

**SUBJECT: ELCPP How Good is Our Partnership Self-evaluation 2011**

**1 PURPOSE**

- 1.1 To advise the Board of the outcome of the ELCPP 2011 How Good is Our Partnership self-evaluation.

**2 RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 2.1 The Board is asked to consider and comment on the self-evaluation (Appendix 1) and to approve the summary of improvement points that will be included in an Improvement plan to be considered at the next Board meeting.

**3 BACKGROUND**

- 3.1 **How Good is our Partnership** (HGIOP) is the pilot self-evaluation tool developed by East Lothian Community Planning Partnership (ELCPP) as part of our performance management framework. This tool aims to enable ELCPP to evaluate how well we are working in partnership to deliver the outcomes we have agreed in our Single Outcome Agreement. In other words – **How well is ELCPP becoming an Effective Outcome Focused Partnership?**

- 3.2 The framework which forms the basis of HGIOP is based on the Partnership Toolkit prepared by Audit Scotland to assist Councils and Partnerships prepare for their Audit of Best Value and Community Planning. It is based around the eight themes and related questions of the Partnership Toolkit:

1. Leadership
2. Governance
3. Communities
4. Performance Management
5. Evidence & Needs Led
6. Priorities & planning
7. Resources
8. Impact for people and communities

- 3.3 In developing the HGIOP self-evaluation we established the following guidelines:

- For analysis of the partnership as a whole (i.e. not of each partner organisation's contribution to partnership working).
- Based on Audit Scotland's Effective Partnership Working criteria and scoring system (1/2/3 equating to Basic, Better, Advanced practice)
- Brief and easy to complete with limited number of sub-questions
- Provide evidence where possible

- The Reviews of the East Lothian SOA 2009 provide a basis for action in key elements of the HGIOP framework
- 3.4 The partners officers group were invited to take part in the self-evaluation meeting or to complete the self-evaluation template and provide comments. The self-evaluation template was completed by a core group of officers and additional comments from one member of the group who was not able to attend have also been taken into account. The questions in the template (Appendix 1) were scored against the Best Value Toolkit's three levels – Basic (1), Better (2) and Advanced (3) – using the definitional guidelines in the toolkit. The scores are indicative and to a certain extent subjective but they do provide a general guide as to how ELCPP might be judged against the framework's criteria.
- 3.5 The self-evaluation has identified a number of areas for improvement if the partnership is to aim towards achieving better or advanced practice across the HGIOP framework.
- Use the publication of the refreshed SOA 2011 to encourage more active involvement of all partners/ sectors (including third sector and elected members) in supporting the SOA
  - Develop more joint strategies and plans at the CPP level such as Joint Asset Management Plan
  - Partnership Agreement based on the refreshed SOA, including complaints handling and scrutiny arrangements
  - Review governance arrangements
  - Publish theme groups papers on the web
  - Undertake a Risk Assessment of the SOA
  - Implement improvement points from review of community engagement
  - Consider representation of communities at strategic level and throughout the theme groups
  - Full roll out of LAFs across all 6 areas
  - Implement actions from SOA Reviews
  - Improve data quality, gathering and analysis
  - Implement recommendations from SOA Reviews and demonstrate links between individual partner plans and the SOA
  - Develop more joint strategies and plans at the CPP level such as Joint Asset Management Plan
  - Learn lessons from Integrated Resource Framework pilot in relation to development of joint resource planning
  - Developing Local Area Forums and their input into the SOA
  - Integrate learning from experience of Support from the Start / early intervention approach
  - Further areas for joint working to be identified through SOA 2011 logic models.
- 3.6 These improvement points will be included in an Improvement Plan that will also take onboard the actions previously identified arising from the evaluations of the SOA, partnership working and community engagement that were undertaken in 2010.
- 3.7 The HGIOP self-evaluation toll will be revised to take account of lessons from this initial self-evaluation. In particular further work needs to be done to ensure that views from across ELCPP are taken into account in the self-evaluation process .

#### **4 POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

- 4.1 The HGIOP self-evaluation framework detailed in Appendix 1 complements East Lothian Council's *How Good is Our Council* self-evaluation. HGIOP fulfils ELCPP's commitment to undertake a self-evaluation in preparation for the Audit of Best Value and Community Planning that Audit Scotland is scheduled to undertake in East Lothian in 2012/13.

#### **5 EQUALITIES IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

- 5.1 This report is not applicable to the well being of equalities groups and an Equalities Impact Assessment is not required.

#### **6 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

- 6.1 Financial – none.  
6.2 Personnel – none.  
6.3 Other – none.

#### **7 BACKGROUND PAPERS**

- 7.1 None

#### **8 APPENDIX**

ELCPP How Good is Our Partnership self-evaluation 2011

<b>PRESENTED BY</b>	Paolo Vestri  Corporate Policy Manager, East Lothian Council & Chair of the ELCPP Working Group  pvestri@eastlothian.gov.uk  01620 827320
<b>DATE</b>	3 <sup>rd</sup> March 2011

APPENDIX 1: ELCPP How Good is Our Partnership Self-evaluation 2011

THEME 1: How committed to partnership working are senior management, board members and political leaders of partner bodies?

	Particular areas of strength and good practice	Key areas for improvement	How are we doing? Score - NA / 1 / 2 / 3
1.1 Do leaders of the partnership articulate the shared vision and sense of purpose?	Board involvement in formulation of the Statement of Intent, the SOA and sense of belonging to the partnership Partners beginning to use this wording e.g. Police & Council about to incorporate into the new Corporate Plan The acceptance (generally speaking) of the community engagement and third sector engagement as part of community planning	Board to ensure that their organisations articulate the vision in a clear and consistent way and their commitment to it – communication.	1.5
1.2 How involved and committed are partners?	Some partners demonstrate advanced practice e.g. Police  CPP has been very supportive of VAEL's inclusion as a strategic partner and made a strong commitment which has been followed through in terms of participation	Increase the active involvement of partners	1.5
1.3 What levels of leadership and involvement are exhibited by elected and governing body members?	Plan agreed to ensure administration members involved in theme groups and some actively involved – others less so.  Chief Officers have delegated responsibility in other organisations	Continue to review and monitor elected member involvement to ensure they play an effective role / governance	1.5
1.4 How much influence does the partnership have on partners?	Through SOA delivery evidence of much more joined up approach  Increasing involvement through SOA 2011 process  VAEL is having a lot of influence but it's still in the early stages	More joint plans such as Joint Asset Management	1.5
1.5 What levels of leadership and involvement are exhibited by senior managers?	Police & LBFRS have effective involvement from the top to down the line Council achieving increasing involvement from relevant CMT members CHP/NHS Lothian gave senior management involvement in	Third sector involvement across partnership groups	1.5

How Good is Our Partnership – Self- evaluation 2011 / Theme 1

	several themes Officers representing these organisations may or may not have strategic buy in, but they seem very engaged		
--	--	--	--

<b>Overall Score ( NA 1 / 2 / 3 )</b>	<b>1.5</b>
<b>What will we do next?</b>	<p><b>Use the publication of the refreshed SOA 2011 to encourage more active involvement of all partners/ sectors (including third sector and elected members) in supporting the SOA</b></p> <p><b>Develop more joint strategies and plans at the CPP level such as Joint Asset Management Plan</b></p>

**Supporting Evidence:**

1. Statement of Intent and SOA 2009 are the shared vision / evidence of articulation of this?
2. Attendance of members at Board meetings (not yet quantified over the year).
3. The Leader of the Council now chairs ELCPP
4. Chairs & members list of SOA Theme Groups
  - Board members are also theme leaders/chairs for SOA Community Safety and Health & Social Care & some are members of
  - Senior managers chair the Children, Young People/GIRFEC group & Community Safety and Co-chair Health & Social Care & are members of Children & Young People/GIRFEC
5. Agreement with ELC Administration on members responsibilities for each of the 8 SOA priorities. Some elected members are members of the theme groups (Health & Social Care, Children, Young People/GIRFEC) or chair key partnership groups e.g. The Environment Forum Steering Group. Administration elected members chair the two Local Area Forums and all ward elected members are encouraged to be involved
6. VAEI documents and structures
7. SOA Theme Group Quarterly monitoring reports & evolution of logic models
8. Board meeting minutes and completed action sheets
9. Refreshing SOA process demonstrating greater involvement

**THEME 2: How effective are the partnership governance arrangements – specifically scrutiny and accountability?**

	<b>Particular areas of strength and good practice</b>	<b>Key areas for improvement</b>	<b>How are we doing? Score - NA / 1 / 2 / 3</b>
2.1 Is there an agreed vision, purpose and objectives for the partnership?	SOA went through rigorous process of development with involvement & consultation across partners. This is increasing with the current refresh.  Statement of Intent included wide consultation and a rigorous process  Extensive involvement of partners and staff in theme groups and related partnership groups.	Strengthen communication and links between partnership groups in each area of work/theme	2
2.2 Have appropriate actions been identified to deliver intended outcomes?	Logic modelling approach and regular revision of these. Role of working group to connect across theme groups	Improved indicators through the refreshing of SOA 2011 Clearly show links between actions and outcomes	2.5
2.3 Have clear roles, lines of accountability and communication been established?	ELCPP governance framework established at the start of the SOA  Board & working group & community engagement group papers readily / publicly available through the CP website with direct link to Council system	Review ELCPP governance arrangements – make explicit governance framework  Publication of all theme group papers / public availability	1
2.4 How well does the partnership respond to challenge, scrutiny and complaints?	SOA monitoring reports have been publicly available through the Board & plans to streamline reporting. Regular communication to ELCPP network that reports are available. SOA Annual report produced & published Involvement of VAEL in recent Change Fund discussions suggest there is still some progress to be made	Draft partnership agreement clarifying system for challenge, scrutiny and complaints handling system	1.5
2.5. How well have risks been assessed and managed?	NA	No risk assessment so need to produce one	0

How Good is Our Partnership – Self- evaluation 2011 / Theme 2

2.6. Is the partnership building sufficient leadership capacity?		Not relevant	
--	--	--------------	--

<b>Overall Score ( NA 1 / 2 / 3 )</b>	<b>1.75</b>
<b>What will we do next?</b>	<b>Partnership Agreement based on the refreshed SOA, including complaints handling and scrutiny arrangements</b> <b>Review governance arrangements</b> <b>Publish theme groups papers on the web</b> <b>Undertake a Risk Assessment of the SOA</b>

**Supporting Evidence:**

1. Statement of Intent
2. SOA 2009 & suite of related logic models
3. CP Briefing sheets (Community Planning, SOA, Local Community Planning)
4. ELCPP website
5. Reviews of SOA 2009 – Outcomes to Logic Models & Outcome Focused Partnerships
6. Quarterly monitoring reports to the Board
7. ELCPP Structure and Remits document
8. Board & Working Group membership and remit permanently attached to minutes
9. Theme Network mapping done with Health & Social Care & Environment, Housing & Places & Children & Young People Theme Group

**THEME 3: How effective is the involvement of communities in the partnership process and how well is the partnership process helping to deliver community capacity building and empowerment?**

	Particular areas of strength and good practice	Key areas for improvement	How are we doing? Score - NA / 1 / 2 / 3
3.1. How committed are leaders to the engagement of communities in the partnership?	ELCPP community engagement strategy & plan funded and underway	Implement improvement points from review of community engagement	2
3.2. Is there wider cultural commitment to community engagement in the partnership?	Local Area Forums & inclusion of CAPPs in 2 areas & also in some Theme Groups / related partnership groups	Consider representation of communities at strategic level and throughout the theme groups	
3.3 What is the partnership's understanding of communities' needs and aspirations?			
3.4 How well reflected are community needs and aspirations in vision and planning?	Review of Community Engagement undertaken and improvement points to be implemented		
3.5. What is communities' involvement in decision-making at all levels?	There too many officers on groups and not enough community reps involved – this will be an area of work for VAEL	Full roll out of LAFs across all 6 areas	
3.6. What is the commitment to capacity building for partners and communities?			
3.7. What is the commitment to community engagement in plans and strategies?			
3.8. How well established is monitoring, challenge and scrutiny of achieving the engagement of communities?	The community is not one homogeneous entity, and somehow this has to be reflected in the dialogue – some groups are not included so feel they have limited involvement in decision making at thematic or strategic level		
3.9. Is there clear evidence of benefit to communities?			
3.10. What are communities' perceptions of being engaged?	Need to better evidence benefits to communities		

<b>Overall Score ( NA 1 / 2 / 3)</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>What will we do next?</b>	<p>Implement improvement points from review of community engagement</p> <p>Consider representation of communities at strategic level and throughout the theme groups</p> <p>Full roll out of LAFs across all 6 areas</p>

**Supporting Evidence:**

1. Third sector partnership is a member of the Board and all CP partnership groups –also supported by CP funding for launch and development of the programme
2. Community partners signed the SOA and are members of some SOA Theme Groups and related partnership groups (on Health & Social Care, sub groups of Community Safety Theme Group, Housing Forum, Environment Forum Steering Group ...)
3. Local Community Planning launched as a major path to community involvement & wider engagement & ELCPP funding to support this. Local Area Forum register of participants and members of task groups
4. Community Engagement Strategy/action plan 2010 based on the NSCE & with dedicated Community Engagement staff & budget
5. VOiCE register and completed reports
6. Participation & engagement agreements & plans of SOA themes, partnerships and plans? (Housing, Environment Forum Steering Group remit, Adult Social Care Joint Planning Groups,
7. ELC Residents Survey 2009 & 2011 – including SOA priorities
8. ELCPP funding for the EL Diversity Network & content of programme
9. ELCPP website, twitter, etc.
10. Review of Community Engagement in the SOA.
11. Business community recently presented key concerns to the Board & action taken
12. Key partnership and service strategies based on community needs and aspirations - examples? New LHS, Integrated Children’s Service Plan informed by Listen More Assume Less.
13. Partners/services fund dedicated staff for community / consumer involvement who are involved in delivering the SOA e.g. Children’s Services Consumer Involvement worker, Tenant Participation worker CLD Dialogue Youth worker, CHP PPF worker, all CLD staff including Local Community Planning officers.
14. ELC capacity building programme supports local community planning
15. ELC funding for ELTRP and the Community Care Forum directly supports capacity building

**THEME 4: Has the partnership agreed a set of measures and targets to track progress and demonstrate impact, and how good are the joint arrangements for managing and reporting performance?**

	<b>Particular areas of strength and good practice</b>	<b>Key areas for improvement</b>	<b>How are we doing? Score - NA / 1 / 2 / 3</b>
4.1. Have agreed measures been established to track progress?	SOA document, quarterly monitoring & Annual Performance Report	Implement action points from SOA Review	2
4.2. Is the partnership able to demonstrate impact through its performance management system?	Confusion around the logic models, but it's working itself through, but more could be done to find indicators/measures of outcomes that really reflect achievement rather than being included just because the data is there	As above	2
4.3. Does the partnership use performance information to proactively manage and improve performance?	As above	As above	2
4.4. How effectively is the partnership reporting to stakeholders?	East Lothian Performs – currently being updated to be more comprehensible	Need to improve quality of indicators & communication of results	2

<b>Overall Score ( NA 1 / 2 / 3)</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>What will we do next?</b>	<b>Implement actions from SOA Reviews</b>

**Supporting Evidence:**

1. SOA 2009 document and related logic models
2. Aspire View & East Lothian Performs with quarterly pdfs on each area.
3. SOA Performance Report 2009/10
4. Review of the SOA to Logic models – action plan
5. Quarterly thematic monitoring reports to the Board, the Working Group & circulated to the wider partnership, ELC CMT through e-news and also to the public through ELCPP website.
6. Revised governance arrangements for Community Safety and Children/Young People Theme Groups

**THEME 5: How well are partnership outcomes and actions evidence-based (on shared contextual analysis and information) and how well do they reflect the needs of the area/communities/service users?**

	<b>Particular areas of strength and good practice</b>	<b>Key areas for improvement</b>	<b>How are we doing? Score - NA / 1 / 2 / 3</b>
5.1. Is appropriate information about the needs of communities systematically collected and shared?	SOA based community needs through key theme groups specialists in the area & using key data East Lothian Poverty Profile Local Area Forums beginning to gather information on community needs to update profiles	Improve data gathering and analysis across the partnership Incorporate residents survey information into refreshed SOA	<b>1.5</b>
5.2. Are priorities and actions evidence-based and do they focus on the needs of the area?	See above	See above	<b>1.5</b>
5.3. Is information shared at service level to support any local integrated service delivery or case management approaches?	Information shared effectively as appropriate – protocols established e.g. Child & Adult Protection multi agency steering groups -		<b>1.5</b>
5.4. Have barriers in terms of information quality, accuracy, availability and governance been addressed?	No barriers encountered, but need to be better at sharing data across all partners and sectors	See above Ensure data quality for indicators – in progress Consider need for a data analyst for East Lothian	<b>1.5</b>

<b>Overall Score ( NA 1 / 2 / 3)</b>	<b>1.5</b>
<b>What will we do next?</b>	<b>Improve data quality, gathering and analysis</b>

**Supporting Evidence:**

1. SOA 2009 context & priorities - currently under review
2. Local Area Profiles developed for 4 areas and used to inform plans, evaluations and service development (Musselburgh, Dunbar, Preston-Seton-Gosford & Fa'side)
3. Fairer East Lothian Fund & Safer East Lothian Fund based on intelligence/ SOA priorities.
4. Data management gap identified and preliminary work undertaken.

**THEME 6: Have partners set and agreed priorities and how committed are they to delivering them?**

	<b>Particular areas of strength and good practice</b>	<b>Key areas for improvement</b>	<b>How are we doing? Score - NA / 1 / 2 / 3</b>
6.1 How does the substance of the shared vision translate into priorities or objectives?	SOA 2009 & associated logic models	See action points of SOA 2009 Review	2
6.2. How coherent is the planning structure?	Logic models & joint strategies show partner responsibilities	Demonstrate links between individual partner plans and SOA	2
6.3. How well are plans implemented?	Joint plans are being implemented and monitored too early to assess impact  Indicators and measures are not well enough formed for the new logic models for this to be clear	See above	2
6.4. What impact have plans made on partners?	See above  From VAEL's perspective there's still a long way to go on this one, as the Change Fund experience shows	See above	2

<b>Overall Score ( NA 1 / 2 / 3)</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>What will we do next?</b>	<b>Implement recommendations from SOA Reviews and demonstrate links between individual partner plans and the SOA</b>

**Supporting Evidence:**

1. SOA 2009 set out context, priorities and local outcomes with logic models to deliver each outcome.
2. The Statement of Intent of 2010 established longer term goals.
3. SOA 2011 framework to establish the route from the Statement of Intent to cross cutting goals, to Outcomes, Indicators, key strategies / plans and service plans.
4. ELC corporate plan now aligned with SOA outcomes – others?
5. Joint strategies/plans increasing e.g. Environment strategy 2010, Revised Joint Older People's Strategy 2011, Local Housing Strategy etc.
6. Fairer Scotland Fund and Community Safety Fund based on SOA outcomes and supports work by partners and wider organisations.

**THEME 7: How well does the partnership understand the resources needed to deliver its priorities and how well have partners aligned their funding, assets and staffing in a sustainable framework?**

	Particular areas of strength and good practice	Key areas for improvement	How are we doing? Score - NA / 1 / 2 / 3
7.1. Is there an integrated approach to service and financial planning the partnership, which takes account of partners' service objectives and priorities?	The SOA	Consider the requirement for a resource/ financial plan	1.5
7.2. Are partners clear about the resources required to delivery their shared service objectives and priorities both in the short and longer-terms?	In some areas there is effective joint resource planning e.g. Integrated Children's Service Plan & forthcoming Health & Social Care Change Fund	See above	1
7.3. Do all partners have in input to developing service plans and resource plans to support the SOA?	Where relevant they do e.g. joint service plans & service user input into individual service plans e.g. Children's Services		1.5
7.4. Does the partnership have a robust budget process and is this clearly understood by all partners?	NA – no partnership budget as such		NA
7.5 Does the partnership have clear financial responsibilities and delegated budgetary authority within its governance arrangements?	As above		NA
7.6. Does the partnership have an effective system of budgetary monitoring and control?	As above		NA
7.7. Does the partnership have clear plans to deliver best value and	All public partners have a commitment to Best Value	Not yet but partnership agreement to include commitment	1

How Good is Our Partnership – Self- evaluation 2011 / Theme 8

continuous improvement?		to Best Value & SOA 2011 Effective & Efficient Services will be cross cutting	
7.8. Is the partnership proactive in pursuing initiatives that complement the sustainability policies of individual partner organisations?	Sustainability was high on the agenda of SOA 2009 and will be a guiding principle for SOA 2011 Partnership Environment Strategy agreed and underway		2
7.9. Has the partnership jointly agreed efficiency savings targets into its plans and are these subject to scrutiny and challenge by all partners?	NA individual partners are making efficiency savings		NA
7.10. Has the partnership jointly developed a workforce plan that ensures that it has the right staff in the right place to deliver agreed services, objectives and outcomes?	NA		NA
7.11. Is the partnership proactive in managing its assets to ensure that it makes the best use of them?		Joint asset management plan agreed and will be developed	1
7.12. Does the partnership have a clear understanding of its IT requirements?	NA		NA

<b>Overall Score ( NA 1 / 2 / 3)</b>	<b>1.3</b>
<b>What will we do next?</b>	<b>Develop more joint strategies and plans at the CPP level such as Joint Asset Management Plan</b> <b>Learn lessons from Integrated Resource Framework pilot in relation to development of joint resource planning</b>

**Supporting Evidence:**

1. ELCPP now has a £40,000 budget with contributions from 3 partners - to support the delivery of the SOA (not for direct delivery of projects) & quarterly budget monitoring reports to the Board.
2. Board meetings include a standing item on the financial situation.
3. Logic models detail responsibilities for funding & delivery and planned to improve on this aspect in 2011/12. The logic models have not been costed overall and a total calculated.
4. The Effective & Efficient Services Logic Model and related action plan addresses the improvement plan from the last Audit of Best Value & Community Planning.
5. Reviews of SOA 2009 & action plan – address resourcing and sustainability.
6. SOA 2009 recognises that sustainability is a cross cutting issue and action plan from the SOA Reviews include making this effective.
7. Partnership Asset management plan under development

**THEME 8: How effective has the partnership been at delivering real outcomes and impact for people and communities?**

	Particular areas of strength and good practice	Key areas for improvement	How are we doing? Score - NA / 1 / 2 / 3
8.1. What outcomes does the partnership want to see for its communities?	Outcomes clearly stated in the SOA and there is a rationale for reflecting the priorities of communities of interest and of place Communities Outcome and Theme Group being developed for SOA 2011 This is a weak area but it is improving with the creation of new SOA's which have involved more perspectives – the challenge is to separate out service outcomes which would be achieved anyway, from partnership outcomes	Developing Local Area Forums and their input into the SOA	2
8.2. What indicators is the partnership using to measure these outcomes?	See action points for SOA 2009 Review		2
8.3. Is the partnership clear what the baseline looks like?	See above		1.5
8.4. Has there been real impact on citizens?	NA too early to demonstrate impact		NA
8.5. What is the partnership doing to improve these outcomes?	Outcomes and indicators being reviewed for SOA 2011 See also action points for SOA 2009 Review	Integrate learning from experience of Support from the Start / early intervention approach	2
8.6. Is the partnership genuinely working together to deliver joint services and Best Value?	Lots of examples e.g. Anti-social behaviour task and coordination group, Child Protection, Violence against Women	Further areas for joint working to be identified through SOA 2011 logic models	2
8.7. How effective has the SOA process been in the partnership?	This is the first CP SOA and work already effective – see all of above	See all of above	2

## How Good is Our Partnership – Self- evaluation 2011 / Theme 8

<b>Overall Score ( NA 1 / 2 / 3)</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>What will we do next?</b>	Developing Local Area Forums and their input into the SOA Integrate learning from experience of Support from the Start / early intervention approach Further areas for joint working to be identified through SOA 2011 logic models

### Supporting Evidence:

1. SOA 2009 process brought in a cross section of partners/staff and drew in evidence of need from a range of communities of interest (and of place?)
2. SOA Annual Report 2009 established some baseline information & 4 Case Studies published by the IS demonstrated good practice - too early to assess real impact.
3. Support from the Start Report 2010
4. Fairer Scotland Fund Annual Report
5. Report of Review of Outcome Focused Partnership 2010 & action plan – addresses innovation also
6. This self-evaluation establishes a baseline
7. Governance arrangements changing / strengthening e.g. unification with existing governance group for Children's Services Integrated Children's Service Plan and Community Safety Theme Group (accountability here?)
8. SOA Annual Report 2009 reported to the Board and then to Council and all other Board partner governing bodies.
9. Scottish Government has approved 2009/10 Annual Report
10. Audit Scotland Shared Risk Assessment 2010 did not identify any major areas of concern in relation to the SOA.