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**SUMMARY**

The purpose of this report is to provide the Best Value Panel with an overview of the key service issues and the opportunity to discuss other issues which may need to be addressed in the 2nd stage of the review.

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the Best Value Panel approves the following key issues for further investigation in the second stage of the best value review of Strategy, Planning and Performance:

- Performance Management
- Programme Management
- Performance Audit
- Boundaries with other departments and departmental structure
INTRODUCTION

1. In compliance with the Local Government Act 1999, the Authority has agreed a programme of Best Value reviews for all of its functions. The review of Strategy, Planning and Performance is scheduled for completion in the financial year 2005-2006.

2. This 1st stage report is part of the agreed process whereby the key issues for the review are identified at an early stage and, subject to agreement; further work is concentrated on these areas for the remainder of the review. This approach was agreed at the Best Value Panel on 20th May 2002 (BV51).

WHERE ARE WE NOW

Background to the review

3. The duty of a best value requires Fire and Rescue Services to secure continuous improvement with regard to economy, efficiency and effectiveness. The primary aim of a best value review is to deliver credible recommendations and action plans that will result in sustainable, significant improvements in service quality and/or efficiency for the area under review.

4. The Authority agreed to carry out three best value reviews during the second half of 2004/05. These are: Strategy, Planning and Performance (SPP); Communications and Property Services. There is some inter-relationship between the reviews of SPP and Communications, therefore a joint project board has been established to co-ordinate the work and oversee individual steering groups for each review. This is to ensure co-ordination, provide an efficient means of involving the executive and ensure that the appropriate people are involved at the right level. (Details of the Project Board are attached in appendix A Scoping document). The review of Property Services has separate project management arrangements.

5. Any best value review has to take place in the context of the current situation within the Authority in terms of what has gone before and/or what is also happening while it is being undertaken. The review of Strategy, Planning and Performance will take into account issues arising from the Fire and Rescue Services Act 2004, the National Framework for the Fire and Rescue Service and the development of integrated risk management planning, the Audit Commission’s report of November 2004 undertaken as part of the Initial Performance Assessment (IPA) exercise and the approach to future service delivery set out in the London Safety Plan 2. All of these matters will be reflected in the work and recommendations contained within the 2nd Stage review which is due to report to the Best Value Panel in May 2005.

Description of service under review

6. The functions and services relating to strategy, planning and performance are led by the Strategy, Planning and Performance department (SPP). Where other departments
are involved in delivery of specific functions or services, this has been explained below within the section on boundaries with other departments.

**Structure of the Strategy Planning & Performance Department**

7. The Strategy Planning and Performance Department sits within the Corporate Services Directorate. The aim of the department is to ensure an organisational approach to continuous improvement through co-ordinated management information systems and planning and performance review activity and the provision of strategic planning expertise and advice in order to achieve best value.

8. There are three divisions of SPP, each of which perform specific roles. However, due to the nature of the department, there is a considerable amount of collaborative working in order to achieve the department’s objectives. The three divisions making up SPP are: Information Management, Performance Management and Performance Audit and Review.

9. The department was established in 2002 as a result of the recommendations in Review of Strategy, Planning and Performance Department (FEP 273). The structure was designed to support the corporate priorities of the Authority at that time and was in line with the top management review (FEP 100) May 2002.

10. The role and responsibilities of SPP are:

   a) **Planning**

   11. Management of the Authority’s corporate plan, best value performance plan and supporting planning structures. Liaison and joint working with the GLA on performance issues and reporting to the Mayor’s office. Integration of financial and service planning and integration of equalities planning and impact assessment into strategic planning.

   b) **External Liaison**

   12. Managing the organisation’s consultation and engagement strategy and co-ordination of interaction with stakeholders (public, corporate and legislative) regarding major initiatives and forms of external consultation. (e.g. recent liaison regarding LSP2). It also encompasses reporting and analysis of compliments and complaints. Managing external performance assessments. Some external consultation is conducted by other departments.

   c) **Programme management**

   13. Co-ordinating the range of projects, actions and initiatives that fall out of the corporate, departmental and borough plans. This is a key area that provides the tools for the management and co-ordination of the Authority’s business activities and decisions on priorities for the allocation of resources.

   d) **Best value review work**

   14. This team have the responsibility for our statutory requirement to complete best value reviews. They also co-ordinate the organisation’s overall approach to performance reviews and provide a source of advice and good practice on performance review methodology and techniques. Working with the Equalities Unit to assess the impact of recommendations from reviews on our Equality and Diversity performance.
e) Performance audit
15. The team audit operational command systems operating within Fire & Community Safety Directorate. The audit team also support the Health & Safety Manager in carrying out the programme of health and safety audits (an essential element of the safety management system). The team also undertake other non-financial systems audits across the Authority (either as follow up work to best value reviews or in response to other high risk issues which may be identified through day to day management and/or the planning processes).

f) Information strategy and corporate information management projects (including e-government)
16. This strategic level function produces, co-ordinates and monitors the Authority’s information strategy. It provides advice to CMB, Directors and Heads of Service on information management issues and provides specialist advice on these issues to project boards and teams for IT and non-IT based projects. This function also identifies strategic/corporate management information requirements which feed into the IT business systems work plan, business plans, etc. It also prepares and maintains the Authority’s Electronic Government Strategy.

17. In conjunction with other departments it:
   - Assists in the education of staff and managers on the potential of information and information management (Head of Training and Development).
   - Promotes and supports the development of improved corporate information systems for the collection, storage, management and presentation of information (Head of IT)
   - Acts as project sponsor for information management systems.

g) Statistics and Performance Information
18. This is the collation, preparation and analysis of performance and management information for use internally (such as regular reports to Best Value & Finance & Procurement Panels, Corporate Management Board etc) as well as for the benefit of external stakeholders (GLA, ODPM etc). Oversees data sharing initiatives with partners like the London boroughs, police, etc. It also provides a level of technical expertise to assist in the understanding and presentation of performance information and for the verification of data originating outside of the information management division.

h) Data Management
19. This is the data and system administration for key corporate applications. Manages and promotes the use of the Authority’s corporate gazetteer and relationship with the National Land and Property Gazetteer hub. With the IT Department, prepares and maintains a data dictionary, a meta-data repository and an enterprise data model. Sets and enforces data standards, policies and procedures to make sure data is captured in a way which allows correlation of data between different databases and systems. Ensures effective data cleaning and data quality protocols are in place and undertakes data cleaning; develops requirements for data management tools. Plays a key role in the development and rollout of new applications and new versions of existing applications.
i) Knowledge management

20. This is the development of strategies/policies for managing organisational knowledge and knowledge management techniques to improve decision making and management. A key knowledge management tool is a robust and developing intranet site through partnership working with the Head of Communications. This function also includes the library, photographic processing services and management of the systems of instructions and directives.

j) Document management

21. Information (both paper and electronic based) needs to be maintained and managed in line with a clear records management strategy and policies. It provides a service for the storage of inactive (non-current) records, and advises on the retention scheduling, destruction and archiving of paper records of lasting historical interest (in conjunction with the London Metropolitan Archive). Partnership working with the Head of Human Resources also exists for the management of current (active) and non-current (inactive) personal record files. The document management area also covers the central mailroom.

k) Business process improvement

22. This is mainly management of the station-based computing projects (CoFS project) and the lead on the development of IT systems and solutions which impact to improve on station administration. The aim of this function is to remove the bureaucratic nature of station administration and improve efficiency through the development of electronic information flows (e.g. electronic FDR1 and the removal of paper based reporting systems). The area also is lead for key information systems (i.e. the staff attendance recording system (StARS) and the incident recording information system (IRIS), and the management of fire reports (FDR1s) and liaison with ODPM).

l) Information access

23. This is the management of all aspects of the Data Protection Act and Freedom of Information Act by setting policy, providing guidance, advice and training and raising awareness. This function also manages the policies and guidance/advice to staff on information sharing and the associated issues relating to information security, codes of practice and the management of the policies and guidance in relation to the Regulatory of Investigatory Powers regulations and the Human Rights Act1998 (so far as they relate to information access).

m) Risk Information

24. This is the management of data to support integrated risk management planning, including use of risk-based tools to plan and deliver systems to collect, collate and analyse information about risk, thereby supporting development of London Safety Plans. It analyses and presents risk data in user friendly formats (e.g. maps) to make data understandable. It advises on and/or assists with projects which may support or contribute data for risk management planning purposes and works with external contacts to obtain and analyse data that will support risk management planning.

n) Strategy and policy development

25. Support to other corporate projects including development and co-ordination of policy options and writing policy papers. Ensuring preparation of responses to external consultation documents on corporate issues (e.g. Mayoral strategies and other GLA proposals, government white papers and other documents and the range of material
received from the Audit Commission, Local Government Association, Association of London Government etc). The Head of Department plays a lead role in drafting the London Safety Plans and is secretary to the Corporate Management Board.

KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED

**What has been done so far**

26. As part of the review process, the steering group, in conjunction with members of staff from SPP Department, has undertaken the basic fact finding work. Financial, staffing, and performance information has also been collated and is summarised in the baseline analysis.

27. Other departments have been consulted seeking their views on the review, the key issues it needs to address and how they wish to be involved in further stages of the review. The trade unions have been supplied with information and invited to make any comments about the review and the issues it should address. Staff in SPP Department are being kept informed about the review process and they have been involved in the identification of the key issues.

28. A formal Challenge Day was held on the 6th December 2004 attended by external organisations and internal colleagues where they were invited to challenge the functions under review. A full list of attendees is contained within the Baseline Analysis in Appendix B.

29. A FINDS message was sent to all fire authorities within the country requesting information on how they organise and manage similar functions. All of the replies to this message will be examined, to identify questions to be followed up as to how these other organisations operate in relation to the agreed key issues as part of stage 2 of the review.

30. From the above sources a list of issues was drawn up for consideration by the project board and steering group. The steering group analysed the list and taking into account the information collected, they identified four key areas on which it is proposed the next phase of the review should focus.
31. Four key issues have emerged from the preliminary work. These are:

- Performance Management.
- Programme Management.
- Performance Audit.
- Boundaries with other departments and structure.

32. The long list for the key issues is contained in appendix C.

The Issues

Performance Management

33. Performance management is a critical issue for the Authority. Members will appreciate that this was the only issue where the Audit Commission found as part of their Initial Performance Assessment that “weaknesses outweigh strengths”. Effective performance management requires a co-ordinated planning process (risk based and linked to the budget cycle) where objectives and improvement targets are identified at all levels of the organisation (Authority-wide, at departmental and borough level, down to team and individual performance targets). Timely accurate and reliable management information then needs to be available to enable managers to assess their progress in achieving targets and – most importantly – identifying the reasons for any difficulties in achieving targets and using all that information to take action to improve performance in the future. One of the most crucial issues however is the development of a performance management culture. SPP department has a key role to play in several stages in this process – as do managers across the organisation.

34. The Audit Commission report states that ‘LFEPA recognises that it needs to move from a culture of performance monitoring to one of performance management’. This was also acknowledged in our own IPA self assessment.

35. This review provides an excellent opportunity to look in detail at how improvements can be made in this essential process to tackle the known shortcomings. This ties in well with the introduction of IPDS nationally and the separate work under way to develop an appraisal system for non-uniformed staff.

36. The Authority is committed to achieving Equality Standard level 5 and there are various associated planning and corporate governance issues which need to be addressed during the review.

37. All of the organisations attending the challenge day recognised this as an important issue and have undertaken work in this area. The metropolitan police identify local targets and then hold officers accountable against these rather than the corporate aspirations. Other organisations (BT, and City of Westminster) used incentive measures to promote management intervention on performance issues.

38. West Midlands FRS require their managers to submit a direct action plan where problems are identified in meeting agreed targets. Action plans are audited by their performance audit team and the performance results are published on their intranet system to promote competition among districts and stations. Centrex and W M FRS
also suggested that the consistent failure of a performance target may indicate that the
target is wrong and it needs to be challenged.

39. The use of local targets was seen by all to be an effective method of giving ownership
to the personnel involved. However, all participants stated that unless the targets are
SMART (Smart, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Timed) and set in consultation
with the end service providers, their impact on improving performance can be limited.

40. We already have systems in place to identify local issues and progress these through
various planning systems, and some work has also been done to look at how our
financial and business planning systems can be more integrated. This review provides
us with the opportunity to build on the work already undertaken in this area.

Programme Management

41. The need to address performance management issues is outlined above. However this
needs to be supported by a comprehensive programme management system based on
sound project management principles. Currently, there is no centrally co-ordinated
approach to programme or project management across the organisation.

42. Although project management methodology (PRINCE2) is in use in the organisation for
some projects, there is no consistent approach used for the majority of projects.

43. It is recognised that we need to improve the management and co-ordination of the
Authority’s business activities and the decisions on priorities for the allocation of limited
resources. However, in order for this to be successful, we need to develop a shared
understanding of programme management and agree how best to establish and roll out
such a function across the Authority.

44. Work to address these issues has begun with the allocation of money to appoint a
consultancy firm via a report approved by the Authority on 15 April 2004 - Resources
for Modernisation of London’s Fire Service (FEP 545).

45. Consultants were appointed to deliver the following:

   a) Identify options, and potential solutions for programme management,
      including possible IT based systems which must be consistent with the
      Authority’s IT strategy
   b) Identify staffing and structural issues impacting on programme management
      and make recommendations for improvements
   c) Develop a strategy for implementation of identified solutions.

46. The consultant’s report will be available by January, and the second stage of this review
will provide the opportunity to review their findings and propose effective
arrangements for the future, linked to wider performance management considerations.
The recent budget review process also indicated that additional budget provision
might need to be made in 2005-06 for implementation of consultants’ recommendations.
Performance audit

47. The performance audit team were established when the SPP Dept was set up in 2002 (FEP273). The audit team were required, as an interim position, to provide cover on the incident command monitoring rota while the monitoring officer systems were developed by the Operations Response Department. Once in place, the concept was that the Performance Audit Team could, among other things, audit the effective operation of those systems attending incidents on a sample basis as necessary. Work to set up incident command monitoring arrangements has taken longer than anticipated. Although some good progress has been made, uniformed staff in the Performance Audit Team are still spending a significant proportion of their time supporting this key function (currently 31 days per person, per year).

48. With the exceptions of the LAS and WMFRS, the method we use to conduct incident command monitoring was considered atypical. While all the participants of the challenge day had an audit function to assess system and financial matters, some organisations (City of Westminster and HMIC) were considering expanding their audit role to include performance issues. Generally, considerable interest in our process was expressed by all attendees.

49. LAS use a clinical audit team to audit call allocation (the action of call handling and resource deployment) and the correct clinical diagnosis by the ambulance crews. A sample of 10% of all calls is audited. Where performance issues are identified, local corrective action is available through trainers posted at ambulance stations.

50. WMFRS uses a performance audit team to check the progress of the direct action plans put in place by local managers and complete station performance reviews (station inspections). They also audit any work that is undertaken as a result of any action plans from the CPA process. Two Divisional Officers are used to attend incidents and also carry out performance reviews of command. The Information collected is fed into a database and used for station / district comparisons.

51. In addition to incident command monitoring the Performance Audit Team have carried out a programme of work principally around operational risk, although some systems audits (IT, absence control and COSHH) have also been carried out. The Team also provide support on health & safety audits.

52. There is of course a separate internal audit department in Finance Department (whose work is monitored by the Finance & Procurement Panel). In addition, Community Safety carries out policy, procedure and performance audit and OP/CHSES conducts safety audits. The Performance Audit Team liaises closely with these other teams.

53. As the incident command monitoring role beds down within Fire & Community Safety Directorate it would now be useful to look again at the organisation’s need for a performance audit function, its potential role as part of a wide performance management framework, and the best way in which such a function could delivered.
Boundaries with other departments

External consultation and communications

54. Performance Management Division has responsibility for corporate co-ordination of consultation activity. This arises from the Authority’s best value duty to consult. They also lead on corporate consultation activity relating to the London Safety Plan. The results of consultation and external stakeholder engagement are key pieces of performance information and should help decision making around priorities. However, different departments lead on different aspects of consultation e.g. Borough Commanders and local community engagement teams consult locally, Performance Audit and Review Division consult on best value reviews, Finance consult on budget, etc. No one department is responsible for managing stakeholders with a view to developing more meaningful relationships and managing approaches from different parts of the Authority to the same external stakeholder. The Communications department maintain the spreadsheets with stakeholder names and addresses but at present there is no process for linking the results of feedback from consultation or engagement exercises with this information. This limits the organisation’s ability to target engagement & consultation exercises, other than in the broadest sense, and inhibits organisational learning from engagement and consultation work.

55. The results from the Challenge Day showed that a number of organisations (City of Westminster, Metropolitan Police and London Ambulance Service) have identified that their consultation activities can be divided into corporate or local level initiatives. Corporate matters (political lobbying, corporate initiatives) are dealt with through central management. Local consultation (community engagement) is devolved to their local management which is best placed to identify the ‘at risk’ groups (and those with access to them) and engage with them. BT place all consultation with their regional managers as part of their overall responsibilities. Each of the organisations placed their consultation process in different areas, with one, the City of Westminster, having moved it between their communications and performance departments a number of times over recent years. All participants acknowledged that true consultation requires the organisation to be receptive to the messages received and to react accordingly, and many expressed the consequent view that the function of consultation belonged within the performance function.

56. Comparison with the West Midlands Fire and Rescue Service found that structurally, they have a similar approach to consultation on their integrated risk management plan. The best value team are the lead for this consultation with support from other departments. In addition they use external consultants to undertake some related work.

57. The issue for this review is striking the appropriate balance between corporate co-ordination of the consultation and engagement process and sharing of good practice and encouraging and supporting local initiatives which are delivering real benefits.

IM knowledge management team and Communications Department web team:

58. LFEPA’s Intranet site (hotwire) is potentially a key knowledge management tool over and above its role in communication. For this reason, many organisations (BT, City of
Westminster and London Ambulance) manage their Intranet site within their knowledge management departments. All the organisations attending the challenge day promoted the use of the intranet not just to aid communication but to help staff find and share information and knowledge to aid better decision making and management. Additionally, the move towards an integrated approach to web content and document management requires the both the skills provided by knowledge managers and web managers for content selection, usability and navigation. Therefore the question arises as to where the management of the content on the Intranet (Hotwire) site sits or whether better arrangements for co-operative working can be devised. Each of the organisations we asked had different structures in place to oversee their Intranet, and could provide no clear guidance. This issue will be examined further during the comparison visits in stage two of this review.

Information Management and IT Business Systems Group

59. Information Management Division works closely with the IT Department’s Business System Group (BSG). BSG is responsible for procuring and delivering software systems to support business processes. Both IM and BSG are often represented on the same project teams/boards managing IT based projects. There is good understanding of each others’ role and considerable synergy between the objectives which IM and BSG are trying to achieve, i.e. more corporate/joined-up systems, better use and availability of information, etc. This relationship was seen in a positive light during the challenge day for those attendees who still retained a non-strategic IT department (London Ambulance Service, Centrex, and Metropolitan Police Service). Those who have outsourced their technical IT support to users, networks and systems, (BT, City of Westminster) rely on their service providers to design, supply and support the systems they require. However, over-arching strategy and client management of these contracts is undertaken by an in-house information systems department and achieved through stringent service level agreements. In the Metropolitan Police Service, their Information Systems Department includes aspect of information management as well, although some other activities are within the corporate governance area. There may be better ways of delivering business systems overall by reviewing the working arrangements between IMD and BSG.

Relationship between SPP Department and AC Risk:

60. The Authority decided in January 2004 (FEP 519) to designate an Assistant Commissioner with responsibility for Risk, within the Corporate Services Directorate. When taking that decision the Authority noted that “In particular bringing the role of AC Risk into the Corporate Services Directorate will require an examination of how it should work with the current functions of the Strategy, Planning and Performance Department, because of their strong linkages with information management and performance review in particular”. The Assistant Commissioner Strategic Risk has very few staff (most of which are supernumerary) although there is a RNDF bid in the draft 2005/06 budget to regularise the position of some of these posts. Currently, the AC Risk relies on staff seconded from other departments, principally Service Delivery and additional support from staff within different parts of SPP Department in order to deliver his responsibilities.
61. Since the AC Risk post was established two staff from SPP Department have been working to the AC Risk to provide support on the development of the London Safety Plan and in the development of the organisational framework for corporate risk management (including business continuity planning). The Head of PARD also supports AC Risk in the management of corporate risk work.

62. As part of this review it would now be timely to look more closely at the relationship between these groups of staff to ensure that best value is achieved in terms of efficiency and effectiveness.

63. A centralised approach to corporate risk issues and the difficulty in resourcing the teams doing this work was repeated in a number of organisations (WMFRS, LAS and MPS). The subject of corporate risk was seen by those attending the challenge day as an expanding and resource intensive activity. Three organisations (MPS, BT and Centrex) placed their strategic risk group within corporate services with a strong link into their business continuity plans. Two organisations (City of Westminster and Gallagher Bassett) considered that strategic risk and business continuity should be integrated into all corporate activities and monitored through the Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) process. There was however, unanimous recognition from every organisation that this is an area that must be addressed and resourced properly.

64. For the preparation of the draft 2nd London Safety Plan (LSP2), Information Management Division took on responsibility for investigating, manipulating and presenting risk information. The most significant output of this work can be seen in the series of ‘risk maps’ in appendix 4 of the draft LSP2. Information Management Division has also managed the detailed liaison with the consultants (ORH) working on emergency cover and risk modelling to support LSP2 and to assess the Fire Service Emergency Cover (software) toolkit provided by the ODPM. Decisions now need to be taken about the Authority’s longer term approach to developing and resourcing its risk and emergency cover modelling. There is an RNDF bid in the draft 2005/06 budget to support this work.

Access to information (data protection and freedom of information):

65. IM deal with the small number of subject access requests received under the Data Protection Act. This works well given the present small volume of such requests. However the new general rights of access under the Freedom of Information Act came into effect in January 2005. Although it is too early to gain any clear idea of the number of requests for information which may be made it would be timely to consider the optimum organisational arrangements for dealing with such requests.

Production of performance/management information:

66. IM has access to all the LFEPA business systems/databases and produces regular reports (monthly/quarterly) to support management of the suite of performance indicators in the Best Value Performance Plan (BVPP). However, some other departments produce alternative reports which address some of their specific performance indicators. As indicated in FEP 620, it has been necessary to supplement resources within Service Delivery to meet its management information needs to
support performance management at a local level. The longer term arrangements are under consideration as part of the Action Plan arising from that review.

67. There is however evidence that the production of some information is being duplicated for use in different areas (e.g HR). This is a common theme that was repeated in many of the organisations we looked at. As the setting of national targets by central government requires data to be collected, all of the challenge day attendees agreed that the important factor is how this data is interpreted. Notwithstanding this, only one organisation (WMFRS) specifically employed a statistician to provide consistent analysis of their performance information.

68. In addition, the need to improve the relationship between our corporate plan, individual service plans, and borough plans has also been recognised. Work on these issues is in progress in line with the Authority’s decisions on that earlier best value review. However, there are comparable issues in relation to a number of other departments and these will be investigated further in the second stage of the review.

69. The resulting recommendations arising from the further investigation into the above key issues will be fed into a review of the structure of the Strategy, Planning and Performance department to determine the most effective, efficient and economic deployment of resources to meet the Authority’s objectives.

AREAS NOT INCLUDED

Strategic Risk

70. The work of the strategic risk group is not included within this review. This is because the group are still under development, and it would be preferable to review the area once it is properly established. Therefore, it is proposed that only the boundary issues that relate to strategic risk are explored.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

71. At this stage scope for efficiency savings (either cashable or non-cashable) has not yet been identified. However the Authority has set a target for 2% savings to be identified across the best value review programme as a whole, and the options for identifying such efficiency improvements within the Strategy, Planning and Performance Department review will be one focus for the next stages of this review, in particular when comparing with best practice and performance in other organisations.

RECOMMENDATION

72. This paper proposes that the 2nd Stage of this review should focus on four key issues:-

1. Performance Management
2. Programme Management
3. Performance Audit
4. Boundaries with other departments and departmental structure
**LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985**

### List of background documents
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- Initial Performance Assessment - Audit Commission report November 2004
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APPENDIX A - SCOPE

Background

1. The purpose of a best value review is to improve the effectiveness, efficiency and economy of the way the function under review is performed. The primary aim of a best value review is to deliver credible recommendations and action plans that will result in sustainable, significant improvements in the area under review.

2. Reviews are reported in two stages. The first stage report identifies the key issues for the function and those areas for which a more in-depth study are to be undertaken. The second stage report makes recommendations on how service improvements can be delivered.

Scope

3. For the purpose of the Review, this review will cover:

4. The scope for the review will be:
   - Planning
   - External Liaison (compliments and complaints, consultation and engagement)
   - Programme management,
   - Best value review work,
   - Performance Audit work
   - Statistics and performance Information
   - Data administration
   - Knowledge management
   - Document management
   - E-gov co-ordination
   - Station computing
   - Information access

5. The review will also examine:
   - The department’s contribution to risk management
   - The overall management of the above functions
6. The project board are:

- Rita Dexter, Director of Corporate Services (Chair)
- Roy Bishop, Deputy Commissioner
- Barbara Riddell, Director of Resources
- James Flynn, Head of Service - Communications
- Andy Chanin, Head of Service - SPP
- Lesley Courcouf, Haringey Council (external challenger)
- Ceri Edwards, ALG (external challenger)

7. The role of the Project Board will be to ensure consistency of approach, take a corporate overview and to confirm that all recommendations support the delivery of corporate objectives. The Project Board will take overall responsibility for ensuring that the reviews deliver the stated objectives, in line with corporate priorities and that consultation and liaison with all relevant parts of the organisation is appropriately maintained and co-ordinated.

**Steering Group**

8. The role of the Steering group, which reports directly to the Project Board, is to oversee the functional work of the review. It will delegate work and establish small working teams where appropriate. It will ensure that it delivers the stated objectives, in line with corporate priorities and that consultation and liaison with all relevant parts of the organisation is appropriately maintained and co-ordinated. The steering group for the review are:

- Andy Chanin  Chair  Head of Service SPP
- David Wyatt  Information Management
- Shirley Maskell  Performance Management
- Susan Ellison-Bunce  Performance Audit and Review
- Sue Merchant  External consultant
- John Deans  Performance Audit and Review
- Ron Dobson  Service Delivery

Additional representatives are being sought from;

Operational Response, Operational Planning (Health and Safety), Human Resources and Finance.

**Reporting/Meeting arrangements**

- Project Board – 9th December 2004,
- Project Board – 24th January 2005,
- BV Panel stage 1 – 31st January 2005
- BV Panel Stage 2 – 23rd May 2005
- Steering Group - every 4 weeks
Potential impact on other projects/ initiatives

Integrated Risk Management Plan (year 3), Modernisation agenda
APPENDIX B - BASELINE ANALYSIS

1. Brief description of main services provided:

Performance Management Division leads on -

- Developing and implementing a performance management framework for the organisation
- Management of the Authority's corporate plan, best value performance plan and supporting planning structures via the departmental service plans
- Managing external performance assessments
- Supporting the Authority's efforts to modernise the national framework within which the fire service operates including programme management of the modernisation agenda
- Liaison and joint working with the GLA on performance issues and reporting to the Mayor's office
- Development and implementation of the Authority's consultation and community engagement strategy and managing major corporate consultation activity including the consultation process for the London Safety Plan
- Development, implementation and maintenance of a programme management framework for the Authority
- Development and implementation of the Authority's compliments and complaints arrangements
- Overseeing arrangements under the confidential reporting (whistleblowing) procedure
- Support to other corporate projects including development of policy options and writing policy papers
- Ensuring preparation of responses to external consultation documents on corporate issues (e.g. Mayoral strategies and other GLA proposals, government white papers and other documents and the range of material received from the Audit Commission, Local Government Association, Association of London Government etc)

The Performance Audit and Review Division is responsible for supporting continuous service improvements across the Authority. This is achieved by conducting audits on our operational activities, and ensuring compliance with Best Value requirements by implementing a concurrent programme of best value reviews. The division also supports work on corporate risk management, supporting the development of a corporate risk management policy and framework and is leading on development of a corporate business continuity plan.

In particular, the division:

Leads on the ongoing development and implementation of the performance audit and review framework and programme of best value performance reviews for the Authority, ensuring that it supports the strategic objectives of the organisation

- Assists in the development of policy objectives for audit and performance review related areas
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• Undertakes the effective management of services, resources and materials in relation to performance audit and review and ensures their currency and applicability to the Authority and influencing issues
• Maintains a good level of knowledge of the tools and techniques used in both audit and review to deliver continuous improvement
• Supports the corporate approach to service improvement including the Best Value regime, quality initiatives and preparations for Corporate Performance Assessment and any other steps to audit/ review in-house services
• Acts as facilitator on service improvement techniques such as best value review and performance audit and related issues to ensure that experience and expertise is shared across the Authority
• Provides a source of advice and good practice on performance audit and review methodology and techniques.
• Supports the health and safety manager in undertaking audits of the Authority’s safety management systems
• Continues to provide support to Fire & Community Safety Directorate and Operational Response Department on incident and command monitoring.

The Information Management Division (IM) was created in June 2002. It brought together activities related to the management of information into a single organisational unit within the Strategy, Planning and Performance Department (Corporate Services Directorate).

IM has a corporate role in setting and managing policies on a range of information issues (e.g. Information Strategy) and does this in conjunction with Directors and heads of service. IM is the Authority’s expert in information management and provides services to other LFEPA heads of service in a similar way to HR, finance, procurement, communications, etc. In addition to the setting and monitoring of the information strategy and the policies that support it, IM delivers services in a practical way to support both corporate needs (officers and Members) and the service delivery needs of heads of service. IM makes sure that corporate priorities are reflected in the information management work and that a joined-up and integrated view is taken around the support and development of information systems.

IM brings together people from different information disciplines. The aim is to apply sound management principles to the life cycle of LFEPA’s information resources whatever the format or medium. This includes structured information (like databases) and unstructured information (like documents & images) and covers information coming from both inside and outside the organisation.

IM’s key goal is to get the right information to the right person, at the right time, from the right source (external or internal), in the right amount, in the right order, in the right form, in the right medium, as accurately and as quickly as possible – and at the lowest reasonable cost.

Key measures of success will be:
• all staff have ready access to all the information they need to do their jobs, at all levels in the organisation.
• our information assets are fully exploited, through information sharing within the organisation and with other public sector bodies, and through commercial arrangements with the private sector where appropriate.
• the quality of the organisation's information is maintained, and the information used to conduct our business is accurate, reliable, up-to-date, complete and consistent.
• legal and other requirements for maintaining the privacy, security, confidentiality, authenticity and integrity of information are observed, and requests for information are handled within appropriate deadlines.
• information is made available conveniently to the public through a variety of channels.
• the public record and other essential information holdings are preserved.

All functions, led by the Head of Department, contribute in various ways to strategy and policy development, providing support to other corporate projects including development and co-ordination of policy options and writing policy papers. Ensures the preparation of responses to external consultation documents on corporate issues (e.g. Mayoral strategies and other GLA proposals, government white papers and other documents and the range of material received from the Audit Commission, Local Government Association, Association of London Government etc). The Head of Department plays a lead role in drafting the London Safety Plans and is secretary to the Corporate Management Board.

2. How are the services currently provided?

Performance Management Division
In PMD there is a small team of directly employed staff with some external budget for consultation activity and other consultancy support. There are some temporary supernumerary staff and there has been a budget supplementation in 2004-05 to reflect the increased workload. The staffing structure doesn’t now reflect the work that the team does. However, the flexibility and adaptability of staff within the team mean that the transition from expectations in 2002 (when the structure was established) and the current work balance has been managed effectively. People in the team have wide ranging skills which mean they can move between different areas of work easily and effectively.

Performance Audit and Review Division
The Performance Audit and Review Division is headed by a PO2, overseeing three teams: Review; Audit; and Support. Two of the staff from the Audit team are currently seconded to work within the Strategic Risk team to support delivery of corporate and operational risk strategies. The Review Team undertake best value reviews in line with the Local Government Act 1999. The Review Team also co-ordinates the organisation’s overall approach to best value reviews and provides a source of advice and good practice on performance review methodology and techniques. Each member of the Review team leads on one review at a time and these usually take between 9 - 12 months to complete. A five-year best value review programme was agreed in 2000 which will be completed in 2005/06. A new programme will be developed by the end of 2004/05.

The Audit team’s audits vary in duration depending on the area under review, and usually take between 4 and 8 months. There is no medium or long term agreed programme of audits at the moment. The Head of PARD receives requests for audits and for support on audits being led by other departments (particularly Health and Safety) from other Heads of Service. This, together with priorities identified by PARD are discussed with the relevant Heads of Service and then prioritised in agreement with the Head of SPP and the Director of Corporate Services.

The Support Team provides a research and administrative support capability to both groups to ensure that the time of the officers engaged in the Audit and Best Value work is utilised to maximum effect.
Best Value review work

Best Value reviews have two main stages:
- the diagnostic review whereby the selected service is examined and areas where improvements are most likely to be needed are identified
- a full review of key issues identified during the diagnostic stage

The diagnostic stage of the review uses the four Cs (challenge, comparison, consultation and competition) to assess the service and identify opportunities for efficiency savings. The full review further investigates these issues and results in recommendations and the production of a final report and action plan. The trades unions are involved throughout the review process.

Both stages are reported to the Best Value Panel and the final report goes to the Authority for approval.

Performance audit

The Audit Team carries out a number of audits to ensure that control systems are working. Traditionally these audits have been based around operational issues, but the Audit Team have been developing their capacity to undertake other non-financial systems audits across the Authority (either as follow up work to best value reviews or in response to other high risks which may be identified through day to day management and/or the planning processes). The Audit Team also supports the Health and Safety Manager as necessary in carrying out the programme of health and safety audits.

All audits undertaken by the Audit Team encompass the core values of:
- Fitness for purpose
- Health and Safety
- Risk Assessment
- Equality and Diversity
- Continual Improvement

The Head of PARD and the Lead Auditor will liaise with the relevant parties to determine the subject of the proposed audit and agree its purpose and scope. This is confirmed in an agreed brief for each audit setting out the specific audit objectives, the audit criteria and the target dates (start and finish of audit).

Once all preparation and fieldwork has taken place, the results will be analysed in order to identify the key issues. Any discrepancies will be noted along with the reasons identified for and difficulties in meeting the expected standard. An audit report and action plan will then be drawn up to address these identified shortcomings and to promote continual improvement. A time scale is set for proposed for remedial action.

The report and action will be discussed and agreed with:
- Individuals responsible for implementing agreed actions;
- Heads of Departments affected by agreed actions and/or recommendations;
- Heads of Service affected by agreed actions and/or recommendations;

Incident Command Monitoring and Audit Role (DOII Only)
The Audit Team was set up in 2002, taking on part of the responsibilities of the former Operations & Training Performance Inspectorate (OTPI). The OTPI had been set up following the Improvement Notices issued by the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) in 1991. They had a responsibility for monitoring and auditing operational readiness and effectiveness of command and performance at incidents and during training. To discharge this role officers from OTPI attended all incidents to which 6 or more pumps were mobilised, all cylinder and chemical incidents and any 4 pump incidents of special interest.

When PARD was set up the Authority agreed that the responsibility for setting up and running a formal monitoring process for operational command should pass to the Fire & Community Safety Directorate (and additional resources were provided to Operational Response Department to enable them to take on this lead responsibility). This process was to be supported by officers from the Performance Audit & Review Team by auditing the systems through sampling.

However as this is a safety critical function, it was further agreed that during the transition to the proposed arrangements the Area Managers within PARD, together with officers from Operational Response Department, would continue to provide a high level monitoring service until the formal monitoring process is well established across the operational function. These interim arrangements were designed to maintain the same functions and level of cover as previously provided by the OTPI. These interim arrangements are still largely in place, with three of the original four officers continuing to provide this support which takes up an average of just over 30 working days per officer per year. PARD are working with Operational Response to phase out the remaining interim arrangements.

The three officers in PARD provide cover across three of the four watches and, in conjunction with other officers as determined by Operational Response, they continue to attend all incidents of certain types (see above). Their role is to gather information about the performance of incident command and to assess compliance with procedures. They also still attend Performance Review of Command meetings (PRCs), which are held for all incidents of 6 pumps and above, where their role is to provide any relevant information that they have gathered from the incident and to assist the chair to arrive at any learning or good points worthy of further discussion. They maintain the Incident Management Project (IMP) database which records a command summary and operational monitoring information gathered at the incident and a summary of the PRC. They also continue to attend and assess incident command training simulations and other training exercises.
Information Management Division

Information strategy and corporate information management projects (including e-government)

- Produces, co-ordinates and monitors the information strategy.
- Identifies strategic/corporate management information requirements which feed into the IT business systems work plan, business plans, etc.
- Provides advice and support as required on information management issues.
- Assists in the education of staff and managers about the potential of information
- Promotes and supports the development of improved corporate information systems for the collection, storage and presentation of information
- Manages (with Head of IT) a clearing house for all information system ideas/proposals to ensure (a) better links between existing and future computer systems; (b) greater exploitation of data; and (c) improvements to data/information capture and handling
- Leads on and co-ordinates e-government/electronic service delivery initiatives; prepares and maintains the Authority's Electronic Government Strategy.
- Establishes a data warehousing strategy to support performance management and decision support [with Head of IT]

Statistics and performance information

- Collates and prepares performance and management information reports for Departmental/Directorate Boards (as required), Corporate Management Board and the Authority (its panels and committees) and for managers generally.
- Undertakes trend/descriptive analysis of performance information/data to support managers, the annual target setting process and development of new indicators.
- Provides specialist expertise/services in presenting performance information and statistics – documents, graphs, web pages, mapping (e.g. LSP borough profiles).
- Develops partnerships and joint working on the collection, collation, and analysis of information with other agencies (like the GLA, London Boroughs, LASS, ODPM, etc);
- Establishes and maintains policies for data/information sharing with other agencies and collaborates with other agencies to share data (e.g. project LASS) and exploit external data sources for the benefit of the Authority.
- Undertakes (or commissions from external organisations) specific research and studies.
- Validates statistical information produced outside IM before publication.
- Works with Directors, heads of service and external agencies (like ODPM) on the development of new performance indicators.

Mapping and web presentation

- Sets-up and maintains pages on external and internal web sites presenting performance and statistical information about LFEPA and other services provided by IM;
- Leads on the development/maintenance of a geographic information systems (GIS) strategy and acts as the Authority’s Ordnance Survey Liaison Officer (OSLO).
- Supports GIS users across the Authority, and manages the GIS board and user group.
Information access
- Manages the impact of the Data Protection Act setting policy, providing guidance, advice and training; and deals with all DPA subject access requests; supports staff/managers on the impact of DPA. Ensures compliance with the DPA.
- Manages the impact of the Freedom of Information Act setting policy, providing guidance and advice and training. Supports staff/managers on the impact of FOIA. Ensures compliance with the FOIA including maintenance of the publication scheme and ‘non-standard’ information requests
- Leads on the development and maintenance of information security (non-technical) and maintains non-technical policies on security of data/information including the code of practice on the use of computers and any other future codes (e.g. use of email).
- Contributes to the development of, and promotes awareness of information security / access issues and policies [in conjunction with the Head of IT].
- Manages the policies/guidance about the Regulatory of Investigatory Powers regulations (RIPA) and the Human Rights Act (HRA) (in relation to information access).
- Maintains links/relationships with external bodies on ‘access to information’ matters.
- Manages the policies and guidance/advice to staff on information sharing.

Data management
- Undertakes data/system administration for key corporate applications (i.e. IRIS, StARS, FIRES, POM S, PIM S, HR, SERD, Farynor Fire Safety) including maintenance of user definable tables, system security/user permissions and provides (non-technical) support to users of corporate systems.
- Manages and promotes the Authority’s corporate gazetteer and relationship with the National Land and Property Gazetteer (MLPG) hub [with Head of IT].
- Prepares and maintains a data dictionary, meta-data repository and enterprise data model [with Head of IT].
- Sets and enforces data policies and procedures to make sure data is captured in a way which allows correlation of data between different applications [with Head of IT].
- Ensures effective data cleaning and data quality protocols are in place; develops requirements for data management tools and plays a key role in the development and rollout of new applications and new versions of existing applications.

Business process improvement
- Manages, in conjunction with AC Service Delivery, station-based computing projects (CoFS project) and leads on the development of IT systems and solutions which impact on station administration.
- Maintains an overview of station awareness and training issues and the overall development of station based computing.
- Leads on the development of IRIS, StARS and other key applications used at stations
- Develops expertise on business process re-engineering and process improvement activities to support departments to improve information flows and processes.
- Develops a forms control/management function and works to replace paper forms with electronic equivalent and to electronic workflow systems.
- Co-ordinates and supports work to improve the efficiency of information flows including efforts to reduce the ‘bureaucracy’ at fire stations and elsewhere.
• manages the collation/supply of fire/incidents reports (FDR1s) to ODPM.
• represents the needs of all users in respect of desktop computing (e.g. word processing, spreadsheet, email), remote access, and other general IT applications.

**Knowledge management**
• leads on the development of strategies/policies for managing organisational knowledge, corporate memory and case-based reasoning.
• develops and maintains hotwire (Intranet site) as the principal knowledge management system [in partnerships with the Head of Communications].
• manages the publication of instructions and central directives and systems for updating and maintaining currency.
• maintains an overview of content management issues and search and retrieval tools
• establishes and maintains the Authority taxonomy structure and metadata standards.
• manages the Authority library/resource centre and exploits external information sources (physical and electronic).
• manages the Authority’s collection of photographic and video/film images, and provides a photographic processing service.

**Document management**
• maintains records management strategy/policies and guidance for unstructured (e.g. paper and electronic records), documents and data.
• provides service for the storage of inactive (non-current) records, retention scheduling and destruction and archiving of paper records of lasting historical interest
• provides advice on the design of systems for the storage of paper & electronic records.
• manages current (active) and non-current (inactive) personal record files (PRFs)
• maintains systems for the efficient movement of paper-based information around the organisation [existing mail services] and seeks to exploit digital image processing (scanning of paper).
• acts as project sponsor and promote systems/standards for the management of electronic documents including policy and advice on the use of shared drives.
• acts as project lead for the implementation of an electronic document and records management system (EDRMS) and digital image processing across the Authority.

**Risk information**
• manages data to support integrated risk management planning, including use of risk-based tools - including the FSEC toolkit as appropriate - liaising within IM and with the Director of Corporate Services, the Head of SPP and AC Risk as required. In particular to:
  • plan and deliver implementation of systems to collect, collate and analyse information about risk, thereby supporting development of London Safety Plans;
  • supervise the inputting/loading of data and the staff/consultants employed for these purposes, including training (where necessary)
  • identifies, gathers and prepares required data for loading/inputting
  • considers/recommends changes to existing IT, Information Management and other business systems and processes, to capture and record risk information in a consistent, complete and comprehensive way.
• analyses and presents risk data in user friendly formats (e.g. maps).
• Advises/assists with projects which may support or contribute data for risk management planning purposes.
• assist with such initiatives where necessary, to improve the reliability/quality of data used for integrated risk management planning purposes.
• works with external organisations/companies to obtain [and share] data, analysis and intelligence that will support risk management planning.
• supports AC Risk and HIM in connection with work by external consultants and organisations, who may assist in the development of risk planning.
• uses tools to undertake specific risk planning and analysis to produce outputs to inform policy choices, options and decisions.

3. Which other services in the Authority are integral to your service delivery?

All. PMD manage the corporate planning and performance framework. IM manages a variety of information processes that touch on all other departments of the organisation. In particular, IM works very closely with the IT Department (Business Systems Group).

The best value programme must review all functions within the Authority. The performance audits are focussed on the operational departments and issues, but can have a wider remit depending on the area of audit (for example absence control).

Auditors undertaking the incident command monitoring role (Group Manager) work closely with the incident management division in Operational Planning. Operational management of the officers is provided by the SDO in that department.

4. Staffing numbers and structure:

In addition to the Head of Department and PA,
**PMD Approved structure**

- **PO2 x 1**
  - Planning & Performance Management
    - MG7 X 1
    - MG9 X 1
    - MG11 X 1
  - External Liaison
    - MG7 x 1
    - MG9 x 1
  - Programme Management
    - MG7 x 1

**PMD Current actual structure**

- **PO2 x 1**
  - Head of Strategy, Planning and Performance
    - Modernisation Programme Manager
      - PO3 x 1
  - Planning & Performance Management
    - MG7 X 1
    - MG9 X 1
    - MG11 X 1
  - External Liaison
    - MG7 x 0.5
    - MG9 x 1
  - LSP consultation
    - MG7 x 1
    - MG9 x 1
  - Programme Management
    - Nil staff
Performance Audit & Review Division Structure

Head of Performance Audit and Review

Audit
- MG7 x 2
- DO II x 3

Best Value
- MG7 x 2
- DO II x 1

Support team
- MG 9 x 1
- MG 10 x 1
- MG12 x 1
Information Management Division Structure: IM has some 45 authorised posts and (currently) 6 supernumerary or temporary staff.
5. Approved Revenue Budgets 2004/05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>2,446,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Employee Expenses</td>
<td>29,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premises</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>22,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies and Services</td>
<td>418,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Party and Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves and Contingencies</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings to be achieved (to be allocated)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Financing</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
<td>2,916,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income [Less]</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Base Budget at March 2004</strong></td>
<td>2,904,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Growth items approved for 2004/05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programme management consultancy</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External liaison consultancy</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External liaison staffing</td>
<td>41,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Document &amp; Records Management</td>
<td>930,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk information/LSP2 preparation</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDR1 temporary staff</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Protection/Freedom of Information awareness/training*</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Integration Project (2nd year) (data warehousing, etc)</td>
<td>130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,391,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* budget held by Training & Development Department

6. Are there any contracts in place relating to provision of the service which are due to end in the next 18 months?

No

7. What performance indicators does the service support?

(i) Corporate indicators on which SPP Department leads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LFPI 20 (a)</td>
<td>Compliments received (number)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFPI 20 (b)</td>
<td>Complaints received (number)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFPI 4</td>
<td>Percentage of those making complaints satisfied with the handling of those complaints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFPI 5</td>
<td>Number of complaints to an Ombudsman classed as maladministration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BVPI 3</td>
<td>Percentage of citizens satisfied with the overall level of service provided by the Authority (3 yearly survey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BVPI 157</td>
<td>Citizen interactions enabled for electronic service delivery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. How is the service performing against those indicators

LFPI 20 (a)  227 April ‘04 – Sept ‘04
LFPI 20 (b)  83 April ‘04 – Sept ‘04
LFPI 4  70% in 2003/04 (annual figure)
LFPI 5  0 in 2003/04 (annual figure)
BVPI 3  63% (last survey undertaken in 2003/04)
BVPI 157  43% in 2003/04 (annual figure)

9. What targets are in place and how are they measured?

See appendix 1.

10. How does this service contribute to the Authority’s Principal Aim of “Making London a safer city…. “?

Our overall departmental objective is to ensure an organisation wide approach to continuous improvement through co-ordinated management information systems and planning and performance review activity and the provision of strategic planning expertise, information and advice in order to achieve best value. Without such a managed approach to continuous improvement, the organisation’s effectiveness and efficiency would be impaired which would have a detrimental effect on achievement of its principal aim. All of our work involves promoting corporate objectives, and making firm links between the Authority’s principal aim and service standards and the work carried out throughout the Authority.

11. What are the critical success factors for this service?

Meeting statutory requirements
Flexibility
Better decision making based on risk
Good liaison arrangements
Political awareness
Provision of timely and accurate information
Productive working relationships
Credibility
Keeping on top of emerging information/developing situations
Contribution to overall Authority objectives
Enabling the Authority to be reflected in the best light – contribution to confidence in strong corporate governance, efficiency and effectiveness.
Understanding stakeholder needs and drivers
12. Is this service provided because of any legal requirements, or because of national or Authority policies?

An overall approach to external performance assessment is needed. There are statutory requirements relating to production of the IRMP, performance information and the BVPP and to consult with the public. The Authority is required to supply statistical returns and performance information to government, GLA, and other bodies.

The Authority has duties under both the Data Protection and Freedom of Information Acts which govern access to information and these duties need to be managed to ensure the Authority complies fully. The proper management of records (both paper and electronic) is a requirement flowing from the statutory Code of Practice issued by the Lord Chancellor under the Freedom of Information Act.

As a Best Value Authority, the Authority must make arrangements to secure continuous improvement in the way in which its functions are exercised, having regard to a combination of economy, efficiency and effectiveness, which will include performance reviews. The best value review programme also contributes to meeting the Authority’s fiduciary duty through the target to identify 2% financial savings across the areas subject to review (either cashable or non-cashable).

Incident command monitoring was established following the issue of the HSE Improvement Notices LFB1 and LFB2 to provide a monitoring system and an independent audit function to collect information for principal management about the quality of operations and training performance.

13. Who are the users of this service?

Members; corporate management board; principal managers; staff; Audit Commission; external auditor; external stakeholders (eg, GLA, ODPM)

14. What effect would there be on the Authority’s service delivery if this service was not provided at all?

See above re contribution to principal aim. Some statutory requirements not met, in particular, the requirement to publish the BVPP and the undertaking of best value reviews. Production of the IRMP (as called for by the National Framework) would also be inhibited.

The Authority, and its operational staff, would be exposed to increased risks were PARD to cease its involvement in incident command monitoring before alternative arrangements are fully in place and if auditing of operational performance were to cease.
15. What opportunities or threats do you envisage for the service over the short to medium term?

Modernisation indicates significant change in the organisation. This change needs to be managed in a co-ordinated and effective way, providing an opportunity for improved cohesion, and delivery can be supported by means of best value reviews and audits. It is also a chance to examine the information we hold and the information we need in order to continue delivering an effective and efficient Fire & Rescue Service. Development of our information systems will enable us to exploit the full potential of the information required to support change within the organisation. Programme management consultancy provides the opportunity to develop new systems for prioritisation and resource allocation to reflect the rigour needed in our new situation.

Our new planning database available via the intranet provides an improvement opportunity in communication of developments in planning that we’ve taken forward.

IPA improvement planning will create an opportunity to drive forward the performance management framework and this, along with the new guidance on best value and performance improvement for fire authorities, will enable us to maximise the benefits of best value reviews and the use of performance information within the organisation.

Individual performance appraisal and IPDS provide opportunities for performance management to be fully integrated into the organisation although there are still some issues about overall lead responsibility.

The national framework 2005/06 publishes a revised set of Best Value Performance Indicators (BVPIs) and new national targets. This improved suite of BVPIs will allow us to further develop the range of information presented to managers for performance management purposes and will assist us in monitoring and delivering key national priorities.

LSP2 includes a programme of research to be undertaken during 2005/06. This will allow us to further our knowledge on key service delivery areas such as community safety and managing risk.

This best value review provides additional opportunities to develop the consultation and engagement function which has been neglected by the organisation and to provide intellectual leadership to it and position it firmly in its performance context; although some may consider that the consultation & engagement function might more sensibly sit with the Communications function. LSP consultation & engagement could sit with the Strategic Risk team (responsible for production of LSP) in line with other consultation and engagement activity which is carried out within service departments.

PARD work programmes could become more strongly risk-based and focussed. This could include: assessing the impacts of reviews and audits; providing best practice advice on review/audit techniques to others; commencing third party (service suppliers) audits on behalf of other departments.

Information Access requirements governed by the Data Protection Act, Freedom of Information Act and the Code of Practice on Records Management provide further opportunities to live by our core values of openness and honesty as well as ensuring that our information assets are organised in the most efficient way.
The Information Integration Project and data warehousing strategy will allow staff at all levels to access a range of information in a manner that has not been previously possible. This will improve the information available to support service delivery, planning and performance management.

We have responded to changes in the external environment by being flexible and adaptable and embracing change. There will be more opportunities for this in the future.

The creation of a medium to long term audit programme would raise the team’s profile and improve effectiveness and the morale of the performance audit team.

The Best Value Review itself provides an opportunity to review arrangements in the light of experience since the division was established. Specialist skills are often required for a number of posts within SPP and experience has shown that it can take some time to develop the levels of knowledge required to maximise performance. A significant number of leavers would jeopardise the services we provide.

16. What are the constraints on improving the service’s efficiency and effectiveness?

Time and resources to deliver SPP’s broad range of functions and responsibilities, for example where there has been insufficient focus before or when statutory requirements demand significant change in the way we manage our information assets. In particular, IM has a large dependency on IT to deliver improved information systems.

Conflicting priorities for the organisation and others’ ability and/or willingness to engage in our areas of work and to embrace the corporate benefits. For example, departments can have difficulty supporting and responding to the process and the outcomes of reviews and audits in a congested change management agenda.

The lack of an agreed basis and framework for performance audit means that the work has a low profile in some parts of the organisation and its value is not always recognised.

The flat reporting structure within PARD is inefficient and does not support teamwork or the development of staff. The PARD support office function has not developed well and this may be partly a result of the structure, which does not integrate the support function within the other two teams.

17. What alternative methods of service delivery are there?

Private sector – management consultancies – could provide many of the services, for example: programme management, records management and best value reviews. External consultancies are currently used to run consultation activity.

Best value reviews and performance audits could be undertaken by other departments, for example: departments could lead their own best value reviews and internal audit could have a role in performance audit. The programmes of reviews and audits could be structured differently. Information management functions could be dispersed across all relevant departments.
18. What are the benefits of providing this service in house?

Many of the services provided are integral to corporate processes and procedures and it would be difficult to extricate them for a private sector contract. As noted, there has been (and with modernisation there will continue to be) a good deal of change which the organisation needs to manage, and SPP has the knowledge, expertise and effective working relationships with other departments to support this. Flexibility is key to managing peaks and troughs in Authority workloads and SPP staff often work across team boundaries to support and deliver projects as demand dictates.

A good deal of information handled is sensitive and confidential, and if the services were contracted out, there would be likely to be needed a larger than typical client/core side to manage the contract and to handle this information. It is also unlikely that retrieval and manipulation of data could be provided by the private sector given the broad range of time-critical information requests we receive and the evolving nature of our corporate applications.

Without a best value team the centre of expertise and knowledge about the best value process would be lost. This could lead to inconsistencies between reviews and would place a greater burden on other departments who have a role in ensuring that the reviews meet legislative and budgetary requirements and that the reporting complies with Members’ expectations. It would be more difficult to disseminate good practice and to evaluate the benefits of the programme. External consultants are sometimes used to support elements of best value reviews and experience suggests that use of consultants to deliver the best value programme would be more expensive than an in-house service. External consultants would also need a longer lead-in time for reviews in order to gain sufficient knowledge of the organisation to develop realistic recommendations.

The knowledge and experience provided by the uniformed officers in the Performance Audit and Review team provides credibility to recommendations made about operational issues.

19. Potential Equalities Implications

Opportunities to make significant contribution to the equality & diversity agenda via planning and programming, consultation and performance are considerable.

Consultation is a key area where equalities considerations need to be taken into account, in terms of ensuring accessibility, representation, inclusion of traditionally excluded groups. PMD also co-ordinates planning and information gathering on other Departments’ consultation, community engagement and outreach work - and this work also has strong links to equalities.

Corporate planning processes and information systems have been developed/continue to develop to support the monitoring of LFEPA’s equalities agenda – which will allow officers in other departments to spend less time on collating data and completing forms and to work on equalities areas.

All best value reviews consider equalities and diversity issues in relation to the service under review. For example, the review will make sure that the impact on any of our target groups is understood before changes to the way in which the service is delivered are recommended. Where possible, access to the service is improved.
20. Potential procurement opportunities

Significant procurement opportunities are linked to IM’s role in the development of information systems. This might include completely externalising the service. However, other opportunities are minimal unless the functions were completely externalised.

21. Sustainable Development

As with the equalities and diversity agenda, our corporate role provides significant opportunities to contribute to organisational and national priorities. This includes the environmental and sustainability agenda.

IM produces a considerable amount of data both London-wide and more locally covering topics such as the built environment, deprivation and demography. This information is used to make decisions about how we tailor services to local needs and support the sustainability and development of local communities. Sustainable development is also a component of both Best Value Review and Audit work.

22. Health and Safety

As with equalities and diversity and environmental and sustainability agendas, our corporate role provides significant opportunities to contribute to organisational and national priorities. This includes the health and safety agenda.

Corporate Planning processes have been developed to streamline monitoring processes for the Health, Safety and Environmental Action Plan. The performance audit arrangements help to ensure that health and safety management systems are working as intended and delivering the required results. IM work with Health & Safety to ensure the key health and safety priorities are monitored and performance managed.

The Best Value Process

Challenge
The challenge day for strategy, planning and performance was held on the 6 December, where representatives from both internal Authority staff and external service users were invited to challenge the functions provided by the Authority in relation to strategy, planning and performance. The companies and organisations represented were:

Metropolitan Police Service
London Ambulance Service
City of Westminster
West Midlands Fire and Rescue Service (apologies)
Gallagher Bassett
HMIC
BT
Post Office (apologies)
Easy Group (apologies)
Thames Water (apologies)
Centrex
ODPM
Internal attendees were provided by:

Performance audit and review
Information management
Performance Management
Service Delivery
Corporate Risk (apologies)

All brigades, via FINDS, were asked about their arrangements for providing strategy, planning and performance functions. Responses were received from: West Midlands Fire Service; Strathclyde Fire Brigade; East Sussex Fire and Rescue Service; Lancashire Fire & Rescue Service; Lothian and Borders Fire Brigade; Gloucestershire Fire & Rescue Service; Leicestershire Fire and Rescue Service and South Yorkshire Fire Service. These responses will be followed-up in the second stage of the review.

Consultation
This best value review commenced in October 2004, consequently there has been limited time to carry out detailed consultation as part of this first stage report. However internal consultation has taken place with the Executive team and all Heads of Service; staff in the Strategy Planning and Performance department and the representative bodies.

It is proposed to continue the above consultation in greater depth and further meetings with staff and the representative bodies are being arranged. Further consultation, including external (other best value authorities, commercial and other businesses, including organisations in the voluntary sector, also service users and potential supplier), will be arranged as part of the second stage of the review.

Comparison.
Comparison at this early stage of this best value review has centred on initial findings from the Challenge Day, internal data collection and the data supplied in response to the FINDS message. External comparison visits are planned with fire brigades and other organisations, including some of those who attended the Challenge Day. Comparisons with private and voluntary organisations will be also be made, where possible through the connections made at the challenge day event.

Competitiveness
It is too early in the review process to accurately measure the competitiveness of LFEPA’s strategy, planning and performance functions. How competitiveness can be accurately measured has been discussed with representatives of Procurement Department as part of the first stage report. Further work is planned to discuss procurement and competition issues in more detail particularly when information is available to compare with best practice and performance in other organisations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Reporting period</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide Services to meet users needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for Money – Per capita spend on Strategy Performance and Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report every six months on achievement of standards on compliments and complaints</td>
<td>NOW</td>
<td>REPORT TO CMB &amp; HRE PANEL</td>
<td>met</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(See below)</td>
<td>ANNUALLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring survey of satisfaction with complaints handling conducted every six months.</td>
<td>Six monthly</td>
<td>Survey undertaken &amp; outcome reported in annual report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(see above)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(see above)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production of annual consultation strategy</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Report to Authority</td>
<td>Not met owing to resourcing</td>
<td>July 2004</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production of quarterly service and financial monitoring reports</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>Report to F&amp;P Panel</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet the timetable for responding to consultation papers including the Mayor’s strategies on 100% of occasions</td>
<td>As needed</td>
<td>Responses as appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production of annual BVPP</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Report to BV Panel &amp; Authority</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreed Audit programme completed</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Manual – compared with agreed programme</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>As per programme</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of Best Value Review programme delivered on time</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Manual – compared with agreed programme</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>As per programme</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% Best Value Review Final report recommendations accepted by Authority</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Manual - Authority minutes</td>
<td>1 recommendation outstanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No adverse comments about best value reviews in CPA reports or other external assessments</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Manual – CPA report, Annual Audit letter, external audit reports</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publish quarterly digest of Performance Indicators – provisional data within 2 weeks of the end of the quarter and final data within 6 weeks.</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>Manual – comparing dates of publication.</td>
<td>Not achieved: Q4 digest not published</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond to DPA subject access requests within 40 calendar days.</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>Manual – compare dates recorded on spreadsheet</td>
<td>Partial achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Indicators</td>
<td>Reporting period</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond to FOIA publication scheme requests within 20 working days.</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>Manual – compare dates recorded on spreadsheet.</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publish new/updated instructions on receipt of final draft within 12 working days.</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>Drafts received via email and edited, final version checked then published on Hotwire test server.</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer simple enquiries to the Library immediately where possible, or within 4 hours; answer more detailed enquiries within 2 working days; carry out intensive research within 3 working days.</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>Email, phone and personal enquiries responded to in hard copy or electronic formats.</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td>See IMD9 changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond to all internal records search and retrieval requests within (a) 24 hours for PRFs; and (b) within 24 hours for general records.</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>Email, phone and personal enquiries</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery of correctly addressed mail at HQ Complex within two rounds of receipt of the item in the mail room</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>Manual – collected by messengers</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINDS email-box cleared by 12 noon each weekday</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>E-mails checked each morning</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production of quarterly (a) service and financial monitoring report and (b) BVPP performance monitoring report</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>Report to (a) F&amp;P Panel and (b) BV Panel</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This appendix sets out the issues identified as falling within the scope of a Best Value Review of Strategy, Planning and Performance and the assessment made on prioritising the key issues for the second stage of the review.

The issues are addressed under four areas;
- Performance management
- Programme management
- Performance audit role
- Boundaries with other departments and departmental structure

### Performance management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Supporting notes</th>
<th>Key?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moving from performance monitoring to performance management</td>
<td>Moving from performance monitoring to performance management would be a major cultural change. Do we have the right principles, processes &amp; people to deliver?</td>
<td>How would we construct a performance management framework? What would it look like and what would be its objectives?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>Supporting notes</td>
<td>Key?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation learning</td>
<td>Are we clear about the role of the different plans (BVPP; IRMP; Corporate Plan)? What scope is there to streamline and better co-ordinate our planning arrangements and the information required to support them (e.g. borough profiles)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How can we get the organisation to use performance information to aid decision making and contribute to continuous improvement?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who should lead on the production of performance management reports? Is this an IM function or a PMD function and what is the balance of responsibilities between SPP and the lead officers for performance indicators in explaining performance variances and identifying appropriate action?</td>
<td>(There are links with the actions arising from the BVR Borough structure and support services which are addressing related issues)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How can we develop partnership working at a strategic level and a shared performance management framework with our partners to measure effectiveness of joint working?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How can our performance information help us to identify the drivers for change at a strategic level?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational learning</td>
<td>How can we get better at using performance information and the outcomes of performance reviews and audits to learn &amp; improve?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How do the results of external and internal performance assessments link to (a) our corporate and service plans and (b) the best value review and audit programmes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>Supporting notes</td>
<td>Key?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How can we integrate better what we’re learning from consultation and engagement about user, citizens ‘&amp; stakeholders’ views? How can we ensure that those we consult are helped to develop an improved knowledge and understanding of the services we provide and our objectives?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How can a performance management framework aid best practice sharing &amp; organisational learning &amp; development?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Programme management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Supporting notes</th>
<th>Key?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving management and co-ordination of the Authority’s business activities and decisions on priorities for allocation of limited resources. Consultants are due to report on a programme management function in early January 2005</td>
<td>Is there a shared understanding of ‘programme management’? How can we make sure that the organisation gets maximum benefit from the establishment of such a function? What resources would be needed? Are there boundary issues?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How are projects initiated? How do we assess their effectiveness? And how do we learn from them? How would we roll out a project initiation and management methodology across the organisation? How would we ensure staff were competent project managers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritisation and estimation of resources</td>
<td>We’re not good at stopping things. New areas of work are often additions rather than replacements. What processes do we need in place to help us to spot the creaks and cracks in the organisation? How do we retain organisational focus on the most important and how can we decide what can be stopped?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How can we improve financial information to underpin corporate decisions on policies and priorities – and improve integration of business and financial planning?

Business Continuity Planning

Business Continuity Planning is currently being led by the Corporate Risk Group and supported by a member of the PARD team. Is this where responsibility for BCP should belong? How should this work be linked to corporate and departmental plans, managed as an ongoing project and embedded in the organisation?

3) Performance audit role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Supporting notes</th>
<th>Key?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do we need a Performance Audit role and if so, what should the role be?</td>
<td>What performance audit requirements do we have? Should the focus remain on auditing non-financial operational activities? Should it be widened? Should it be changed? Should it focus more on auditing effectiveness?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links to related work elsewhere</td>
<td>How should the organisation deliver the audit of controls relating to the Statement of Internal Controls and what should the Performance Audit role be within that?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What should be the relationship between the internal audit and performance audit programmes and how can we best ensure that these programmes are complementary – adding real value to the organisation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How will the work programme relate to Health and Safety audits? What is the relationship to other ‘audit’ functions within the Authority, e.g. Health and Safety and the Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>Supporting notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety Department?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corporate learning and continuous improvement</td>
<td>How should the audit function relate to these functions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How should the results of audits be feedback to deliver real organisational improvements?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How will the programme be related to corporate and departmental plans?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How will corporate, service and borough plans be informed by recommendations from performance audit work?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommend appropriate methodology for devising risk-based work programme and reporting arrangements</td>
<td>How should the work be linked to corporate and/ or operational risk?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) Boundaries with other departments and departmental structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Supporting notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current roles and relationships</td>
<td>When IM was set up in 2002, there were a number of assumptions about its role &amp; boundaries with other departments. This review provides an opportunity to revisit &amp; test them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT department</td>
<td>What working relationships should be in place to make sure that IM and BSG work in a joined-up way and don't overlap or duplicate effort?</td>
<td>Is the current organisational split between these functions the most appropriate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How should the client role, linking business needs to system development and management, be supported?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>Supporting notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk department</td>
<td>What should be the relationship with the Strategic Risk Group?</td>
<td>Corporate risk work is currently supported by two members of the PARD team seconded to the Strategic Risk Team. Should their roles be formalised within the Strategic Risk Group or are there other ways of establishing effective working relationships to deliver a corporate risk framework? How does the corporate risk framework sit with programme management and corporate planning functions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications department</td>
<td>Blurred lines between communications functions and consultation functions and between central and local activity. How best can stakeholder relationships be managed to the benefit of the stakeholders, and to ensure that benefits are maximised and corporate objectives delivered? Also, there are other boundary issues with departments running consultation/engagement activity (e.g. Community Safety and Service Delivery)?</td>
<td>Is there a case for using customer relationship/contact management systems to better manage stakeholder relations? How can we work with our partners to support the delivery of our consultation and engagement objectives? How do we achieve a successful management of the Intranet site to support both knowledge management and communications objectives?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFCS and SD/MCU in particular</td>
<td>There are issues from key issues 3 and 4 of the BVR of borough structures and support services which are relevant here and are being followed up under the agreed action plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>Supporting notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance and management information</td>
<td>What role, should departments other than IM have in the production of performance/management information?</td>
<td>Should IM be the only source of performance information?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom of Information Act requests</td>
<td>Are our arrangements for dealing with requests for information under the general right of access (i.e. dealing centrally with unusual and complex request leaving those who already provide information to continue as normal) likely to be the most effective and efficient means of dealing with these requests?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Audit</td>
<td>What should the relationship be between Internal Audit and Performance Audit?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department structure</td>
<td>Once boundary issues and priorities of functions are clearer, what will be the most effective structures to deliver the services required?</td>
<td>What are the resourcing requirements for the services identified? Where and how should this be managed and delivered?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What administration and support is required and how should this be delivered?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgets</td>
<td>Are budgets appropriate to meet SPP objectives?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>Team split over sites does this hinder effective and joined up working?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>