

**DRAFT GREATER MANCHESTER COMBINED AUTHORITY (GMCA)  
CORPORATE ISSUES AND REFORM OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE  
11 DECEMBER 2018 AT 6.00PM AT GMCA OFFICES**

Present:	Councillor Nathan Evans (Trafford) (in the Chair)
Bolton:	Councillor Hamid Khurram
Bury:	Councillor Stella Smith
Manchester:	Councillor Annette Wright
Oldham:	Councillor Colin McLaren Councillor Peter Davis (Substitute)
Rochdale:	Councillor Peter Malcolm
Salford:	Councillor David Jolley
Stockport:	Councillor Linda Holt Councillor Yvonne Guariento
Trafford:	Councillor Bernard Sharpe (Substitute)
Tameside:	Councillor Gillian Peet Councillor John Bell
Wigan:	Councillor Joanne Marshall

**In attendance**

Bury Council	Councillor Rishi Shori, Portfolio Leader for Young People Geoff Little, Portfolio Chief Executive for Young People
Salford City Council	Charlotte Ramsden, Strategic Director
GMFRS	Leon Parkes, Assistant Chief Fire Officer Tony Hunter, Director of Prevention and Protection
TfGM	Steve Warrener, TfGM Finance and Corporate Services Director Alison Chew, Interim Head of Bus Services
GMCA	Richard Paver, GMCA Treasurer Susan Ford, Statutory Scrutiny Officer Jamie Fallon, Governance and Scrutiny Officer

**CI62/18 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Tim Pickstone (Bury), Mary Watson (Manchester), Anne Duffield (Trafford) and Jim Wallace (GMFRS).

**CI63/18 CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS AND URGENT BUSINESS**

No urgent business was raised.

**CI64/18 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Declarations of interest were received from Councillor John Bell regarding the GMFRS related items; Quarter 2 Performance (CI69) and Unwanted Fire Signals (CI70).

**CI65/18 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 20 NOVEMBER 2018**

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 November 2018 were submitted for approval.

**RESOLVED:**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 20 November 2018 be approved as a correct record.

**CI66/18                      WORK PROGRAMME**

Susan Ford, Statutory Scrutiny Officer, introduced the work programme.

Members were informed that the Chair's and Deputy Chair's of the Scrutiny Committee's had met on the 10 December, where it was proposed that the following items be included within the work programme:

- GMCA's Corporate Resilience and Brexit (January or February 19)
- That this Committee support the work of the HPE on waste for the next 6 months where required (tbc)
- Transport governance decision making (approx. March 19)

Members were asked to contact the Statutory Scrutiny Officer with any further items for inclusion in the work programme.

**RESOLVED:**

That the reconfigured work programme be agreed.

**CI67/18                      GM CHILDREN'S PLAN**

Councillor Rishi Shori, Portfolio Leader for Young People, introduced a report which provided an update on the progress, in respect of the GM children's work and sought agreement for progressing the Children's Plan and funding proposals to the GMCA.

Also in attendance was Geoff Little, Portfolio Chief Executive for Young People and Charlotte Ramsden, Strategic Director for People, Salford City Council. It was noted that Jon Rouse, Portfolio Chief Executive for Young People was also part of the team progressing this work.

The following key areas were highlighted:

- The Children's Plan outlines GM's ambition for outcomes for the children and young people in GM and sets out seven key priority areas of focus which reflect the existing priorities of the Greater Manchester Strategy and GM Children's Health and Wellbeing Framework.
- The Plan seeks to define key areas of ambition with clear and deliverable outcomes that will form the basis of the delivery plans.
- The work was being local authority led, and engaged each districts Cabinet Members for Young People, as well as their Directors of Children's Services.
- Business cases have been developed for the use of the £5m of the £7.43m resource allocated by DfE to the GMCA (as summarised within appendix 2 of the report). These will enable the scale and spread of successful innovations to support specific areas of work included in the plan.

Members raised the following questions:

- A Member queried how the innovation theme had been selected for each local authority? It was confirmed each local authority engaged in a two part process with the National Innovation Unit which involved a diagnostic to identify the innovation/s appropriate to them. This was followed by workshops in which the local authority and partners worked to develop their approach and identify priorities for investment. It was noted that the approach acknowledged that each local authority had different demographics, and its own challenges which required a tailored approach.
- Would this approach cause tension, in particularly where one area achieves better outcomes, and would there be pressure for local authorities to follow suit using the same innovations? In terms of sovereignty, it was confirmed that local authorities were given the ability to adapt the model to suit the individual place but it was noted that DfE were working closely with GM to ensure that we remain true to the key principles of the models, as there would be an element of evaluation. It was highlighted that without the DfE funding each locality would have to focus on their statutory responsibilities and this funding would enable them to add value to that offer.
- Do local authorities and the GMCA plan on briefing Councillors, and affording them the opportunity to share their views about this innovation work? A Member who sits on Salford's Corporate Parenting Panel highlighted that he was unaware that Salford proposes to use an existing Children's Home as a 'No Wrong Door Hub'. Charlotte Ramsden responded to confirm that the high level plans had been approved by Lead Members, but further work was required to develop the detail. It was noted that Members would be engaged during the next phase of work.
- What would the extra £150k be used for? It was confirmed that the money would be used to fund Research in Practice to help us learn from the innovative approaches and share best practice.
- Members of the School Readiness Task and Finish Group highlighted how they have been examining the progress of the priority to support its development. This work had highlighted gaps in provision and a shortfall in resources which were currently being addressed. A visit to Stockport that morning had reinforced the importance of an inclusive model and the need for the different partners to work collaboratively. Have baselines been identified to enable progress to be measured over time? It was confirmed that through a mix of bringing together more data and intelligence, and more sophisticated approaches to measurement, we are gradually getting a clearer view of impact of our services. A range of data, insight and evaluation will therefore be used so that we can be clear that we are delivering on the priorities of the plan. Complementing the work undertaken by individual authorities, a GM performance and outcomes framework would also be developed for the Plan's six priorities, aligned to the GM Strategy, Taking Charge and other relevant plans. Members requested that the current data sets be shared with the Committee.
- A Member highlighted that the GMS Dashboard considered at the previous meeting indicated that there had only been 0.5% percentage point change on the previous year in relation to 'the proportion of children who are school ready at five years old (2018). It was highlighted that the new GM delivery model had been implemented in 2013, and had made an impact, but there was recognition that a significant part of the gap related to the proportion of children with the most complex needs, and a different approach was required to support this cohort. Other factors to consider were the: different levels of investment across localities; variances in the cohort; a reduction in local authority funding; and an associated increase in

child poverty. It was confirmed that the data was continually being analysed in order to test our approach and see how we can make a difference. This included exploring how interventions could be implemented to support those children at key stages one and two. The Committee requested further background information to support their understanding of the statistics detailed within the GMS Dashboard.

- Further clarification was sought in relation to how we are addressing workforce shortages such as the shortfall in qualified psychologists. It was confirmed that the social work academy had been developed in partnership with local authorities, colleges and universities in GM to develop the quality of training, and offer guaranteed placements within localities. It was noted that although this would mean that local authorities were employing a high number of newly qualified workers, they would be trained to deliver to GM standards. It was confirmed that forecasting was being undertaken to understand future needs and develop appropriate pathways to develop GM's workforce.
- A Member raised concerns regarding the outcomes for children who are excluded from school and explored whether relationships with schools had been developed to improve the outcomes for this cohort of children. It was confirmed that increasing the quality of education and educational achievement, especially in secondary schools, was a priority and developing an inclusive schools system was crucial. Work is underway with all schools to encourage inclusivity. Part of this work includes providing an element of challenge, where they feel that exclusion is necessary, but also supporting them to identify more ways to support the children within schools more effectively. It was noted that the Education and Employability Board was supporting this work, to enable as many children to receive a quality education in a mainstream setting, but where this is not possible, ensuring that there is a right mix of alternatives available.
- How are we managing the relationships with schools to encourage them to refer appropriately to Collaborative Assessment and Management of Suicidality (CAMS)? It was confirmed that there is a robust Children's Mental Health strategy which includes support for schools, and overseeing the relationship with CAMS. It was noted that CAMS data (on waiting times and referrals) will be regularly published. One of the measures of success was the increase in the number of appropriate referrals to CAMS, which would demonstrate that the work we are doing is having the right impact. It was noted that there had been an increase in appropriate referrals recently, which over time would hopefully reduce waiting times. The opportunities and benefits resulting from having joint executive leads from both health and local authorities sectors were highlighted. It was agreed that a presentation on the Children's Mental Health Strategy would be circulated to the Committee.
- Are school teachers receiving training which will enable them to appropriately identify referrals to CAMS? It was confirmed that training was being rolled out and leads within schools had been identified.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the report be noted.
2. That the Committee support the implementation of the 10 innovation scale and spread business cases and support the release of the £5m of the DfE funding for those to be implemented by agreeing to £500k for each authority which will be used in accordance with their business plan.

3. That the Committee support the release of the £150k to support the development of independent learning from the work.
4. That the Committee recommend that the GMCA endorse the Children's Plan and agree to the release of the funding to assist with the delivery in accordance with the business plans.
5. That further information on the Children's Mental Health Strategy would be circulated to the Committee.
6. That further information on the data currently available in relation to the priority areas be circulated to the Committee.
7. That further information relating to the rationale for school readiness statistics detailed within the GMS Dashboard be circulated to the Committee.

## **CI68/18**

## **GREATER MANCHESTER FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE Q2 PERFORMANCE**

Leon Parkes, Assistant Chief Fire Officer, presented a report on the Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue Service (GMFRS) quarter 2 performance during 2018/19 against the development and delivery goals contained within the Corporate and Integrated Risk Management Plan 2016/20.

The following key points were highlighted:

- GMFRS attended a total of 9,025 incidents (fires, false alarms and special service calls) during quarter 2, an increase of 9.14% when compared with quarter 2 during 2017/18. The increase was mainly associated with the increase in fires, particularly from moorland fires, related to the unseasonably hot weather, although an increase in false alarms had also been observed. Special service calls had seen a reduction.
- The average response time was 5 minutes 49 seconds, which exceeded the target of 5 minutes 45 seconds and was higher than the 5 minutes 30 seconds during the same quarter in 2017/18. There were a number of protracted incidents which have impacted on overall response time, particularly during the month of July during the moorland incidents.
- Sadly three people died as a result of a fire in quarter 2, compared with six fire related deaths in quarter 2 2017/18. All three were accidental in nature and occurred in dwellings, but the victims were known to other services.
- Quarter 2 has seen a total of 3,830 false alarms recorded, an increase of 329 (9.4%) when compared to quarter 2 in 2017/18; 1427 of all false alarms were FADAs (non-domestic), compared with 1550 during the same period in 2017/18.
- The overall sickness absence during quarter 2 was 4.16% which is a reduction of 0.95% when compared to quarter 2 in 2017/18. Mental health and Musculo-skeletal injuries remain the main reasons for time lost to sickness. GMFRS promotes stress counselling, employee assistance programmes, occupational health services and rehabilitation progressing, using flexible working options/ improved work life balance, make changes to working patterns or environment and have a capability procedure to support employees.

- There had been 27 hostilities towards GMFRS personnel reported during quarter 2. This measure was extended on 1 April 2018 to include hostilities towards all GMFRS personnel and property and is therefore not comparable to 2017/18 data.
- The Home Office Fire Service Workforce and pensions report published in October 2018 advises; that in 2017/18 10.5% of new firefighters in England were female. In GMFRS this figure is 31%, the second highest percentage of new female recruits in England, and the highest when compared to Fire services in other metropolitan authorities. In terms of BAME figures the England figures was 5% compared to the GMFRS figures of 41% which demonstrates that the talent and attraction work is having a significant positive impact.

The following questions and suggestions were raised:

- Has an analysis of the impact that amalgamating the North West Control has had on attendance times been conducted? It was confirmed that no specific analysis had been conducted, but it was highlighted that the technology used within the Regional Fire Control Centre was new and more advanced, noting that every fire engine has been fitted with GPS technology and the control centre will mobilise the quickest and nearest fire engine. In some cases this could mean mobilising a fire engine from another area. It was confirmed that further enhancements were planned to take place next year which would improve the location accuracy to five metres noting that further information would be provided in due course.
- How long does the recruitment process take? It was confirmed that the overall process could take in the region of two to three months, as it encompasses a number of stages; from the filtering a high volume of applications, to conducting physical testing, and interviewing candidates at the assessment centre. To reduce the length of future recruitment processes shortlisted applicant's details are retained who can be called upon when further vacancies arise.
- Was the lack of resource having an impact on the attrition rate? It was confirmed that there were a variety of reasons affecting attrition rate, which included the service's retirement profile. It was highlighted that firefighters are only required to give one weeks' notice which poses a challenge when succession planning however, exit interviews are conducted and actively monitored. In addition, the rail industry had recently been actively targeting firefighters.
- A Member expressed his disappointment regarding GMFRSs withdrawal from the Emergency Medical Response trial and explored whether there were any negotiations underway with the Fire Brigade's Union (FBU) which sought to reinstate their support of this work? It was confirmed that GMFRS still respond to a significant number of incidents were they work with paramedics as a team, and the training was still being maintained, however, unfortunately they are not responding on behalf of, and with paramedics to 'red ones'. It was confirmed that negotiations were underway nationally and GMFRS are monitoring its progress with interest. It was highlighted that GMFRS are still running the 'Survival Academy' and there 'restart the heart campaign' aiming to provide CPR training to the every member of the public. As part of their work with businesses, GMFRS are also registering the locations of defibrillators on to the national register.
- What was the rationale for the considerable reduction in Safe and Well visits? It was confirmed that there were a number of elements which had impacted on the reduction which included the moorland fires. Following this incident, the service went into a period of recovery whereby they retrieved equipment, and gave staff time to recover, and catch up with staff training. It was advised that Safe and Well visits continue to be successful in

reducing fires within the home, but it must be recognised that crews have to prioritise their fire protection work. Dealing with the outcomes related to the Grenfell enquiry was a continuing challenge for GMFRS, noting that crews had visited all 500 hundred high rise buildings in GM within three months. The importance of crews becoming familiar with their built environments was emphasised.

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the update on be noted.

#### **CI69/18 UNWANTED FIRE SIGNALS (UWFS'S)**

ACFO Tony Hunter, Director of Prevention and Protection, GMFRS, introduced a report which provided an overview of the GMFRS's response to Automatic Fire Alarms (AFA's).

The following key points were highlighted:

- In 2005, a tragic incident occurred on Liverpool Road, which involved an Eccles fire engine, whereby a collision occurred on the way to a false alarm where by a member of the public tragically lost their life. This made GMFRS question how we respond to incidents and in terms of the attending incidents striking the right balance between the safety of the firefighters and the public.
- A significant number of incidents attended by GMFRS are due to unwanted fire signals (UWFS), which could be reduced if someone checked that there was an actual fire.
- Sending fire appliances to calls of this nature has a significant impact on GMFRS, due to the following reasons:
  - Fire appliances are not available to respond to genuine life threatening emergencies
  - Responding to UWFS under blue light conditions poses an unnecessary risk to staff and other road users
  - Operational crews are disrupted whilst undertaking other core tasks such as training and community safety activities
  - Financial costs are incurred for fuel and there is an associated impact on the environment caused by the appliance movements.
- To address the burden and manage the risk imposed by UWFS, FRS have been engaging with building occupiers and owners to help encourage them to reduce the number of false alarms in their premises, and modified the resources that it sends in response to a call originating from an automatic system.
- There are a number of different approaches taken by other North West FRS's which include; not responding to any AFA's unless backed up by a 999 call and charging property owners for repeat UWFS.

The following questions were raised:

- A Member expressed his objection in relation to moving to a policy which did not respond to AFA's. Has there been any legal challenge to clarify whether GMFRS are legally required to respond to AFA's? It was confirmed that as GMFRS were one of the few FRS that still responded to AFA's, it was likely that the legal challenge had taken place, however clarification would be sought. It was highlighted that 40% of all incidents attended were false

alarms and a high percentage of these were UWFS. In these instances, between 4 and 8 firefighters were attending premises to check fire alarms. It was agreed that the percentage of UWFS would be clarified and circulated to the Committee.

- A Member highlighted that a high volume of the false alarms related to non-domestic premises, noting that historically repeat offenders included schools, student accommodation, and hospitals. How are we tackling repeat offenders in relation to prevention and should we be considering implementing charging? It was confirmed that there were different approaches adopted, which were dependent upon the premises and the risks which applied. It was confirmed that in relation to hospitals and schools, GMFRS had dedicated offices who work with their fire safety officers to try and reduce the number of false alarms. This worked included supporting them to develop their fire safety strategy, but also giving warnings where necessary. It was noted that charging had previously been considered but as many of the repeat offenders were in the public sector, it was felt that it would be more effective to work with them to reduce the number of false alarms. GMFRS also engage with businesses to help reduce the number of false actuations in their premises.

#### **RESOLVED:**

1. That the report be noted.
2. That further clarification be provided to the Committee with regards to whether GMFRS are legally required to attend AFA's.
3. That further clarification be provided to the Committee in relation to the percentage of UWFA's.

#### **CI70/18**

#### **TFGM BUDGET FOR BUS COSTS**

Steve Warrener, TfGM Finance and Corporate Services Director, introduced a report which described the budgets managed by TfGM for the delivery of Bus Services including, the Supported Services and Concessionary Reimbursement budgets.

The following key points were highlighted:

- The Supported Services Budget consists of 'general network services' and the schools network.
- The general network includes 240 services (as at September 2018) with an annual budget for 2018/19, net of income, of £19.2 million.
- The schools network includes 304 contracts (as at September 2018) with an annual budget of £8m. These are usually in the form of resource contracts with TfGM taking the revenue risk. School services are provided in cases where either there is no alternative service available in the commercial network services. Whilst schools are now attracting pupils beyond the traditional catchment areas there remains a general expectation that this additional demand and cost will be picked up by TfGM. TfGM therefore has to manage this within the existing budget envelope which means that difficult choices have to be made.
- In addition to management through TfGM, oversight of the Supported Services Budget, and approval of any planned changes in the network, is through the TfGMC Bus Network and Transport for Greater Manchester Services Sub-Committee ('BNTS'). BNTS meets six times a



year and receives reports on network performance, performance against budget and details of any planned changes in the network, for review and approval.

- The funding available for the Supported Services budget has reduced by 20-25% over the last five years as the TfGM Levy Budget has been either cut or 'frozen' at a 'cash standstill' level over much of the period. Over the same period there have been significant cost pressures on budget due to cost inflation and service deregistrations.
- To date, TfGM has sought to manage these pressures from within existing budgets through a combination of initiatives such as; seeking to 'commercialise' existing subsidised services; reducing service frequencies, whilst maintaining the overall network; delivering additional efficiencies in service provision through the procurement process; and seeking efficiencies in the school services network.
- Although the strategies have helped to limit the impacts on the network, some service reductions and removals have been necessary to manage within the budgetary pressures noted. These have been targeted on those services with the lowest usage.
- In addition, TfGM also provides a grant to Greater Manchester Accessible Transport Limited (GMATL) which makes up the majority of the funding for the 'Ring and Ride' accessible transport service. This funding has also come under significant pressure in the last 5 years and has reduced from £6m to £4.3m in the 2018/19 budget. The grant reduction has been managed through a number of efficiencies in the delivery of the service, including depot consolidation, and through increases in certain fares. All changes to fares have been made in consultation with GMATL customers.
- In terms of concessionary reimbursements, the majority of the cost relates to the English National Concessionary Scheme (ENCTS), which provides free off-peak bus travel for concessionary travellers (older persons, disabled) anywhere in England. TfGM is required to pay for all travel from and within its boundaries on eligible services, reimbursing operators on the basis that they are 'no better, no worse off' due to the existence of the ENCTS. This is a statutory obligation and the scope to control cost locally is very limited.
- However, TfGM has sought to manage its 'risk' in relation to future costs by seeking more cost certainty through the agreement of 'fixed cost' or 'fixed rate' reimbursement agreements with the major operators.
- The costs incurred in connection with Bus Reform are currently being funded from Earnback Revenue and Reserves and Mayoral Capacity funding. The forecast costs in 2018/19 are £6m.

Members asked the following questions to Steve Warrener and Alison Chew, Interim Head of Bus Services who was also in attendance:

- Further clarity was required in relation to 'Ring and Ride' and whether consolidating depots was a false economy due to the additional fuel costs and additional travel time for drivers. It was confirmed that TfGM had worked closely with GMATL regarding the proposed changes and the changes had been subject to a detailed appraisal. This work had concluded that it was more beneficial for GMATL to consolidate the depots.
- Had staff retention been affected by the consolidation of the depots? It was confirmed that staff were consulted on the proposed changes and the changes had not resulted in a significant loss of staff. However, attrition was an ongoing challenge for the service in terms of recruitment.
- How much does the enhanced GM concessionary schemes on Metrolink and Rail cost and was this sustainable? It was confirmed that there were additional concessions on Metrolink and Rail which were factored into the budgets. Further information on the costs would be circulated to the Committee.

- How can the consultation process for changes to bus services be improved so that Members and the public have more time to respond to proposed changes to services? It was confirmed that providers have an obligation to inform the local authority of any proposed changes to their commercial services with 70 days' notice. There is then a period of 28 days (within the 70 days) where TfGM can request data from the provider. It was noted that TfGM do engage with Members, particularly with a focus on BNTS, and also receive a lot of Member correspondence which they take into account. It was confirmed that TfGM would consider what process could be implemented to provide more opportunity for Members to respond to proposed changes.
- Further clarification was requested in terms of the reference to 'difficult choices' in relation to the schools network (detailed at p2.5). It was confirmed that TfGM consider each case in isolation, giving priority to minimising the number of times that passengers need to change service+. TfGM had not, to date, had to take into consideration the type of school, however, some analysis on the breadth of services had been conducted. It was confirmed that there were currently no plans to change the approach.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the report be noted.
2. That the Committee receive further information in relation to the costs associated with the concessionary schemes on Metrolink and rail.
3. The TfGM note the Committee comments in relation to the consultation of proposed changes.

**CI71/18            GMCA REGISTER OF KEY DECISIONS**

**RESOLVED:**

That the report be noted.

**CI72/18                            DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING**

Tuesday 22<sup>nd</sup> January, 1pm, GMCA Boardroom, Churchgate House, Manchester, M1 6EU