

**GREATER MANCHESTER COMBINED AUTHORITY (GMCA)
CORPORATE ISSUES AND REFORM OVERVIEW and SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
21 AUGUST 2018 AT 6.00PM AT THE GMCA OFFICES**

Present:	Councillor Nathan Evans (Trafford) (in the Chair)
Bolton:	Councillor Kevin McKeon (substitute)
Bury:	Councillor Stella Smith
Bury:	Councillor Tim Pickstone
Manchester:	Councillor Mary Watson
Manchester:	Councillor John Leech (substitute)
Manchester:	Councillor Annette Wright
Oldham:	Councillor Colin McLaren
Oldham:	Councillor Clint Phythian (substitute)
Rochdale:	Councillor Peter Malcolm
Salford:	Councillor David Jolley
Stockport:	Councillor Linda Holt
Tameside:	Councillor John Bell
Trafford:	Councillor Anne Duffield
Wigan:	Councillor Fred Walker (substitute)

In attendance

GMCA	Eamonn Boylan, Chief Executive, GMCA
	Dawn Docx, Interim Chief Fire Officer, GMFRS
	Leon Parkes, Assistant County Fire Officer, GMFRS
	Sarah Barnes, GMCA
	Susan Ford, Statutory Scrutiny Officer
	Emma Stonier, Governance and Scrutiny Officer

CI16/18 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Hamid Khurram (Bolton), Gillian Peet (Tameside), Yvonne Guariento (Stockport) and Joanne Marshall (Wigan).

CI17/18 CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS AND URGENT BUSINESS

The Chair asked Members if they agreed to the 18 September meeting being held at the Fire Training Centre in Bury. A tour of the training centre would be arranged for 4.30pm and the meeting would commence at the usual time (6.00pm). Members agreed to this. It was also requested that consideration was given to inviting Members of the other scrutiny committees and substitute members.

CI18/18 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest received.

The Chair reminded Members to complete their annual GMCA Register of Interest Form and return this to the Governance and Scrutiny Officer.

The minutes of the meeting held on 19 June 2018 were submitted for approval.

A Member asked for clarity around the use of substitutes and also whether July's meeting had been cancelled because of quoracy. There was a pool of scrutiny substitutes used for all scrutiny committees to ensure that meetings were quorate. Initially the GMCA will try to ensure the right political balance, but if it was thought a meeting was not going to be quorate then the invitation would be sent to all substitute members. The July meeting had not been cancelled due to it not being quorate. The substantive agenda item had been from GMFRS and it had been at the time when the organisation was fighting the moorland fires.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the last meeting held 19 June 2018 be approved as a correct record.

PREVENTING HATEFUL EXTREMISM AND PROMOTING SOCIAL COHESION COMMISSION: A SHARED FUTURE

CLlr Rishi Shori, Portfolio Leader for Young People and Cohesion, introduced the report which provided an update on the work that had been undertaken by the Preventing Hateful Extremism and Promoting Social Cohesion Commission.

Members had the following questions and comments:

- J Whether the Commission had arrived at the conclusion that Prevent was positive? Members were informed that the role of the Commission was to look at how Prevent operated. The principals of Prevent were generally accepted, however there was a perception that it targeted specific communities and work was required around people to ensure information was readily available to communities about Prevent and its role and also how communities can assist. One suggestion in the report had been to set up an informal advice line where people could raise concerns. The number of GM residents referred to Prevent was relatively small and GM had requested the figures from the Home Office in order to be as open and transparent as possible.
- J Members asked for clarity around the reasoning for the decision not to have a GM Charter to promote social cohesion. The results of the Commission's consultation had demonstrated that the majority of people were not supportive of a GM Charter and the commission had taken note of this feedback. Additionally it was noted that by defining an 'identity' there is a perception that people fit into this or not. A Member noted that there could be a set of shared values even if there was not a cohesive shared identity. It was stated that there were challenges associated with distinguishing between identity and culture as the two were not exclusive of each other.
- J Members felt there was a conflict between a bottom-up response and the role of public bodies in providing leadership, for example through a zero tolerance approach to hate crime. Members were updated that these two approaches were aligned with local communities driving what happens at a local level with GM adding value to local actions.
- J How were members of the Commission recruited? Members were informed that a selection criteria was developed and the Chair of the commission met with a variety of

people to ensure there was a broad range of expertise and experience. Details of membership was included in section 4.1.2 of the report.

- J That there was a lack of clarity in the report about the meaning of Prevent. Members were updated that it was felt that the meaning of Prevent was relatively clear, there had been misinformation about what Prevent was. An approach was required which communicated more clearly what it meant and overcame the perceptions that it targeted specific communities.
- J The report stated that there was a lack of flexibility in intervention and Members asked why this was and examples of this. Members were updated that there were instances where people missed thresholds for the referral to multiple services. If communication was more effective across organisations then this individually would be better able to access services. The difference in government funding received in different GM authorities was also highlighted.
- J There was a suggestion that police funding cuts may be one of the reasons why people may not share information with the police. Were there other reasons why people might not want to share information with the police? The Commission had received feedback that there was a general lack of places where people could go to report concerns. This was also linked to the provision of youth services and the limited opportunity to report concerns to those not in 'authority. Neighbourhood police were felt to be a positive route to report concerns to build relationships with communities.
- J That careful consideration should be given to attendees at the proposed annual engagement event and that it was crucial that people working in the community were invited. Members were updated that it was felt the engagement event would be a positive tool and that GM was committed to ensuring that the principals of engagement were clearly defined. Members also requested that consideration was given to how women and girls were engaged with and empowered.
- J How would the proposal to move some of the responsibility for Prevent to Local Authorities be funded? Members were informed that there was funding available for this but the exact amount had not been finalised. It was highlighted that this was a positive step forward in changing perceptions of Prevent.
- J That sustaining/securing long term funding to implement the Commission's recommendations would be challenging. It was stated that funding and delivery of the recommendations needs to be looked at in the context of the Public Service Reform (PSR) agenda leading to working in 'smarter' ways, and that the Commission's report should not be considered in isolation to other work taking place across GM.
- J How would success be measured? It was emphasised that the aim of the recommendations was to improve social cohesion across GM. GM was looking at this in relation to the ambitions outlined in the Greater Manchester Strategy (GMS) and how the outcomes in this were delivered.
- J That for almost all people meeting intervention thresholds mental health had been a factor and anecdotally it appeared that in some cases of radicalisation this, alongside poverty, isolation etc., were not factors. Mental Health was linked to the emphasis on a safeguarding approach. It was also highlighted that not all referrals into Prevent resulted in an onward referral to Channel. Channel Peer Reviews had been undertaken and mental health had been found to be a contributor in cases, indicating there could be more emphasis required in Prevent training around mental health.
- J That it was crucial that the message about the phone line, where people could receive advice and guidance, was communicated clearly so people would make use of this resource. The Mayor and Deputy Mayor (Policing and Crime) had endorsed this

recommendation and the importance of advisors in being able to make decisions about the required support emphasised.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

CI21/18 GMCA BUSINESS PLAN 2018-20

Eamonn Boylan, Chief Executive, GMCA, presented a report which provided Members with the GMCA Business Plan for 2018-20 and outlined activity to be delivered in the coming two years.

Key areas highlighted included:

- J The Business Plan is focused on work of the GMCA. It was noted that successful delivery of the Public Service Reform (PSR) agenda could only be delivered through and with partner organisations.
- J The Business Plan does not include details operational plans for transport, policing or the fire service which have their own operational plans.
- J The complex nature of the GMCA as an organisation, bringing together different bodies with a range of work practices and process was emphasised. These were in the process of being rationalised.
- J Work was taking place around the integration of functions across the organisation to ensure delivery of the Greater Manchester Strategy (GMS) and the best value for money.
- J GMCA was working with the Greater Manchester health and Social Care Partnership (GMHSCP) to look at ways back office functions can be aligned with the combined authority.
- J The net contribution from the 10 local authorities which included £4m funding provided to the cultural programme. The budget did not include the Growth Company, which is externally funded.
- J Key priorities for the GMCA included:
 - GMSF consultation at end October 2018.
 - £40m funding secured for the roll out of Full Fibre to public sector premises. GM's ambition is to have 25-30% premises connected by 2020 compared to 3% currently.
 - Public Service Reform (PSR) which includes: work and health programme; StartWell, Early Years Programme, Life Readiness and the GM Aging Hub. GM has been recognised nationally for its work on the Age Friendly agenda.
 - GM is a member of the 100 Resilient Cities Network and the GM Resilience Team was looking at: infrastructure in relation to global warming/climate change and contingency planning for exiting the European Union.
 - New contractual arrangements for Waste Management. GM had negotiated out of the PFI contract which would make savings for all constituent bodies.
 - Preparing for the devolution of the Adult Education Budget (AEB), which will be approximately £90m per annum, in 2019/20.
 - Developing a Local Industrial Strategy.
 - Making representation to Government regarding the proposed Shared Prosperity Fund matching current EU funding levels in GM.

- Supporting the Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue Service post the Kerslake Review finding.

Members had the following questions and comments:

-) What the GMCA's plans around carbon reduction were? Following the Mayor's Green Summit there had been an announcement that GM intended to achieve carbon neutrality 7 years before the Government date. GM partner organisations had also signed up to the strategy which had come out of the Green Summit. It was agreed that the Committee would be provided with more information regarding this.
-) Whether the GMCA had borrowing powers? It was confirmed that the GMCA do not have the power to borrow at a GM level and it was not expected that the requisite parliamentary orders would be made in the near future. Capital sums were depended on borrowing through Manchester City Council or Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) and the most of GMCA funding was received through grants, such as the Transforming Cities Fund. Members asked whether there was concern about maintaining the level of investment post Brexit. GM were lobbying for a future flexible approach to investment from the Government through the Shared Prosperity Fund.
-) What was the role of the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) in attracting business to the region and how did GM see future economic growth and skills developing? The work of MIDAS, GMS Inward Investment Agency (such as the ERDF) and the success of the Evergreen funds was highlighted to the Committee. GM was still seeing growth in certain sectors and places, however challenges ahead were noted. GM was in continuing discussion with the Department for Education regarding skills, and Work was also taking place around how to make the best use of the apprenticeship levy.
-) What were the biggest challenges for the GMCA and what were some of the successes of the GMCA, particularly in relation to benefits for GM residents? One of successes highlighted was the Business Rate growth retention pilot. This would have been unable to take place without a Mayoral Combined Authority. Additionally it was highlighted that GM's growth trajectory and economy were driving the reform agenda to enable GM residents to benefit from growth. Early Years work, skills and life readiness were all noted as being crucial elements of this agenda. The reshaping of Health and Social Care was also highlighted as being an area which should deliver tangible benefits for GM residents. Consideration was needed about how this was more widely communicated.
-) The West Midlands Combined Authority had already developed a Local Industrial Strategy and had secured £250m Government funding for battery and connected vehicle programmes and it was asked what progress GM had made relating to this. The importance of attracting industrial investment was also highlighted by Members. Members were informed that the West Midlands was an area with significant automotive primes. They were also updated that GM was focused on developing an Industrial Strategy and had commissioned an independent review to assess future risks to the economy and to drive the strategy forward. A logistics hub was being developed in the North of the conurbation, which the GMCA had funded. The development of Airport City and its contribution to growth was also highlighted.

RESOLVED:

1. That the contents of the GMCA Business Plan be noted.

2. That Members be provided with further information about the GMCA's carbon reduction plans.

CI22/18

GMFRS ACCELERATED RECRUITMENT 2018/19

Dawn Docx, Interim Chief Fire Officer, introduced a report which provided an update on the GMFRS accelerated Firefighter recruitment and training plan.

Key areas highlighted included:

-) That GMFRS needed to recruit 332 firefighters into the service through to April 2020.
-) The focus on increasing the diversity of the workforce through recruitment.
-) Numbers of firefighters recruited so far: 27 had been recruited in January 2018 and were now on stations across GM; 37 were currently in training and were due to pass out in September; 55 had been recruited in the most recent round and were in the process of being offered contracts. 50 firefighters had been recruited through inter-service transfers from other fire services. There was also a recognition that GMFRS may lose some staff through inter-service transfer.
-) GMFRS have worked with GMP around attracting a more diverse workforce and had undertaken a range of measures to attract new recruits. It was highlighted that 28% new recruits were from underrepresented groups.
-) GMFRS were in the process of developing a new operating model for the future.

Members had the following questions and comments:

-) Whether vacancies arising from firefighters leaving GMFRS were able to be filled from the ranks? Employees would be encouraged to apply for promotions when available and GMFRS was undertaking a piece of work around refining their promotion processes, making it clear what skills were required for each level and what staff needed to do to prepare for promotion.
-) How many applications were received for each post? GMFRS had undertaken a targeted recruitment process. Applications had been restricted to those who had undertaken volunteer roles, attended a taster day or had connections with the organisation. The result of this approach had been fewer overall applications but those received were from better prepared candidates.
-) Whether women were included in under-represented groups? It was confirmed that women were included in this group as they were under represented within GMFRS. It was also asked what percentage of the 28% of new recruits from underrepresented groups were women. This was estimated at approximately 50%. Members would be provide with more detail about the breakdown of this figure.
-) Did the requirement for 332 new firefighters include replacing the average of 90 firefighters who left the organisation each year? It was confirmed that this was the case.
-) Whether GMFRS had any figures showing how many firefighters had left the organisation through inter-service transfers? GMFRS informed Members that this report had not included figures related to this and confirmed this would be included in future quarterly performance reports. It was also requested that future performance reports included numbers of firefighters from underrepresented groups. Currently underrepresented groups made up 5% of the workforce and GMFRS was working hard to increase the diversity of the workforce. It was agreed to provide Members with a short report which

provided more detailed figures about current workforce diversity, work undertaken to increase this and the trajectory GMFRS were aiming for until 2020.

- J Members asked for clarity about what was involved in targeted recruitment. GMFRS had held events/taster days in gyms, mosques, community groups and other locations to reach underrepresented groups. Taster days involve raising awareness about the role, challenging 'myths' and practical sessions with fire service equipment.
- J Members requested that information about staff retention was included in future performance reports.
- J Whether GMFRS attracted applications from other emergency services? It was noted that although there were no exact figures GMFRS particularly attracted applications from armed forces.
- J When will a recruitment and retention plan beyond 2020 be developed? GMFRS will develop a targeted approach to recruitment, and increasing diversity, as part of the new operation model.
- J Whether recruitment had increased staff morale within GMFRS? It was noted that recruitment was in the early stages but that overall it was felt to have had a positive impact on the service.

RESOLVED:

1. That the update on GMFRS accelerated recruitment be noted.
2. That detail about the breakdown of the 28% figure of new recruits from under-represented groups was circulated to the Committee.
3. That Members were provided with a short report providing a more detailed breakdown of figures about current workforce diversity, work undertaken to increase this, breakdown of new recruits and the trajectory GMFRS were aiming for until 2020.
4. That information about staff retention was included in future performance reports.

CI23/18

WORK PROGRAMME

Susan Ford, Statutory Scrutiny Officer, introduced the work programme. Members confirmed the agenda items for the September meeting. Members agreed that Budget Monitoring would be added to the October work programme and that School Readiness would be an agenda item in either November or December.

Members also discussed the inclusion of; women and the criminal justice system and fairness, equality and devolution. The Committee's suggestions would be incorporated into the work programme in consultation with policy leads.

Members asked whether there was a time limit for when reports were requested by them to when they were considered by the Committee. It was confirmed that this depended on the nature of the report and request. Some of the considerations included; timings relating to the topic in question and working around items already included in the work programme.

RESOLVED:

1. That the Statutory Scrutiny Officer circulated a reconfigured work programme prior to the next meeting.
2. That Budget Monitoring be added to the October work programme.
3. That School Readiness would be considered in either November or December.

CI24/18

DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Friday 21st September, 2.00pm, Boardroom, Churchgate House, Manchester, M1 6EU