

Call-In a Decision Form

| | |
|--|--|
| TITLE OF REPORT | Extension of a Section 75 agreement with NCA |
| DATE DECISION MADE: | 15 december 2025 |
| DECISION MADE BY: (Cabinet/officer) | Cabinet |
| REFERENCE NO. (If appropriate) | HSC-14-25 |

The following signatories request that the above decision be called in:

| | Name | Signature |
|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| 1* | Mark Kenyon | By email |
| 2* | Alicia Marland | By email |
| 3 | Sam Al-Hamdani | By email |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | | |
| | | |
| | | |

**Two signatories minimum.*

To be filled out by lead signatory:

Why is the decision being called in? (Continue on another page if necessary)¹

There was not enough information on which to make a decision.

The paper essentially asks Cabinet to approve a contract extension AND to make changes to the service provision in Oldham:

“d) to delegate authority to the relevant officers to harmonize the 0-19 specification with Bury and Rochdale to allow for greater consistency, whilst ensuring that an appropriate locality schedule reflects the current delivery model in Oldham.”

Section 2.6 describes the origin of this request:

“The NCA currently provide 0-19 services to Bury, Rochdale and Oldham through three separate approaches. Although all areas are operating through a different delivery model 3 and under different contractual arrangements, there has been an ask from the provider to work towards a harmonized specification”

2.6 then continues to list the benefits to The NCA:

¹ The grounds on which an executive decision can be called-in are:

1. The decision falls outside the Council's agreed Budget or Policy Framework. 2
2. There was not enough information on which to make a decision
3. An alternative policy option or options were not sufficiently explored.
4. The reason(s) for rejection of alternative policy options were not sufficiently explained.
5. Other Committee/Sub-Committees or any other Council body which have a legitimate role to comment were not given the opportunity to do so
6. The decision should have been included in the key decision notice.

- help streamline NCA oversight processes
- greater consistency within the north east arc of Greater Manchester
- agree a standardised performance framework across all three localities

2.6 then describes why this is a reasonable request:

“As all areas are broadly working to deliver the mandated and nationally prescribed Healthy Child Programme – this is considered achievable. Oldham’s schedule of delivery will reflect our nuanced approach to deliver through an integrated approach in partnership with the Local Authority, and any additionality.”

The report is lacking information in four key areas, without which affects the quality of the decision taken by Cabinet, reduces transparency and scrutiny.

1) Limited or No discussion of benefits to the borough of Oldham

Whilst there is detail about how a decision taken by Oldham will benefit The NCA, there is very limited discussion in the report about how this specifically benefits the borough of Oldham. Whilst it is collegiate and worthy to help a partner, our primary concern is the delivery of services for the borough of Oldham. The report does not detail this anywhere and it should. If there is no specific benefit to the borough of Oldham other than building goodwill with a partner, then the report should state this.

2) In addition, the report is vague at section 2.5:

“the Local Authority is expected to commission school nursing, National Child Measurement programme (NCMP), plus targeted support.”

“is expected” is extremely unclear and does not specify whether the authority:

- is expected but doesn’t,
- is expected and does or
- is expected but will do in the future

3) No “before” performance metrics

Section 2.9 mentions the monthly governance oversight group that monitors service delivery but does not contain any summary of service delivery metrics. This will make it more challenging in the future to evaluate the quality of this decision (ie how has service delivery been impacted by the harmonisation of 0-19 specification?).

4) No discussion or detail about how to measure and mitigate a con.

Section 3.1 describes the following for the preferred option:

Option 1 – To extend the section 75 partnership agreement with the NCA for the delivery of the integrated children’s and families service.

Pros – the partnership already exists, the staffing model is stable, and this requires minimal Council capacity to enact this option

Cons – this doesn’t provide any option to test the market

This section should contain at the very least a discussion of the quantitative or qualitative impact of this con. Ideally it would also seek approval for actions to potentially mitigate this con.

To be filled out by the Chair of the O&S Board:

Which Officers/Cabinet Members do you wish to attend the Overview & Scrutiny Board meeting to answer the call-in and why?

Date Call In to be heard:

For office use only:

Signature of O&S Board Chair:

Date:

Time: