninsula. Cycling is also a zero-carbon transport option that can deliver worthwhile carbon savings, together with many other benefits, at very low cost. Developing green links across the peninsula will help with the delivery of CDC's Climate Change Action Plan.

GLaM is working more closely with Sustrans to look at:

Appendix 2 –Partnerships Report 2021

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustrans – Restoring the Record • The Case for Quiet Lanes on the Manhood Peninsula <p>When considered together with options for cycle hire and e-bikes conducted previously, these projects support CDC’s carbon neutral aspirations for the District.</p> <p>Continuing to host the MPP Continuing to host the MPP will help the Council achieve the following outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve and promote inter-sectoral integration, co-ordination, communication and understanding between those involved in the Manhood Peninsula. • To work with parishes to develop and implement the Vision projects • To ensure the sustainable development of the peninsula by considering long-term issues, including climate change and flood prevention measures. • Adopt a proactive approach to addressing the effects of climate change in the local community. • Pursue future funding to build on the success of previous projects such as Coastal Change Pathfinder and Sea’s the Day. • Encourage dialogue and cohesion between the numerous agencies and stakeholders in the area enabling a joint response to strategic issues as reflected in the current sub-groups. • Assist and promote the development and implementation of guidelines, strategies and action plans related to sustainable development, flooding and climate change. • Enable residents to understand some of the pressures facing local authorities. <p>In view of the continued announcements coming from international bodies (see latest IPCC report https://www.ipcc.ch/2019/) regarding the acceleration of climate change and sea level rise, by working with the MPP the Council will be more able to recognise the future risk to the entire peninsula and the importance of making its existing economy (green/outdoor tourism and agriculture) as resilient as possible for as long as possible.</p>
<p>What Chichester District Council resources are in the partnership?</p> <p>The District Council is the major funder of the part-time MPP Project Officer post. The Project Officer leads the HLF funded project Seas the Day, works in partnership with the East Wittering and Bracklesham Parish Council to develop the Vision, and provides input to the Selsey Vision Task and Finish group looking at East Beach, the Selsey fishery wayfinding and the visitor economy. The Project Officer also leads and directs the other MPP planned objectives and project groups outlined above.</p>
<p>What resources do other partners place in the partnership?</p> <p>The MPP’s other funding partners are the peninsula parishes via the Parish Precept. For 2020/21 this was £4,800.</p>
<p>What are the partnerships lines of accountability? E.g how is the partnership monitored</p> <p>The MPP Project Officer currently reports to the Divisional Manager of Place in Growth & Place, and maintains links with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment to facilitate work on the coast, in the East Beach area of Selsey and elsewhere on the peninsula. • Economic Development • Planning Policy • Communities
<p>Are there agreed terms of reference in place for the partnership? When were the terms last reviewed?</p> <p>Yes – the Terms of Reference for the partnership were set at the outset and were reviewed in both October 2016 and Sept 2019.</p>
<p>When was the partnership last <i>independently</i> reviewed? Who carried out the review? and what recommendations were there?</p>

Appendix 2 –Partnerships Report 2021

<p>The partnership has not been officially reviewed by an independent body. The partnership is reviewed annually by its partners, including Chichester District Council. As the partnership is comprised of a wide variety of local, regional and national</p>
<p>Have you completed a Risk Assessment of the partnership? Y/N Please attach your most recent risk assessment</p>
<p>yes</p>
<p>Has a financial agreement between partners been prepared and signed?</p>
<p>No. No other bodies fund the partnership other than CDC and the parishes. When the Environment Agency was a funding partner there was an annual signed agreement but this has now ceased.</p>
<p>Has an exit strategy for CDC been put in place? Are there any potential commitments arising from the exit strategy?</p>
<p>Commitments – redundancy payment for the MPP Project Officer should this be required</p>



Partnership Risk Assessment Form

Page 28

Assessment for (provide full name of partnership)	Manhood Peninsula Partnership		Estimate of Risk – L = Likelihood I = Impact Scores 1 = Low 2 = Medium 3 = High 4=Almost Certain					
			Likelihood	4 Almost Certain	4	8	12	16
				3 Probable	3	6	9	12
				2 Possible	2	4	6	8
				1 Unlikely	1	2	3	4
	1 Minor	2 Moderate	3 Substantial	4 Major				
	Impact							
Date of assessment	24/06/2021	Name of lead partner (who owns the partnership)	Chichester District Council		Reviewed (Date and by whom)			
Assessor's name	Jane Cunningham	Job Title	MPP Project Officer					
Manager's name	Tania Murphy	Job Title	Divisional Manager - Place					
Who might be harmed	Staff-Yes Public <input type="checkbox"/> Contractors <input type="checkbox"/> Other partners-Yes CDC-Yes Others (please state) <input type="checkbox"/>							

What are the risks?	What are you already doing to eliminate or control risk?	Estimate of risk (see box above)			What further action is necessary to eliminate or control risk?	Action by (who)?	Action by (when)?	Action completed (date)
		L 1-4	S 1-4	O LxS				
<i>E.g. Reputational, financial,</i>	<i>Partnership agreement in place</i>	1	2	2	<i>Develop and sign a financial agreement</i>	<i>Partnership lead organisation</i>	<i>30.09.20</i>	<i>30.07.20</i>

Appendix 2 –Partnerships Report 2021

Reputational – partners demonstrate publicly conflicting interests	The MPP does not issue joint statements unless the matter has been consulted on and agreed with all partners. This is seen in the MPP Terms of Reference, and key statements on drainage, economy and green links	1	1	1	Ensure the Terms of Reference and key statements express the current views of partners	MPP Chairman, MPP sub group chairmen, and MPP Project Officer	Annually	10/02/2021
Reputational – project leaders demonstrate publicly conflicting interests, particularly on planning matters	Project leaders are not able to speak for other partners without consent. The MPP does not comment on individual planning applications.	2	2	4	As previous	MPP Chairman, MPP sub group chairmen, and MPP Project Officer	Ongoing	Ongoing
Financial – CDC and the parishes are the only bodies funding the MPP Project Officer. Should the parishes drop out CDC will be the sole funder of the post. Should the post terminate the MPP will cease.	Ensure the MPP Project Officer's projects and other work activities fit with CDC aspirations, as well as those of the peninsula town and parish councils.	2	3	6	MPP risk - the partnership will terminate. CDC risk – if the parishes do not fund the MPP Project Officer and related projects, the cost will fall to CDC. Ensure projects are a good fit for CDC priorities and those of the local communities. Find external funding.	MPP Project Officer, Divisional Manager – Place.	Ongoing	Ongoing

Appendix 2 –Partnerships Report 2021

<p>Physical – meeting environment. MPP meetings are usually held on location on the peninsula. The risk is that venues are dangerous or unsuitable for partners.</p> <p>Online - Due to covid restrictions meetings have been held online, and will continue to do so until further notice</p>	<p>MPP meetings are held in the Selsey Centre and the Harbour Conservancy classroom at Dell Quay. They are the properties of large organisations therefore H&S are considered, and access is available to all.</p>	1	2	2	<p>Book meetings up to a year ahead to ensure availability. Ensure participants are aware of meeting times</p>	<p>MPP Project Officer, venues</p>	Ongoing	Ongoing
--	--	---	---	---	--	------------------------------------	---------	---------

Appendix 2 –Partnerships Report 2021

2. West Sussex Affordable Warmth Partnership
Lead officer: Liz Reed, Housing Standards Manager
Partnership Description; what is the partnership’s vision, and overall aims?
<p>As a partnership of local authorities, the aim is to work towards a West Sussex where residents have the information, resources and support available so they are able to keep warm in their homes. While in the ideal West Sussex, no one would live in fuel poverty, it is outside the control of the partnership to control all the elements that would achieve this. However, we aim for a West Sussex where the worst effects of fuel poverty are eradicated.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fuel poor households can access the assistance they need, to improve the energy efficiency of their homes, regardless of property type, tenure or location 2. West Sussex residents can afford to heat their homes adequately, without having to reprioritise other financial and personal needs. 3. West Sussex residents are not disadvantaged because of how they pay for their energy and are able to engage with a competitive energy market
Planned Outcomes for the financial year ahead 2021/2022
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bid for funding opportunities to support the installation of energy efficiency measures. • Continue promotion and delivery of the Green Homes Grant Local Authority Delivery schemes and future government schemes including the Homes Upgrade Grant. • Relaunch the county-wide website providing residents with a one-stop shop of all the grants, assistance and advice available in the local area.
What Chichester District Council resources are in the partnership? (include money, officer time and assets)
Quarterly partnership meeting plus ad-hoc meetings as and when funding becomes available. Meetings are attended by the Housing Standards Manager, Climate Change Officer and Home Energy Visiting Advisor
What resources do other partners place in the partnership?
All District and Boroughs provide an attendee at the meetings. Arun DC also provide the management of the West Sussex Fuel Poverty Co-ordinator who co-ordinates the partnership.
What are the partnerships lines of accountability? E.g how is the partnership monitored
The partnership works to a Framework of Action. The current document is under review. The partnership is managed by the West Sussex Fuel Poverty Co-ordinator who chairs the meetings. All meetings are minuted.
Are there agreed terms of reference in place for the partnership? When were the terms last reviewed?
The Terms of Reference were reviewed in 2018.
When was the partnership last <i>independently</i> reviewed? Who carried out the review? And what recommendations were there?
There has been no independent review; however schemes that are jointly delivered are reviewed on an annual basis.
Have you completed a Risk Assessment of the partnership? Y/N Please attach your most recent risk assessment (note: you should be using the CDC risk matrix for this, available on the intranet)
No. The group facilitates the sharing of knowledge, best practice and limited joint project work.

Appendix 2 –Partnerships Report 2021

Has a financial agreement between partners been prepared and signed?
No
Has an exit strategy for CDC been put in place? Are there any potential commitments arising from the exit strategy?
There is no formal or contractual obligation to this 'commitment' and CDC or any member authority could withdraw at any time.
Membership
All West Sussex Councils belong to the group. The partnership is also attended by County Council representative, Citizens Advice. District and Borough authorities send Private Sector Housing Managers and Officers, Sustainability and climate change officers as well as energy efficiency officers and advisors.

Appendix 2 –Partnerships Report 2021

3. Local Community Neighbourhood Network (LCNN)
Lead officer; Pam Bushby / Elaine Thomas
Partnership Description; what is the partnership’s vision, and overall aims?
<p>The LCNN is a multi-agency group aims to address local health and wellbeing issues in the Chichester District.</p> <p>We recognise that there are a variety of partners who influence the health and wellbeing of residents, and that increased collaboration is likely to bring additional benefits.</p> <p>The LCNN is a place based, collaborative network that seeks to realise these benefits by providing a forum that allows the time and space to build genuine partnerships and trust between members.</p> <p>It is anticipated that these benefits will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creating opportunities for more joined up and co-ordinated working at a local community level • Preventing duplication • Ensuring best use of local assets, resources and shared intelligence • Enabling network knowledge to build and maintain an accurate shared picture of local system resources, gaps and challenges • Providing new, collaborative opportunities that support innovation and best practice
Planned Outcomes for the financial year ahead 2021/2022
This is a new partnership that I still developing priorities and action planning
What Chichester District Council resources are in the partnership? (include money, officer time and assets)
CDC Divisional Manager and Community Wellbeing Manager lead on planning and chairing the meetings
What resources do other partners place in the partnership?
Partner time and expertise
What are the partnerships lines of accountability? E.g how is the partnership monitored
Reports to West Sussex Health and Wellbeing Board
Are there agreed terms of reference in place for the partnership? When were the terms last reviewed?
Yes April 2021
When was the partnership last <i>independently</i> reviewed? Who carried out the review? And what recommendations were there?
N/A
Have you completed a Risk Assessment of the partnership?
yes
Has a financial agreement between partners been prepared and signed?
NA
Has an exit strategy for CDC been put in place? Are there any potential commitments arising from the exit strategy?

Appendix 2 –Partnerships Report 2021

No
Membership
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• (Chair) Chichester District Council - Divisional Manager for Communities• Chichester District Council - Community Wellbeing Manager• Citizens Advice - Chief Executive Officer• Health Watch – Community Partnership lead• Primary Care Network leads – Primary Care Network Development manager• Primary Care Network nominated leads• Voluntary Action Arun and Chichester – Chief Executive Officer• West Sussex County Council & West Sussex Clinical Commissioning Group – Head of West Sussex Collaborative Working• West Sussex Clinical Commissioning Group nominated lead• West Sussex County Council – Partnerships and Locality Relationship Manager• West Sussex County Council Public Health – Consultant in PH / lead for Healthy Lifestyles

Partnership Risk Assessment Form

Assessment for (provide full name of partnership)	Local Community Neighbourhood Network		Estimate of Risk – L = Likelihood I = Impact Scores 1 = Low 2 = Medium 3 = High 4=Almost Certain					
			Likelihood	4 Almost Certain	4	8	12	16
				3 Probable	3	6	9	12
				2 Possible	2	4	6	8
				1 Unlikely	1	2	3	4
		1 Minor	2 Moderate	3 Substantial	4 Major			
Impact								
Date of assessment	24/08/2021	Name of lead partner (who owns the partnership)	Pam Bushby / Elaine Thomas		Reviewed (Date and by whom)	Elaine Thomas 24/08/2022		
Assessor's name	Elaine Thomas	Job Title	Community Wellbeing Manager					
Manager's name	Pam Bushby	Job Title	Divisional Manager for Communities and Wellbeing					
Who might be harmed	Staff <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public <input type="checkbox"/> Contractors <input type="checkbox"/> Other partners <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CDC <input type="checkbox"/> Others (please state) <input type="checkbox"/>							

What are the risks?	What are you already doing to eliminate or control risk?	Estimate of risk (see box above)			What further action is necessary to eliminate or control risk?	Action by (who)?	Action by (when)?	Action completed (date)
		L 1-4	S 1-4	O LxS				
<i>E.g. Reputational, financial,</i>	<i>Partnership agreement in place</i>	1	2	2	<i>Develop and sign a financial agreement</i>	<i>Partnership lead organisation</i>	30.09.20	30.07.20
Lack of engagement from key partners	Making meetings relevant, engaging with priorities applicable to all	2	2	4	Continue to communicate with partners	All		

Lack of funding if needed	Most work is currently being done with no funding but will explore relevant avenues as needed	2	2	4		All		
---------------------------	---	---	---	---	--	-----	--	--

4. Chichester Community Safety Partnership
Lead officer; Pam Bushby Divisional Manager Communities and Wellbeing
Partnership Description; what is the partnership's vision, and overall aims?
A statutory requirement under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 to form a strategic Partnership that brings together partners to have a coherent approach to community safety.
Planned Outcomes for the financial year ahead 2021-24
To deliver the projects identified in the CSP plan for 21/22 To deliver joint working model with Arun CSP Lead monthly JAG meetings with the Police
What Chichester District Council resources are in the partnership?
30 hours officer time
What resources do other partners place in the partnership?
£38,125 – police crime commissioner Officer time from other organisations In kind support for projects
What are the partnerships lines of accountability? E.g how is the partnership monitored
CDC overview and scrutiny committee
Are there agreed terms of reference in place for the partnership? When were the terms last reviewed?
Yes. They were reviewed in 2021
When was the partnership last <i>independently</i> reviewed? Who carried out the review? and what recommendations were there?
Reviewed by the Sussex Police And Crime Commissioner in 2019. She recommended that the chair be circulated around the partners. Our CSP has agreed that the chair remain with the council as this gives continuity and consistency
Have you completed a Risk Assessment of the partnership? Y/N Please attach your most recent risk assessment
Yes
Has a financial agreement between partners been prepared and signed?
Part of the terms of reference. If there is funding agreed with a certain project then an agreement will be made with that project/ organisation..
Has an exit strategy for CDC been put in place? Are there any potential commitments arising from the exit strategy?
The partnership is statutory for us and the partners therefore there is no need for an exit strategy
Membership Includes
CDC, WSCC, Sussex Police, WSFRS, Sussex Police and Crime Commissioners office, Neighbourhood Watch, Crime Stoppers, Probation service, Change Grow Live.



Partnership Risk Assessment Form

Assessment for (provide full name of partnership)	Chichester Community Safety Partnership		Estimate of Risk – L = Likelihood I = Impact Scores 1 = Low 2 = Medium 3 = High 4=Almost Certain					
			Likelihood	4 Almost Certain	4	8	12	16
				3 Probable	3	6	9	12
				2 Possible	2	4	6	8
				1 Unlikely	1	2	3	4
		1 Minor	2 Moderate	3 Substantial	4 Major			
Impact								
Date of assessment	March 2021	Name of lead partner (who owns the partnership)	Chichester District Council	Reviewed (Date and by whom)	April 2021			
Assessor's name	Pam Bushby	Job Title	Divisional Manager Communities and wellbeing					
Manager's name	Louise Rudziak	Job Title	Director Housing and Communities					
Who might be harmed	Staff <input type="checkbox"/> Public <input type="checkbox"/> Contractors <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other partners <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CDC <input type="checkbox"/> Others (please state) <input type="checkbox"/>							

What are the risks?	What are you already doing to eliminate or control risk?	Estimate of risk (see box above)			What further action is necessary to eliminate or control risk?	Action by (who)?	Action by (when)?	Action completed (date)
		L 1-4	I 1-4	O LxS				
<i>E.g. Reputational, financial,</i>	<i>Partnership agreement in place</i>	1	2	2	<i>Develop and sign a financial agreement</i>	<i>Partnership lead organisation</i>	<i>30.09.20</i>	<i>30.07.20</i>
Reputation could be tarnished if projects go wrong	Partnership agreement in place all projects have to be approved a monitored by the partnership group.	2	2	4	None			

Partnership funding could be reduced by Sussex Police and Crime Commissioner	Trying to reduce costs where possible. Ensuring there is a small reserve to ensure projects do not end abruptly. Putting business cases to SPPC	2	2	4	This issue is out of our control. All possible measures are in place.			
Partnership events could have health and safety implications	All events are carefully planned with partners having to give final approval. CDC risk assessments are used.	2	3	6	None			

5. Sussex air quality partnership [Sussex-air]
Lead officer; Simon Ballard, Environmental Protection Manager
Partnership Description; what is the partnership's vision, and overall aims?
Sussex Air was set up in 2000, comprises of officers from all the Local Authorities in Sussex (East and West) including Brighton and Hove and WSCC and ESCC. The partnership has a set of terms of reference but is not a formally constituted body and only exists as a budget code at ESCC. The partnership meets four times per year, works to an agreed agenda and is currently chaired by Adur and Worthing District Council. All partners currently pay an annual subscription of £3,000 to Sussex Air, which is used to pay for the services set out below. The partnership has no assets other than a small positive current account balance. The partnership enables the sharing of best practice, knowledge sharing and joint project work including joint bids to enabling grants.
Planned Outcomes for the financial year ahead 2021/2022
See business plan.
What Chichester District Council resources are in the partnership? (include money, officer time and assets)
£3,000/annum subscription. One CDC officer attends meetings on approximately five occasions per annum. These have all been virtual over the period of COVID but are returning to face-to-face meetings June 2021.
What resources do other partners place in the partnership?
All LA's in East and West Sussex pay £3000/annum subscription and send one officer to each of the five yearly meetings.
What are the partnerships lines of accountability? E.g how is the partnership monitored
The partnership produces an annual business plan and an annual report of its activities and outcomes. These are reported at the group's meetings and called for scrutiny at by Sussex Chief Environmental Health Officers (SCEHO) meeting annually. The SCEHO appoints a representative of their group to attend the Sussex-air meetings. All meetings of Sussex-air are minuted and the meetings are chaired. Currently Adur and Worthing (Nadeem Shad) chair the group.
Are there agreed terms of reference in place for the partnership? When were the terms last reviewed?
The Terms of Reference were reviewed in 2018.
When was the partnership last <i>independently</i> reviewed? Who carried out the review? And what recommendations were there?
The partnership reports annually to CDC's partnership review and last did so in 2019. No recommendations were forthcoming.
Have you completed a Risk Assessment of the partnership? Y/N Please attach your most recent risk assessment (note: you should be using the CDC risk matrix for this, available on the intranet)
No. The group facilitates the sharing of knowledge, best practice and limited joint project work. The data management contract let by the group for the management of air quality monitoring data allows access to the contracted provider at a more competitive rate than otherwise would be the case.
Has a financial agreement between partners been prepared and signed?
Yes
Has an exit strategy for CDC been put in place? Are there any potential commitments

arising from the exit strategy?
<p>CDC pays an annual subscription to the group of £3,000. There is no formal or contractual obligation to this 'commitment' and CDC or any member authority could withdraw. The data management contract (for air quality monitoring stations) let by the group has yearly break clauses. The group currently exists as a budget code at East Sussex County Council who bear the related financial risk.</p>
Membership
<p>All East and West Sussex Councils belong to the group, including the counties and Brighton and Hove. The County Councils send both highways and public health officers to the meetings. District and Borough authorities send Environmental Health officers who deal with local air quality management to the group. The group has a link to the Environment Agency but they do not belong to the group (or pay the annual subscription). The group has links to Imperial College London's, Environmental Research Group and the University of Brighton, the former via a contract for the management of air quality monitoring data and the management and running of the Air-Alert pollution prediction service and Cold-Alert services (cold prediction service).</p>

6. West Sussex Waste Partnership

Lead officer: Kevin Carter

Partnership Description; what is the partnership's vision, and overall aims?

The partnership is delivered through two inter-related groups; the Member led Inter-Authority Waste Group (IAWG) and the Strategic Waste Officers Group (SWOG). The West Sussex Waste Partnership (WSWP) works together to reduce waste and to maximise reuse, recovery and recycling. The WSWP is striving towards a zero waste economy, where all materials have a purpose and avoid disposal of any kind.

The Partnership composition is currently being reviewed in line with the necessary increase in the environmental agenda topics. A senior officer working group are currently working with members across the different authorities to ascertain the required partnership structure at the member level

The partnership provides a platform for collaborative working between the 7 District and Boroughs in West Sussex and the County Council who have responsibility for waste management.

Planned Outcomes for the financial year ahead 2021-22

The WSWP will continue to focus on initiatives to increase the level of recycling in West Sussex to minimise waste and reduce the overall system cost of waste collection and disposal.

Having prepared and submitted several key Government consultation responses for the planned new Environmental Act the WSWP will continue to monitor and review any proposed changes on how waste is collected, disposed of, and re-used, including the funding landscape especially considering the likely introduction of 'producer pays' concept into the wider waste industry.

Having prepared and submitted several key Government consultation responses for the planned new Environmental Act the WSWP will continue to monitor and review any proposed changes on how waste is collected, disposed of, and re-used, including the funding landscape especially considering the likely introduction of 'producer pays' concept into the wider waste industry.

The WSWP are undertaking a domestic food waste collection trial within one of the Tier 2 authorities. The trial will provide valuable information specifically around resident engagement, and support. CDC has not committed to a similar trial at this stage following a Cabinet report but remain committed to the concept of food waste collections in the future. CDC have introduced a trade waste food collection service.

What Chichester District Council resources are in the partnership? (include money, officer time and assets)

IAWG (meetings held quarterly)

- Cabinet Member for Environment and Chichester Contract Services (CCS). Attendance at meeting and feedback to CDC Waste and Recycling Panel.
- Director of Corporate Services. Attendance at meetings plus Member support.
- Divisional Manager CCS - Attendance at meetings plus Member support.

SWOG (meetings held monthly with additional meetings as required).

- Divisional Manager CCS. Current chair and direct representative to IAWG.
- CCS Business Manager. Attendance at meetings as required plus project delivery.

Communications Group (sub group of SWOG) (meetings held monthly)

- Recycling Projects Officer. Attendance at meetings plus project delivery.

For financial resource please see section below relating to Financial Agreements.
What resources do other partners place in the partnership?
As above – Officers and Members.
What are the partnerships lines of accountability? E.g how is the partnership monitored
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IAWG – reports to Leaders’ Board once a year or more frequently as required. • SWOG – reports to IAWG but lines of accountability to Environment Directors’ Oversight Group which is comprised of the relevant Director for each partner plus Chair of SWOG and meets at least twice a year. • Communications Group – reports to SWOG. Updates are provided at each meeting.
Are there agreed terms of reference in place for the partnership? When were the terms last reviewed?
Yes – Memorandum of Understanding (MoU). Reviewed in 2016 and further updates to governance arrangements made in 2018.
When was the partnership last <i>independently</i> reviewed? Who carried out the review? And what recommendations were there?
Partnership last independently reviewed by CDC’s Corporate Management Team and Cabinet in 2012/13 as part of the process for prioritising future partnerships. The overall finding was that the existing model was considered an excellent example of co-operative working. In addition, various options for joint working were considered in 2013 but not pursued.
Have you completed a Risk Assessment of the partnership?
Completed last year in old format. To be reviewed
Has a financial agreement between partners been prepared and signed?
The MoU that was signed by all members included financial considerations for improving recycling where WSCC made a payment to the waste collection authorities based on an agreed recycling support payment mechanism. In 2019 WSCC withdrew from this agreement and rescinded the MoU schedule that details the financial relationship of the partnership. The effect on Chichester DC income is a loss of approximately £700,000 per annum.
Has an exit strategy for CDC been put in place? Are there any potential commitments arising from the exit strategy?
No exit strategy in place as the partnership effectively defines the working relationship between CDC as the Waste Collection Authority and WSCC the Waste Disposal Authority which is bound by legislation.
Membership includes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • West Sussex County Council • Horsham District Council • Adur and Worthing Council • Crawley Borough Council • Chichester District Council • Mid Sussex District Council

7. THE WEST SUSSEX AND GREATER BRIGHTON STRATEGIC PLANNING BOARD
Lead officer; Tim Guymer
Partnership Description; what is the partnership's vision, and overall aims?
Local authorities are required by law through the Duty to Co-operate to ' <i>engage constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis</i> ' on planning matters that impact on more than one local planning area. The West Sussex and Greater Brighton Strategic Planning Board is a grouping of local planning authorities responsible for identifying cross boundary strategic planning issues and agreeing how these should be prioritised and managed.
Planned Outcomes for the financial year ahead 2021-22
Overall programme to deliver Local Strategic Statement 3 (the third such joint strategic planning strategy agreed and published. Preparation of evidence to inform the planning of the production of the document also to be substantially finalised. When complete, LSS3 will identify the longer term development needs of the coastal West Sussex & Greater Brighton area through to 2050, identify a strategy to meet this need and represent the mechanism within which to deal with cross-border strategic planning matters. Refresh of the Local Strategic Statement under duty to cooperate
What Chichester District Council resources are in the partnership? (include money, officer time and assets)
Officer and member time to attend Board (and officer group) meetings. Officer time to contribute to the work of the Board, in particular the preparation of the evidence base for LSS3.
What resources do other partners place in the partnership?
The other constituent local planning authorities all agree to commit similar resources to the work of the Board.
What are the partnerships lines of accountability? E.g how is the partnership monitored
The Board is an advisory body and so decisions on taking forward its work programme remain the responsibility of the individual local authorities.
Are there agreed terms of reference in place for the partnership? When were the terms last reviewed?
The Board operates on the basis of a memorandum of understanding agreed by the constituent authorities.
When the partnership was last <i>independently</i> reviewed? Who carried out the review? And what recommendations were there?
The work of the project board has not been independently reviewed. However, it is subject to the scrutiny of the constituent authorities and is currently reviewing its processes and lines of reporting prior to the detailed preparation of LSS3.
Have you completed a Risk Assessment of the partnership? Y/N
No. In broad terms, the risk of failing to collectively agree on an approach to determine the amount and distribution of proposed development and infrastructure to facilitate it would compromise the strategic planning of the wider area, including efforts to secure necessary infrastructure and adopt the Local Plan Review.
Has a financial agreement between partners been prepared and signed?

The future funding of the works of the Board, other than officer/member time, is reliant on the pooling of additional business rates which has been agreed by West Sussex leaders.
Has an exit strategy for CDC been put in place? Are there any potential commitments arising from the exit strategy?
No.
Membership Includes
Awaiting information

8. Coastal West Sussex Partnership
Lead officer; Melanie Burgoyne
Partnership Description; what is the partnership’s vision, and overall aims?
<p>Coastal West Sussex is a public/private sector partnership that have joined together to champion the sustainable development of the coastal communities. Putting people and business at the heart of regeneration and working across traditional boundaries the partnership is forming the foundations for investment and growth. In particular it is a key partner in designing and contributing to our Local Enterprise Partnership’s Strategic Economic Plan, managing the West Sussex and Greater Brighton Strategic Planning Board and for initiating and assisting the delivery of collaborative projects in the CWS area</p>
Planned Outcomes for the financial year ahead 2021-22
<p>In March 2021, partners were asked what they felt would be the challenges and opportunities for the economy as we emerge from Brexit and the pandemic. These insights helped the economic partnership consider the right connections and interventions to ensure the coastal economy can prosper.</p> <p>CWS identified 5 themes which, with the right support, can take the area forward.</p> <p>These are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Digital and physical infrastructure – improving connectivity across and beyond the coastal area 2 Space – making the best use of land to provide good quality homes and employment space 3 Skills – raising aspirations to learn new skills for the jobs of the future 4 Promotion of the region (including culture and the visitor economy) to attract visitors, investors and new businesses to the area 5 Sustainable growth – promote, encourage and enable activities that help address the climate change crisis <p>This has been articulated here:- https://coastalwestsussex.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/CWS-White-Paper-2021-FINAL.pdf</p>
What Chichester District Council resources are in the partnership? (include money, officer time and assets)
<p>The Partnership has been funded out of the Business Rates Pool for this financial year</p> <p>8 days of senior officer time.</p> <p>Chief Exec and Director Growth and Place attend management board meetings</p>
What resources do other partners place in the partnership?
<p>The CWSP is hosted by Adur & Worthing Councils with a permanent Director employed by Worthing BC. The annual contribution from the local authorities towards core costs is £71k, and in the past two years there has been an annual allocation of £50k to allow for a project budget. There is a Partnership Board with public and private sector members, and a private sector Chair. There is also a Skills and Enterprise Sub-Group overseeing the skills priorities agreed by the partnership.</p> <p>Officer time from other partner organisations Part-time director ad hoc administrative support when it can be found</p> <p>Adur & Worthing are the accountable body</p>
What are the partnerships lines of accountability? E.g how is the partnership monitored
<p>Officers on the partnership report to management group including politicians and Chief executives</p>

Are there agreed terms of reference in place for the partnership? When were the terms last reviewed?
Yes. Do not know this partnership is not led by us.
When was the partnership last <i>independently</i> reviewed? Who carried out the review? And what recommendations were there?
2012 Catriona Riddell Associates
Have you completed a Risk Assessment of the partnership?
Minimum of risk to Chichester District Council as we are not lead partner Risk of missing out on opportunities that benefit the district if we are not involved
Has a financial agreement between partners been prepared and signed?
Yes
Has an exit strategy for CDC been put in place? Are there any potential commitments arising from the exit strategy?
No
Membership Includes
Henry Powell, Client Director at Inpress Plastics in Littlehampton is Chairman of the partnership and Caroline Wood is the Director of the Coastal West Sussex Partnership Board. Board Member representative organisations are WSCC, CDC, Arun DC and Adur & Worthing Councils, University of Chichester, Chichester College Group, Greater Brighton Met College, West Sussex Growers Association, Sussex Chamber Commerce, Federation Small Businesses, Lancing Business Park, Alergy Therapeutics, BM Consultants, Butlins, Cobb Digital, Nordell Ltd, Ricardo, Shoreham Port, Stiles Harold Williams, Landlink Estates and Fargro.

9. Experience West Sussex
Lead officer; Sarah Peyman
Partnership Description; what is the partnership's vision, and overall aims?
Experience West Sussex is a destination partnership created to deliver collective value through leadership, inspiration and collaboration for the benefit of West Sussex' Visitor economy
Planned Outcomes for the financial year ahead 2021/2022
The Action Plan for 2021/22 is mainly focussed on supporting the tourism businesses on their recovery from the pandemic but some highlights are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Enhanced marketing to promote health and wellbeing, active outdoors, Autumn Winter visits, and Summer in West Sussex rerun – book ahead , plan early etc. ○ Health and wellbeing support includes business and workers mental health and stress, but also assisting them economically with business recovery. ○ Consumer marketing thematic focus Gourmet and Gardens, Taste West Sussex, Dark Skies with Southdowns National Park, Health and wellbeing experiences, Wild West Sussex (nature based) amongst usual Autumn Winter themes and holiday linked offers. ○ Counter acting any winter Covid restrictions by supporting virtual transactions and experiences, with Shop Sussex campaign. Increasing content on local artisans, online experiences and local producers. ○ Supporting high street events and initiatives for increased footfall for jobs and economic recovery.
What Chichester District Council resources are in the partnership? (include money, officer time and assets)
Divisional Manager attends meetings
What resources do other partners place in the partnership?
The partnership is funded until November 2022, through a Strategic Investment Reserve allocation from pooled business rates (and some funding from West Sussex County Council's economic development budget). Officer time
What are the partnerships lines of accountability? E.g how is the partnership monitored
Programme reporting shall be undertaken as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experience West Sussex Visitor Economy Partnership Group: Minutes and actions will be recorded for each meeting. Any additional reporting requirement shall be at the discretion of the Partnership Group. • West Sussex Chief Executives: An annual report demonstrating progress should be prepared and presented to the Chief Executive Group by the Programme Sponsor
Are there agreed terms of reference in place for the partnership? When were the terms last reviewed?
Yes
When was the partnership last <i>independently</i> reviewed? Who carried out the review? And what recommendations were there?
This has not happened

Have you completed a Risk Assessment of the partnership?

No – Minimum of risk to Chichester District Council as we are not lead partner
Risk of missing out on opportunities that benefit the district if we are not involved

Has a financial agreement between partners been prepared and signed?

Yes

Has an exit strategy for CDC been put in place? Are there any potential commitments arising from the exit strategy?

No – CDC has its own district level DMO which continues to deliver tourism support and marketing for the district.

Membership includes

- ADUR DISTRICT COUNCIL
- ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL
- CHICHESTER DISTRICT COUNCIL
- COASTAL WEST SUSSEX PARTNERSHIP
- CRAWLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL
- HORSHAM DISTRICT COUNCIL
- MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL
- WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL
- WORTHING BOROUGH COUNCIL

10. . Chichester SAG (Safety Advisory Group)

Lead officer; Laurence Foord

Partnership Description; what is the partnership's vision, and overall aims?

Although the formation and retention of a Safety Advisory Group (SAG) is not a legal requirement, SAGs are a UK good practice model, as recommended in several national key guidance documents around event planning/delivery, such as the HSE's Purple Guide and 'The UK Good Practice Guide to Working in Safety Advisory Groups' (2019).

Chichester SAG may be formed in relation to a specific event or venue, or with a broader remit in relation to a range of events to ensure a quality assurance process is in place in terms of the safety arrangements for events. The SAG should be formally constituted and operate to agreed Terms of Reference.

The SAG exists to consider plans presented by the organisers of events and offer guidance on the content and structure of Event Safety Plans. It is not the role of the SAG to assist in the planning of an event or the writing of the Event Safety Plan. The purpose of the SAG is to offer suggestions, comment and guidance in order to help event organisers discharge their legal responsibilities. All SAG members should be competent in their own agency roles as well as understanding their role on a SAG.

The overall aim of the SAG is –

- *To ensure as far as practicable that the risk to public safety is minimised for all those attending or working at an event by providing comment and guidance to the event organiser, who has the overall responsibility for the safety of the event.*

The objectives of the Chichester SAG are -

- *To promote safety and welfare at events;*
- *To promote good safety and welfare practice in event planning*
- *To ensure that well planned events have minimal adverse impact on those attending the event and local communities.*
- *To promote mitigation for potential and unforeseen incidents*

The SAG does not make any decisions on behalf of the Local Authority or other agencies as its role is advisory and as such it has no authority to either approve or ban events. Although all comments and observations made by the SAG are always advisory, they are made by professionals in the interest of public safety and should not be dismissed lightly.

During the last reporting period Chichester SAG has actively attended and contributed to the Local Authority Resilience Partnership (LARP) Events Sub-Group which has been active since its inaugural meeting on 1st July 2020. Regular meetings have been held ever since, increasing in attendance and in the range of issues that have arisen for the group's attention. Meeting frequency has increased from monthly to fortnightly at the request of attendees.

Over its first year of operation the group has maintained a shared live events calendar to capture status of all events, ensuring situational awareness, developed and maintained a comprehensive risk register specific to events management during Covid-19, and produced a library of shared guidance documents and proformas which have been adopted for use across the East and West

Sussex.

The LARP Events Group has also convened a Pan-Sussex SAG Chairs Forum, chaired by the Chichester SAG Chair, which has developed a standard Terms of Reference for adoption by SAGs across the Sussex Resilience Forum (SRF) area, and agreed an annual schedule of meetings in anticipation of key points in the events calendar. The group intends to link in with the Sussex Director of Public Health's to embed good working relationships and agree consistent practice where appropriate and achievable.

The group has also agreed a pan-SRF SAG Chairs Checklist (to address specifically Covid-19 considerations), with view to standardising approach and safeguarding against reputational damage. This document is continuously reviewed to ensure coherence with the most up to date guidance, and the group meets fortnightly to discuss new government guidance and agree shared approaches to application.

Planned Outcomes for the financial year ahead 2021/2022

Collating intelligence and information released from the various pilot events taking place as part of the Events Research Programme and advice accordingly delivered to local event organisers via the SAG process.

Continue to actively attend and contribute to the Local Authority Resilience Partnership (LARP) Events Sub-Group.

Continue to actively co-ordinate and Chair the Local Authority Resilience Partnership (LARP) SAG Chair Sub-Group.

Develop and maintain effective working relationships with SAG partners to achieve consistent practice where appropriate and achievable in terms of the delivering the strategic objectives of the SAG in accordance with its Terms of Reference.

Consider the Government advice and guidance associated with exiting its roadmap and cross-reference this against the shared grid of planned events co-ordinated by the LARP Events Sub-Group. Further embed the Director of Directors of Public Health into the SAG process.

What Chichester District Council resources are in the partnership? (include money, officer time and assets)

Existing resources within CDC are used to deliver the administration and co-ordination of SAGs.

Internal partners from Licensing, Health Protection Team, Environmental Protection Team, Culture & Sports, Corporate Health & Safety/Emergency Planning and the councils' Events & Promotions Officer.

No additional financial support is specifically allocated to the delivery of SAGs.

What resources do other partners place in the partnership?

As above

What are the partnerships lines of accountability? E.g. how is the partnership monitored

SAGs are properly constituted with written Terms of Reference and effective procedures encompassing all matters falling within the Local Authority's regulatory duties.

The delivery of SAG's is accountable to the Sussex Resilience Forum and the Local Authority Resilience Partnership Events Sub-Group reports into the SCG and TCG.

Partners are expected to be competent in their own agency role and as well as understanding their role on a SAG.

Terms of Reference are renewed on an annual basis along with the Chichester SAG annual review.

Are there agreed terms of reference in place for the partnership? When were the terms last reviewed?

There are specific Terms of Reference for the delivery of SAGs which have been agreed by the SRF Executive and adopted by the SRF LARP Events Sub-Group and SAG Chairs Sub-Group as a good practice and consistent approach to the conduct and management of Safety Advisory Groups across all Sussex Local Authorities. The Terms of Reference were last reviewed and adopted in May 2021.

When was the partnership last *independently* reviewed? Who carried out the review? And what recommendations were there?

The delivery of SAG's is reported to the Sussex Resilience Forum and in tune the work of the Local Authority Resilience Partnership Events Sub-Group reports into the SCG and TCG.

Have you completed a Risk Assessment of the partnership?

No

Has a financial agreement between partners been prepared and signed?

No.

Has an exit strategy for CDC been put in place? Are there any potential commitments arising from the exit strategy?

No.

Membership

Chichester SAG is Chaired by Chichester District Council officer - Laurence Foord, Divisional Manager for Communications, Licensing & Events.

Chichester SAG has standing attendees/partners – Sussex Police, West Sussex Fire & Rescue Service, South East Coast Ambulance Service (SECAMB), WSCC Director of Public Health representative(s), WSCC Highways, WSCC Emergencies & Resilience. Chichester District Council teams including Licensing, Emergency Planning, Health Protection & Environmental Protection.

This page is intentionally left blank