

**Minute of virtual meeting of the  
East Renfrewshire Integration Joint Board  
Performance and Audit Committee  
held at 1.00pm on 23 June 2021**

**PRESENT**

Anne-Marie Monaghan, NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde Board (Chair)

Councillor Caroline Bamforth	East Renfrewshire Council
Councillor Barbara Grant	East Renfrewshire Council co-opted member
Anne Marie Kennedy	Non-voting IJB member
Councillor Alan Lafferty	East Renfrewshire Council
Heather Molloy	Scottish Care

**IN ATTENDANCE**

Liona Allison	Assistant Committee Services Officer
Lesley Bairden	Head of Finance and Resources (Chief Financial Officer)
Michelle Blair	Chief Auditor, East Renfrewshire Council
John Cornett	Audit Scotland
Eamonn Daly	Democratic Services Manager (East Renfrewshire Council)
Pamela Gomes	Governance and Compliance Officer Audit Scotland
Noleen Harte	SDS Forum
Lee McLaughlin	Head of Recovery and Intensive Services
Ian McLean	Accountancy Manager
Candy Millard	Head of Adult Health and Social Care Localities
Julie Murray	Chief Officer - IJB
Steven Reid	Policy, Planning and Performance Manager
Louisa Yule	Audit Scotland

**APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Jacqueline Forbes	NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde Board
-------------------	-------------------------------------

**DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

1. There were no declarations of interest intimated.

**MINUTE OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

2. The committee considered and approved the Minute of the meeting of 25 November 2020.

## **MATTERS ARISING**

3. The committee considered a report by the Chief Officer providing an update on matters arising from discussions that had taken place at the previous meeting.

Referring to the proposed update showing the impact of the new COVID Recovery team on service demand for both CAMHS and the Family Wellbeing Service (FWS) the Chief Officer reported that this would be taken to the IJB in August.

The committee noted the report.

## **ROLLING ACTION LOG**

4. The committee considered a report by the Chief Officer providing details of all open actions, and those that had been completed or removed since the last meeting.

The Chief Officer reported that the open action in relation to the impact of FWS on CAMHS would be incorporated into the report being presented to the IJB in August.

The committee noted the report.

## **EAST RENFREWSHIRE INTEGRATION JOINT BOARD AUDIT SCOTLAND ANNUAL AUDIT PLAN 2020/21**

5. The committee took up consideration of the Annual Audit Plan for the IJB that had been prepared by Audit Scotland, and which provided details of the work that body would undertake as part of their audit of the Annual Accounts of the IJB for 2020/21.

Ms Monaghan welcomed to the meeting John Cornett and Louisa Yule from Audit Scotland, Mr Cornett being heard thereafter in further explanation of the Plan. In particular, referring to the financial statement audit risks as set out in the report, Mr Cornett explained that the risk in relation to management override of controls applied to partnerships across the country.

Further discussion on risk took place. Ms Monaghan referred to challenges facing the IJB in relation to short-term funding provided by the Scottish Government often with little notice, the challenges around spending these funds in an efficient and effective manner, and questioned whether this should be reflected in the risk register.

In reply, the Chief Financial Officer recognised that the situation outlined by Ms Monaghan was a risk, but explained the mitigations in place to address it. In addition, Mr Cornett explained that the view of Audit Scotland was that they would want to see evidence that the IJB had credible spending plans in place to make informed spending decisions that delivered value for money and good outcomes.

The committee noted the 2020/21 Annual Audit Plan.

## **UNAUDITED ANNUAL REPORT AND ACCOUNTS 2020/21**

6. The committee considered a report by the Chief Financial Officer providing an overview of the unaudited report and accounts for the IJB covering the period 1 April 2020 to 31 March 2021, as well as outlining legislative requirements and key stages associated with the approval of the annual report and accounts.

Having referred to the establishment of IJBs and the requirements, in accordance with Section 106 of the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973, for annual accounts to be prepared in compliance with the Code of Practice on Accounting for Local Authorities in the United Kingdom, and also to additional guidance produced by the Local Authority (Scotland) Accounts Advisory Committee, the report set out an overview of the process for the preparation and approval of the IJB's annual report and accounts.

The report highlighted the main key messages. There was a year-end underspend of £0.833 million which was 0.56% of the annual revenue budget; COVID-19 spend had been £9.095 million with funding of £12.260 million being received and the balance taken to reserves.

The main variances to the budget were set out in the report in addition to which it was reported that during the year £0.831 million of reserves had been used. The year on year movement in reserves was summarised, it being noted that £6.590 million had been invested into earmarked reserves, the majority of which related to specific ring-fenced funding received from the Scottish Government during the year. The majority of the funding related to COVID-19 costs and would be used to support the ongoing response to the pandemic during 2021/22. Approval for the reserves position as set out in the annual report and accounts was sought.

It was noted that the general reserve remained unchanged at £0.272 million, just under 0.2% of the 2020/21 revenue budget and well below the optimum level at a value of 2% of budget.

Commenting further on the report and accounts, the Chief Financial Officer explained that the guidance on the accounting treatment for COVID-related funding had not yet been finalised but would be reflected in the final accounts. Furthermore, she explained that central support recharges from the Council showed a £269k overspend and this was a result of £377k of unfunded COVID costs incurred by the various departments offset by some operational underspends. Agreement had been reached with Scottish Government that it was appropriate for the HSCP to allocate this against COVID funding and only the £269k to balance central support was drawn down. Whilst it could be argued that the benefit of £108k underspend had been lost, particularly given ongoing financial challenges, as this was public money offsetting the underspend it was considered by the Chief Financial Officer the correct course of action.

Full discussion then took place, and in response to questions the Chief Financial Officer explained further the position in relation to central support recharges including when notification of the anticipated recharge level was provided by the Council and the reasons for the increase in the anticipated level of recharge. She indicated that she would be approaching Council colleagues with a view to increasing the frequency of future discussions on recharges. Ms Monaghan suggested that this should be added to the committee's Rolling Action Log.

Discussion also took place on the level of reserves held by the IJB and the importance of it being understood that a significant proportion was ring-fenced and earmarked for specific purposes with a very small proportion available for non-earmarked use. Supporting this view, Ms Monaghan referred to a forthcoming meeting of NHS IJB leads when budgets and IJB reserves would be discussed.

In response to Councillor Bamforth, the Chief Financial Officer clarified the position in relation to COVID-related costs and whether the IJB had been fully funded for these, confirming this was the case.

Mr Cornett was also heard in relation to IJB reserves, explaining that similar conversations were taking place across the public sector generally. He explained that the narrative in the annual report in relation to earmarked and general reserves was the correct interpretation and Audit Scotland would be looking to reinforce this.

Thereafter the committee agreed to recommend that the Board:-

- (a) approve the unaudited annual report and accounts;
- (b) approve the proposed reserves allocations;
- (c) note that the annual report and accounts was subject to review; and
- (d) agree to receive the annual report and accounts in November, subject to any recommendations made by the external auditor and/or the committee.

## **2020-21 END-YEAR PERFORMANCE UPDATE AND POSTPONEMENT OF ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT**

7. The committee considered a report by the Chief Officer advising of the postponement of the publication of the 2020-21 Annual Performance Report and providing a summary update of key performance for 2020-21.

Having referred to the legislative requirement for Integration Joint Boards to publish Annual Performance Reports, and to temporary legislative changes in relation to the timescales for the publication of such reports, the report explained that given the volume of work required for a full review of performance and activity during 2020-21, and specifically the requirement for input to the review from partners and services, publication of the Annual Performance Report had been postponed until 31 August 2021 with a draft report being submitted to the next meeting of the IJB on 11 August for approval.

In the interim, summary information was provided relating to performance measures set out under the strategic priorities in the HSCP Strategic Plan 2018-2021.

The report made particular reference to the unprecedented challenge faced by the HSCP in responding to the COVID-19 pandemic highlighting the resilience, commitment and creativity shown by staff and giving examples of some of the work undertaken by HSCP staff including the delivery of vaccination programmes and working in partnership to develop the Community Hub. It was highlighted that COVID-19 response activity was in an addition to planned operational activity and that much of the 2020-21 performance data reflected the direct impact of the pandemic on operational activity

The Policy, Planning and Performance Manager was heard in further explanation of the report following which full discussion took place.

Councillor Bamforth commented on the carers seminar held earlier in the week and how it had been useful to hear about the support provided to carers as well as to hear from people with lived experience. In reply, the Head of Adult Health and Social Care Localities explained that part of the reason for the delay in the publication of the report was to enable some of the stories from service users to be included.

The Chief Officer highlighted that maintaining performance during the pandemic had been challenging. In support, Ms Monaghan stated that whilst there had been poorer performance in some areas, this had to be viewed in the context of the pandemic. Overall performance had been good and staff were to be commended for their efforts.

With regard to the report layout, Ms Monaghan suggested there was still an opportunity to try and achieve a better balance between looking back over past performance and plans moving

forward. She suggested this be added to the Rolling Action Log. In reply, the Chief Officer explained that Annual Reports were based on the prescribed format set by the Scottish Government. Notwithstanding officers could look further at the way in which the information was provided.

The committee noted:-

- (a) that the publication date for the 2020-21 Annual Performance Report had been postponed to 31 August 2021; and
- (b) the End-Year Performance Update for 2020-21.

## **SELF-DIRECTED SUPPORT**

8. Under reference to the Minute of the meeting held on 23 September 2020 (Item 8 refers) when it had been agreed to note progress to date and to receive an update on future development activity following local self-evaluation, the committee considered a report by the Chief Officer providing an update on progress in relation to the implementation of Self-Directed Support (SDS) within the HSCP.

The report explained that evaluation and review work had taken place between November 2020 and March 2021 with the findings of the review being outlined. These included a recognition that SDS was being used creatively in East Renfrewshire; budgets were fair, and gave people opportunity and choice when managing their support. Furthermore, the review noted the benefits of an Independent SDS Forum and Carers Centre locally and it was clear the current relationships were positive and partnership working was valued. The general public were considered to be well informed and knew how to access services within East Renfrewshire.

Social Workers consulted during the review were positive about the model of SDS and would like to ensure continued improvement.

The report also outlined a number of areas for improvement, in particular the need for the assessment and support plan approval process to be streamlined. A number of gaps in practices and processes were also identified during the review and these were outlined.

The report also explained that the review had identified a number of issues in relation to resources and resource allocation. In particular, increased flexibility to use budgets more creatively had been raised by practitioners supporting carers/care recipients. Issues around resources, and further testing of the Individual Budget Calculator being required although early indicators were that the model was working well for both individuals and practitioners.

The need to consider how to adequately resource capacity to deliver the review recommendations was also highlighted. This could possibly be achieved through the realignment of existing staff although it was explained that should this not be possible and additional resource required, it would be necessary to demonstrate a clear business case and identify a funding source, potentially on an invest to save basis.

Having emphasised that person centred and relationship practice was the foundation to social work practice and SDS with clear opportunities to build on existing strengths and drive forward process and practice improvements, the report explained that an SDS steering group had been established to oversee the local implementation programme. The group would be co-

chaired by the Head of Service and SDS Forum Manager and membership would include people with lived experience of using Self-Directed Support, practitioners, managers and finance officers.

The group would collaborate to agree and oversee a local implementation plan highlighting key priorities, achievements and risk to Directorate Management Team, Performance and Audit Committee and Integration Joint Board as required.

Ms Monaghan welcomed to the meeting Noleen Harte of the SDS Forum who explained in detail how the focus groups set up as part of the review had operated, and the results of the findings.

Ms Monaghan having referred to the importance of empowering staff and giving them confidence to be flexible and creative in developing care solutions, Ms Harte referred to staff sessions on that topic that had taken place before the pandemic had struck. Efforts were being made to re-establish these sessions.

In response to a question from Ms Molloy on the level of resource available to support a creative approach, Ms Harte explained that there was a low resource base at present and that further work to look at more creative solutions in respect of SDS Option 1 was required.

The Head of Recovery and Intensive Services having commented on the encouraging levels of interest in participation in the Steering Group, the committee noted the:-

- (a) update with respect to SDS implementation in East Renfrewshire;
- (b) establishment of the SDS Steering Group; and
- (c) intention to update the Integration Joint Board and the committee moving forward.

## **AUDIT UPDATE**

9. The committee considered a report by the Chief Officer providing an update on audit activity relating to the IJB undertaken from January 2020; audit activity relating to the HSCP from the same date, information on the Care Finance audit, and details of future reporting arrangements. Information relating to the audit activity work and the Care Finance audit accompanied the report as appendices.

Having summarised the information contained in the appendices, the report explained that NHS Internal Audit activity in relation to HSCPs was NHS-wide and did not include information at partnership level. However, notification would be given of any recommendations specifically relating to East Renfrewshire HSCP.

Having welcomed the revised format, the committee noted the report.

## **IJB STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER UPDATE**

10. Under reference to the Minute of the previous meeting (Item 8 refers), the committee considered a report by the Chief Officer providing an update on the Integration Joint Board Strategic Risk Register. A copy of the risk register accompanied the report.

Having set out the risk matrix used to calculate risk scores, the report then referred to the meeting of the committee on 25 November and explained that since then there had been no change in risk scores, no new risks added or any existing risks removed from the register.

It was explained that risk control measures in place had been updated to include any proposed mitigation which had been completed since last reported. Proposed implementation dates had also been reviewed and updated where necessary.

In addition, the report explained that feedback had been received on the Newton Mearns capital bid which was unsuccessful, with deprivation being a strong weighting factor. The IT risk had been updated to reflect the global supply shortage affecting NHSGGC who were currently experiencing procurement issues in relation to laptops. The possibility of reprioritising existing equipment as a temporary solution was being examined. Increased frailty along with an increase in severity of mental health conditions post pandemic was also being experienced, and this was creating additional pressure on services.

Details of those risks still considered to be high or significant post-mitigation were outlined. These related to the Scottish Child Abuse Inquiry where due to the historic nature of the risk no further mitigations had been identified, and Financial Sustainability, which continued to be a high/red risk as last reported and that this was still considered red post-mitigation reflecting the current economic climate and uncertainty around COVID-19 and Brexit implications.

As previously reported, although "Failure of a Provider" was considered as a medium level risk post-mitigation it was still considered a significant risk given the potential impact on service delivery.

The committee noted the report.

## **CALENDAR OF MEETINGS 2022**

**11.** The committee considered a report by the Chief Officer with proposed meeting dates for 2022.

Following discussion in relation to meetings of the committee taking place on the same day as meetings of the IJB and having heard the Chief Officer on the reasons why such an approach had been adopted in the past, the committee approved the dates.

## **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

**12.** It was reported that the next meeting of the committee would take place on Wednesday 22 September at 9.00am.

CHAIR