

LAA MANAGEMENT GROUP
Wednesday 27th February, 2008
Retford Town Hall

MINUTES

Present

Peter Baguley	LAA Programme Manager: Sustainability (Gedling Borough Council)
Peter Clark	Bassetlaw District Council
Jacqui Bell	Networking Action for Voluntary Organisations
Gillian Blenkinsop	Bassetlaw LSP
Barbara Brady	Bassetlaw and Nottinghamshire PCT
Stephen Bray	Gedling Borough Council
Mick Burrows	Strategic Director for Communities, Nottinghamshire County Council
James Busher	jobcentreplus
Bruce Cameron	LAA Programme Manager: A Safe Place To Live (Nottinghamshire Police)
Nina Dauban	HCOP Block Chair (NAVO)
Kate Davies	DAAT
Richard Edwards	Neighbourhood Manager, Manton Community Alliance
Peter Elderton	LAA Secretariat
Gill Francis	Probation Service
Kate Harley	Government Office for East Midlands
Cathy Harvey	LAA Programme Manager: Health and Wellbeing for All (Nottinghamshire County Council)
Liz Lesquereux	LAA Programme Manager: A Strong Sense of Place (Nottinghamshire County Council)
Susan Lewis-Roberts	LAA Manager
<i>Phil Lyons</i>	<i>Mansfield LSP (Chair)</i>
Ruth Marlow	Mansfield District Council
Anthony May	Strategic Director for Children and Young People, Nottinghamshire County Council
Alan Mellor	Chief Executive, Ashfield District Council
Celia Morris	LAA Programme Manager: A Thriving Economy (Nottinghamshire County Council)
Jean Pardoe	Connexions
David Pearson	Strategic Director for Adult Social Care and Health, Nottinghamshire County Council
Joe Pidgeon	LAA Programme Manager: Health and Wellbeing for All (Nottinghamshire County Council)
Paul Randle	Rushcliffe Borough Council & LSP
Marcie Taylor	Nottinghamshire County Council
Steve Turner	Broxtowe Borough Council
Chris Walker	LAA Programme Manager: A Safe Place to Live (Nottinghamshire County Council)
Pam Wisher	Volunteering Nottinghamshire
Tamara Alexander	LAA Secretariat

Apologies

Les Cowling	LAA Programme Manager: Children and Young People Achieving Their Full Potential (Nottinghamshire County Council)
Ged Greaves	Newark and Sherwood District Council
Chris Kenny	Nottinghamshire County Teaching and Bassetlaw PCTs
Nick Holmes	Nottinghamshire Police
Marie-Laure Huke	Lead negotiator, Government Office for East Midlands
Diane Pollard	Nottinghamshire County Council
Tom Stockwell	jobcentreplus
Sean Whelan	Nottinghamshire Fire and Rescue Service

MINUTES

Meeting opened: 09.45am

NO.	ITEM	ACTION
1.	Introductions Chair	
2.	Minutes from previous meeting and matters arising Chair	
	<p>Minutes accepted as true record.</p> <p>In relation to the reference to elected members (page 6), it was noted that a presentation about the new LAA will be made available with speaking notes to Chief Executives and Leaders, for distribution within each district body. The presentation will also be made available to the LAA Management Group.</p> <p>In relation to the action item requesting GOEM to report to Partners on finance issues (page 7), Government advised that there was no feedback as national guidance is not yet available. There is a proposal to set up a virtual group for Partners across the region to discuss finance issues.</p> <p>In relation to the action item seeking clarification from GOEM on the reward grant, Government advised that there are no details currently available. There is a complex debate within Whitehall about how to take forward reward grant, possibly through a point-scoring system set across all targets in the LAA.</p> <p>In matters arising, a paper on communications was tabled for officers to read and provide comments.</p>	<p>MB to send out presentation.</p>
3.	GOEM position on number of targets to be reported Kate Harley	
	<p>Partners sought clarification from Government about the protocols for reporting targets, as there appears to be some contradiction. On one hand, Government has set spatial levels in the technical definitions for each indicator, often below County level, on the other hand, Government is asking for only one target per indicator to be reported against.</p> <p>GOEM advised that reporting requirements are unclear until final guidance and definitions are made available, however, it appears that there has been some misunderstanding about differentiated targets. While the NI Set refers to spatial levels, these levels are those at which indicators are measured and reported, but they are not the levels at which targets are set.</p> <p>In the LAA, there is room for one target per indicator, although how these targets are constructed is for Partners to determine. Three examples of how one target can be set for each indicator</p>	

NO.	ITEM	ACTION
	<p>include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. setting average target at County level, that is looking for a flat rate improvement across the County 2. focus on certain districts (or hotspots) by setting targets in 2 or 3 districts, so the single target might be to increase performance by 4% across districts A, B and C. 3. narrowing the gap target by looking at differential between top and bottom performing districts and setting a single target such that gap is narrowed by x%. <p>Government advised that 7 targets against district-level indicators will not be accepted.</p> <p>Several partners suggested explicit differentiation between targets reported to Government and targets set for the Partnership. Partners also expressed disappointment with Government's interpretation of the LAA, and reiterated that only setting one target per indicator (particularly at County level) would result in loss of emphasis in hotspots.</p> <p>Concern was raised about having an 'informal LAA' for the Partners sitting under a 'formal' LAA which reports a summary to Government because when push comes to shove, Partners will focus only on the 'formal' LAA in order to satisfy Government.</p> <p>Chair reiterated the need to focus on starting points. Limiting outlook to only one target per indicator will not work. First look at the levels at which we should measure the priorities, and then proceed to determine what and how the Partnership reports to Government.</p>	
<p>4.</p>	<p>Target setting for Priorities 1 and 2</p> <p>Celia Morris</p>	
	<p>NI 151: Overall employment rate</p> <p>The LAA Programme Manager for Economic Theme proposed an improvement target against this indicator in which Nottinghamshire's employment improves to within 1% of the East Midlands regional average over time. Therefore, this target is pegged to the East Midlands average and takes into account contextual factors. Note that the current gap between Notts employment and East Midlands average is 1.9%.</p> <p>Debate was held regarding the meaningfulness of 1% improvement target, particularly if data is 'dodgy' and therefore error margins could be wider than $\pm 1\%$. While data is more reliable at County level, it can vary 'wildly' at district levels.</p> <p>Further concern was raised about data that is only collected annually as this is too far apart. The baseline for this indicator is already a year out of date and it is possible that the gap between employment rates in Nottinghamshire compared with the East Midlands average might already be within 1%.</p>	

NO.	ITEM	ACTION
	<p>Several partners reiterated that it is important to retain this indicator, even if it is difficult to measure and efforts are required to improve data quality.</p> <p>The Chair recommended that the target for this indicator be benchmarked against regional average but focuses on improvement in employment rates against district plans.</p> <p>Some partners argued that this indicator should be removed from the LAA completely until data is considered reliable as the Government will hold Partners to account for agreed and signed targets.</p> <p>Consensus was reached that this target cannot be signed off by Management Group at this stage. Work is required to reassure partners that the data is reliable. In-principle agreement reached that the indicator will be measured at both County level and districts.</p> <p>NI 152: Working age people on out of work benefits</p> <p>The proposed target for this indicator has not been finalised yet as a complex calculation is required to obtain the baseline figures. The proposal is to go with a 'narrow-the-gap' (NTG) target across the County, however, more detailed consultation is required, particularly with the Health & Wellbeing Theme.</p> <p>Concerns raised that NTG targets can be achieved by lowering the performance of better achieving districts rather than improving performance of poorly performing districts. Agreement reached that a proviso be attached to all NTG targets such that no performance of any district can deteriorate.</p> <p>A query was raised about whether NI 152 would be eligible to attract Performance Reward Grant (PRG) through the Neighbourhood Fund as it was earlier suggested that only NI 153 would be eligible for this. GOEM assured Partners that NI 152 is also eligible, although the mechanisms for PRG have not been agreed.</p> <p>NI 154 – Net additional homes provided</p> <p>Programme Manager advised that the target for this indicator cannot be finalised until district figures are made available, pending release of the Regional Spatial Strategy in autumn 2008. It is unlikely that a target for this indicator will be finalised in time for LAA signing in April 2008, however, when the target is confirmed, it will be brought 'on board'.</p> <p>It was also noted that this indicator should be set at district level.</p> <p>NI 171 – VAT registration rate</p> <p>The suggestion is to peg the target for this indicator to the regional rate, which Nottinghamshire is currently ahead of. Partners agreed this suggestion, however, no specific target was put forward.</p>	<p>Further work required to reassure partners of the validity of the target for NI 151 and reliability of data (CM).</p> <p>General agreement that all NTG targets will include proviso that no district in County lower levels of performance.</p> <p>NI 152 is eligible for PRG through Neighbourhood Fund although mechanism not agreed. (KH)</p> <p>A target for NI 154 is unlikely to be finalised until release of RSS in autumn 2008.</p> <p>No specific target proposed for NI 171 although agreement that target be pegged to regional rate.</p>

NO.	ITEM	ACTION
	<p>NI 167 – Congestion: average journey time per mile during morning peak</p> <p>The proposed target is for the Greater Nottingham area only, as put forward in the Congestion Delivery Plan which focuses on the conurbation.</p> <p>NI 176 – Working age people with access to employment by public transport (and other specified modes)</p> <p>The proposed target is already outlined in the Local Transport Plan, however, Government has suggested a more challenging target. Further guidance regarding this is required and therefore development of target is on hold.</p> <p>Partners again called for indicators such as this to be removed from the LAA as there is reluctance to be held accountable for incomplete targets, particularly where delays are resulting from lack of technical guidance.</p> <p>The Chair proposed that a partially agreed set of targets be signed off with other targets being agreed at later stages, when guidance is available and data is reliable. The Chair reiterated that progress with the delivery of improvement plans against the priorities (rather than the indicators) need not be delayed by the lack of a complete set of targets.</p> <p>NI 163 – Working age population qualified to at least Level 2 or higher</p> <p>Suggestion is for a flat improvement rate for the County which is not pegged to the regional average. Partners are currently reviewing the current LSC target, and if this is considered realistic and feasible, then propose that partners accept this as the target for the LAA.</p> <p>Some partners raised concerns about the loss of district focus by having a County level improvement target. While theme partners had considered an NTG target, LSC raised concerns about data reliability at district levels and therefore proposed a County-wide target.</p> <p>Partners from northern districts felt that a County flat rate target was acceptable as long as there is also a NTG target for poor performing districts.</p>	<p>No specific target put forward for NI 167 although propose to follow that in Congestion Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Target for NI 176 on hold pending guidance from Government.</p> <p>Proposal: renew focus on developing delivery plans against priorities regardless of status of targets.</p> <p>NI 163 – current LSC target is possible way forward although further consultation required to finalise.</p> <p>Consideration of NTG targets also required.</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>Target setting for Priority 3</p> <p>Liz Lesquereux</p> <p>with Marcie Taylor (NI 114) and Jean Pardoe (NI 117)</p>	
	<p>NI 114 – Rate of permanent exclusions from school</p> <p>The nominated target is to maintain 0.25% at County level, although it is also important to ensure a focus on hotspots where possible. The theme partners are keen to challenge themselves beyond the current 0.25%, although they are waiting for the</p>	<p>NI 114 – nominated target of 0.25% at County level although proposal to review target pending release of guidance.</p>

NO.	ITEM	ACTION
	<p>release of the technical guidance before reviewing the target.</p> <p>The proposed target is a proxy measure at County level, with the intent to focus on hotspots within delivery plans. Chair suggested that the focus on tackling hotspots needs to be made clearer.</p> <p>NI 117 – 16 to 18 year olds who are not in education, training or employment (NEET)</p> <p>Theme area ensured that this indicator can be measured – even to street level if necessary. An emphasis on hotspots will be integrated into delivery plans.</p> <p>Note: no specific target was put forward for discussion.</p> <p>NI 1 – Percentage of people who believe people from different backgrounds get on well together in their local area</p> <p>Caveat put forward that data is unreliable and therefore theme is using ‘net agreed’ figures.</p> <p>While further work is required, the proposed target is for a 1% improvement district by district, however it is noted that such a target could widen the gap between districts. This issue will be addressed by the Stronger Communities Network meeting on 29/2/08.</p> <p>Partners reiterated the problems of a 1% target, particularly where there are issues with data reliability, as the error margins could distort results.</p> <p>Partners agreed that the proposed target is a good starting point, however, further work is required, particularly in ensuring sound district targets rather than an abstract County figure.</p> <p>NI 4 – Percentage of people who feel they can influence decisions in their locality</p> <p>Recommendation is for a 1% target year on year, collected at district level. Partners were assured that data for this indicator is reliable, but unsure that it accurately represents the ‘state of play’. Data becomes increasingly positive (higher satisfaction levels) as it is disaggregated, however, needs to be aggregated into a single figure for reporting to GOEM.</p> <p>It was noted that the Stronger Communities Network is currently developing delivery plans around this indicator.</p> <p>It was suggested that the target be pegged to the County or regional average so that performance can be bench-marked.</p> <p>NI 7 – Environment for a thriving third sector</p> <p>Progress in setting a target for this indicator has been stymied by the lack of a technical definition for the indicator.</p> <p>While significant work is going on ‘behind the scenes’, a target for this indicator that can be reported to GOEM could be a year away.</p>	<p>NI 117 – no specific target proposed although partners were assured that the indicator is measurable.</p> <p>NI 1 – further work required to improve the proposed target of a 1% flat rate improvement across the County.</p> <p>NI 4 – proposed indicator is 1% improvement year on year, however there was no clear agreement to this by LAAMG.</p> <p>NI 7 – target unavailable as awaiting release of definitions. Furthermore, inclusion in LAA for reporting to GOEM could be a year away.</p>

NO.	ITEM	ACTION
	<p>LAA Programme Manager confirmed that the lack of a target was not hindering the development of a delivery plan aimed at improvement.</p> <p>NI 8 – Adult participation in sport</p> <p>Proposed target is a flat rate 1% improvement by districts, although would need to report a single County figure to GOEM. It was noted that this target could again widen rather than narrow the gap between districts.</p> <p>Queries were again raised about the validity of a 1% target in light of potential error margins over 1%.</p> <p>In light of a repeated call to drop targets such as this from the LAA, the Chair proposed a risk analysis against all proposed indicators which test data reliability and validity. Only if assured that data quality is sound and error margins are low, then can sign off with GOEM for reporting.</p> <p>Partners reiterated the need for both district and aggregated County targets to be included in delivery plans. Chair noted that more reflection is required on delivery plans and the way these will sufficiently improve service delivery</p> <p>Local indicator – cultural enrichment</p> <p>A local indicator for cultural enrichment was deliberately selected as it was felt that no indicators in the NI Set were sufficient.</p> <p>A definition for this is underway, although it is some way off yet as work has been commissioned to ensure that the indicator is sound and will foster innovative approaches to enriching culture in Nottinghamshire. Furthermore, discussions are taking place with the City Council to see if the local indicator can be adopted by both parties, and ensure a unified approach to addressing culture.</p> <p>No specific timeframes provided although it is anticipated that the commissioned piece of work will take 6 weeks.</p>	<p>NI 8 – flat rate 1% improvement target across County. Further work required to reassure partners that this target is sound and will not be distorted by error margins.</p> <p>Proposal: risk analysis against all indicators which tests data reliability and validity.</p> <p>LI – culture: a target is some way off as there is no definition, although work has been commissioned to develop this.</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p>Target setting for NI 40 (Priority 4) Kate Davies</p>	
	<p>NI 40 – Drug users in effective treatment</p> <p>The definition for this indicator is now clear and this is not just about numbers of people in treatment, but also planned discharges and planned care pathways.</p> <p>It is hard to accept a 1% improvement target, therefore, the theme is going for a 3% or 4% improvement, reported to GOEM at County level but also broken down by districts. Partners were assured that the data for this indicator is robust and current baselines are available.</p> <p>Measurement of this indicator is tricky because it is not measured by the NHS.</p>	<p>NI 40 – 3% or 4% improvement target reported to GOEM at County level.</p>

NO.	ITEM	ACTION
7.	<p>Target setting for Priorities 5, 6, 7 and 8 Barbara Brady and Cathy Harvey with Kate Davies (NI 39) and Marcie Taylor (NI 50)</p>	
	<p>NI 123 – 16+ current smoking prevalence The definition for this indicator is unclear as it is not actually about smoking prevalence but quitting rates (which contribute to prevalence). The proposed target is constructed as a County rate and disaggregated district level rates. No specific target put forward. NI 39 – Alcohol related hospital admission rates Getting reliable baselines is problematic for this indicator and it is not yet possible to take data down to district levels. Data at County level is available and is good for determining current trends, although there are some data quality issues. The role of the Acute Trust in supplying data was discussed, particularly regarding data intervals of 18 weeks. It was also noted that the currently available data is not yet formatted to meet the requirements of the LAA and work is underway to make sure this is possible. While this may take some time, it is not preventing the development of delivery plans. NI 55 – Obesity among primary school age children in Reception Year Intervals around the prevalence rate make it difficult to set a target for this indicator. Experts suggest that higher levels of child obesity will be linked to deprived areas, but demonstrating this is impossible with current statistics. Local indicator – adult obesity (BMI measurement in GP clinics) Developing this indicator is challenging but important. As the definition is based on GPs measuring BMI, there is less robust coverage of the Nottinghamshire population. Therefore, it is difficult to be accurate about the percentage of obese adults in Nottinghamshire, but this should not prevent development of the indicators as the issue is important. Baselines for this indicator will not be available until April 2008. NI 120 – All age all cause mortality rate The proposed target is to reduce the gap between the lowest quintile of super output area and the County average by a 30% difference. Partners felt it would be helpful if the indicator could be broken down for each district.</p>	<p>NI 123 – no specific target put forward.</p> <p>NI 39 – no specific target put forward. Further work required to re-format currently available data into form suitable for LAA.</p> <p>NI 55 – no target put forward</p> <p>Local indicator – adult obesity: baselines will not be available until April 2008</p> <p>NI 120 - target provided. No clear agreement by LAAMG.</p>

NO.	ITEM	ACTION
	<p>NI 50 – emotional health of children</p> <p>While there are several existing measures which contribute to this indicator, the theme is waiting for the release of indicator definitions before setting a meaningful target. Nevertheless, a lot of work is underway regarding the development of delivery plans.</p>	<p>NI 50 – target not provided – waiting for release of definitions.</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p>Target setting for Priority 9</p> <p>Joe Pidgeon</p>	
	<p>NI 136 – People supported to live independently</p> <p>Baseline figures are not yet available as this is a new indicator, although when this is available, it can be disaggregated to district levels.</p> <p>In addition, the target cannot be developed until the guidance is available and therefore there is no proposed target at this stage.</p> <p>In the meantime, delivery plans will be drafted.</p> <p>NI 141 – Number of vulnerable people achieving independent living</p> <p>The targets for this indicator will be agreed by the Supporting People Commissioning Board in March. The target will be a County figure as it is tricky to disaggregate, however, a ‘hotspotting’ approach will be taken in delivery.</p> <p>NI 146 – Adults with learning disabilities in employment</p> <p>A baseline and target is available against this indicator. The context is that there are 1,500 people with severe learning disabilities and 5,000 with mild learning disabilities in Nottinghamshire.</p> <p>The proposed target is to secure paid employment for 110 people over the next two years across the County.</p> <p>There was acknowledgement that there are very small numbers involved in this target and some partners queried the relevance of this indicator in the LAA.</p> <p>Partners were reminded that there is a strong imperative to include this indicator in the LAA as it is a national target and contributes to active citizenship and stronger communities. While the numbers of people involved in this indicator are small, they are among the most vulnerable in the County. A key element of this indicator is changing cultural attitudes towards people with disabilities.</p>	<p>NI 136 – no target, waiting for guidance</p> <p>NI 141 – no target, to be agreed in March</p> <p>NI 146 – target is to achieve 110 people with learning disabilities in paid employment over the next 2 years.</p>
<p>9.</p>	<p>Target setting for Priority 4</p> <p>Bruce Cameron and Chris Walker, with Anthony May (NI 111)</p>	
	<p>NI 20 – Assault with injury crime rate</p> <p>It was noted that this is a headline indicator for a greater body of work. Other partners felt that as it is only this indicator that we</p>	<p>NI 20 – target of reducing assault with injury crime rate by 5%</p>

NO.	ITEM	ACTION
	<p>agree with Government, they will not have regard for the wider work being undertaken. We must be cautious as Partners will only be held to account for targets signed off with GOEM.</p> <p>The proposed target for this indicator is a reduction by 5% blanket across the County, however, spatial levels for reporting can be aggregated and disaggregated for varying needs.</p> <p>This target was agreed based on the proviso that no individual district experiences worse performance as the Partnership must focus on improving outcomes in the worst performing areas.</p> <p>NI 16 – Serious acquisitive crime rate</p> <p>Propose that the LAA reports this indicator at County level, with target of 13.6% across the board. There will be a deliberate attempt to NTG through district targets. Delivery plans will be locally based, so data won't be disaggregated down, rather aggregated up to report at County level.</p> <p>The CDRPs will be the delivery plans, so this target cannot be achieved without consent of all the CDRPs. Dialogue will be commencing shortly.</p> <p>NI 111 – First time entrants to the Youth Justice System aged 10-17</p> <p>The notion of replacing this indicator with NI 19 (rate of proven re-offending by young offenders) is misguided and NI 19 is an unreliable indicator.</p> <p>No specific target was proposed against this indicator, although it was agreed that only those targets where we can provide reliable baselines and realistic targets will be put forward to Government.</p> <p>NI 17 – Perceptions of anti-social behaviour</p> <p>Police propose a target of 16% across the County, such that perceptions match the national average. This target would focus on hotspots and aim to NTG.</p> <p>Partners agreed to add the proviso that while aiming for 16% in each district, no district could perform worse (for example, Rushcliffe).</p> <p>This target will be set through the CDRPs and reported at County level.</p> <p>NI 18 – Adult re-offending rates for those under probations supervision</p> <p>This indicator cannot be measured until January 2009.</p> <p>As the Partnership are committed to tackling adult re-offending, the theme propose a local indicator to assist in setting a baseline for this indicator. If this is the case, a target could be set for the local indicator until NI 18 comes 'on-line' in 2009. Government have already provided their support for this approach.</p>	<p>across the County.</p> <p>NI 16 – proposed target of 13.6% across the County</p> <p>Target needs to be agreed with CDRPs, therefore further consultation required</p> <p>NI 111 – no target put forward</p> <p>NI 17 – proposed target of 16% across the County</p> <p>NI 18 – no target will be available until January 2009.</p> <p>Proposal: establish a local indicator until NI 18 goes 'live' in 2009 and therefore set a target against the local (not yet done).</p>

NO.	ITEM	ACTION
	<p>Regardless of the approach taken, the lack of a target for this indicator will not hinder the development of delivery plans.</p> <p>A wider debate ensued about the number of indicators which do not have ‘firm’ targets due to the lack of technical guidance and/or unreliable data and/or lack of baselines.</p> <p>It was proposed that the issues relating to target setting be put to Andrew Campbell who will be attending the Strategic Partnership Board meeting on 7th March.</p> <p>The recommendation from LAAMG is that LSPB do not sign off on anything with ‘dodgy’ baselines, targets or data.</p> <p>Partners also felt it important to assure Government that targets which cannot be signed off immediately have not been forgotten or excluded from the LAA, and in fact will continue to be the subject of delivery planning. However, targets will only be signed off when issues are resolved. Partners reiterated that the priorities have not changed and that priorities are more important than the indicators because they are outcomes focussed.</p> <p>General agreement was reached and issues will be collated for Andrew Campbell.</p> <p>Local indicator – domestic violence</p> <p>Safety theme want a local indicator to keep domestic violence on the agenda while collecting baseline data for next year. Once baseline data is in-place, the suggestion is that this indicator will transfer to NI 32 (repeat incidents of domestic violence).</p>	<p>Recommendation: LSPB not to sign off any targets where data is unreliable</p> <p>Issues with target setting to be collated and submitted to Andrew Campbell at LSPB on 7/3/08 (SLR to coordinate)</p> <p>Local indicator – domestic violence – no specific target put forward</p>
<p>10.</p>	<p>Target setting for Priority 10</p> <p>Peter Baguley</p>	
	<p>NI 186 – Per capita CO₂ emissions in the local authority area</p> <p>The baseline data for this indicator is out of date by 2 years.</p> <p>The proposed target is to reduce per capita CO₂ emissions by 12% at the County level, also broken down by districts.</p> <p>Further engagement is required with LSPs.</p> <p>DEFRA are looking at reducing the intervals between data collection so the lag decreases. As it is, the new LAA will only measure one year of impact of this indicator.</p> <p>NI 187 – Tackling fuel poverty – people receiving income based benefits living in homes with a low energy efficiency rating</p> <p>There is no baseline data for this indicator available.</p> <p>Theme partners are waiting for the release of definitions, however, work is underway to develop a County-wide survey which will address this indicator. Resourcing implications of the survey will also need to be addressed as this is a new requirement.</p>	<p>NI 186 – proposed target of 12% at County level</p> <p>NI 187 – awaiting guidance</p>

NO.	ITEM	ACTION
	<p>NI 196 – Improved street and environmental cleanliness – fly tipping</p> <p>No specific target was put forward, however, it was noted that Partners are particularly keen to including this indicator. The focus is on trajectory rather than a specific target. The delivery plan will benefit from inclusion in the LAA.</p> <p>NI 192 – Household waste recycled or composted</p> <p>The appropriateness of this indicator is still under discussion with Government, however, the Nottinghamshire Partnership are keen to include NI 192 in the new LAA. The alternative is NI 191 (residual household waste per head), however, there are too many variables with this indicator.</p> <p>The proposed target is to bring forward the 2020 recycling target of reducing household waste by 50%, within 5 years. The resulting targets for the LAA are 40.9% for 2008-09, 42.4% by 2009-10 and 43.9% by 2010-11.</p> <p>NI 47 – People killed or seriously injured in road traffic accidents</p> <p>The proposal is to retain the target currently in the Local Transport Plan, measured as an average over on a three year rolling basis.</p> <p>The Government feel a more challenging target is appropriate, so this is under discussion.</p>	<p>NI 196 – no proposed target</p> <p>NI 192 – proposal is to bring forward the 2020 recycling target by 5 years. Resulting targets for LAA are to reduce waste by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 40.9% in 2008-09 - 42.4% in 2009-10 - 43.9% in 2010-11 <p>NI 47 – propose target is that currently in Local Transport Plan (the specific target is not provided)</p>
<p>11.</p>	<p>Any other business Chair</p>	
	<p>Delivery plans</p> <p>A process needs to be agreed to ensure that delivery plans are consistent and have the same approach for the whole LAA.</p> <p>Timeframes are tight, although it appears that many of the theme partnerships have made significant headway in developing delivery plans already.</p> <p>The Chair proposes that draft delivery plans are presented at the next meeting of the LAA Management Group, which demonstrate what new work is being undertaken and in collaborative efforts.</p> <p>The Chair noted that if delivery plans are a simple corralling of existing work, the LAA Management Group will be asking a lot of questions.</p> <p>Finance</p> <p>Time constraints limited opportunity for discussion of Finance issues, however, it was noted that the 5% limit on carry-forward of unspent funds from 2007-08 only applies to Capital and Surestart, not Revenue.</p>	<p>First sight of draft delivery plans to be provided at LAAMG on 3rd April 2008</p> <p>(LAA PMs to coordinate)</p>

NO.	ITEM	ACTION
	<p>Further, there is no restriction on any amounts of revenue carried forward.</p> <p>It is suggested that Partners continue with the process previously agreed.</p> <p>More work is required on funding for future years as 'we are some way off yet'.</p> <p>Partners suggested that the LSPB needs to be more engaged in the debate on how to create headroom for the future.</p> <p>CPA Assessment</p> <p>The CPA Assessment will be undertaken in May 2008. The self-assessment has been drafted and has been sent to officers with the papers for this meeting. Any comments are to be provided to Pete Elderton.</p>	<p>Comments on CPA self-assessment to be forward to Pete Elderton</p>
12.	Next meeting Chair	
	Thursday 3 rd April 2008, 9.30am, Making It Centre, Mansfield	

Meeting closed: 1.00pm