

**Minute of virtual meeting of the  
East Renfrewshire Integration Joint Board  
Performance and Audit Committee  
held at 9.00am on 22 September 2021**

**PRESENT**

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

Councillor Caroline Bamforth	East Renfrewshire Council
Provost Jim Fletcher	East Renfrewshire Council
Jacqueline Forbes	NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde Board
Councillor Barbara Grant	East Renfrewshire Council co-opted member
Anne Marie Kennedy	Non-voting IJB member

**IN ATTENDANCE**

Liona Allison	Assistant Committee Services Officer
Eamonn Daly	Democratic Services Manager (East Renfrewshire Council)
Pamela Gomes	Governance and Compliance Officer Audit Scotland
Ian McLean	Accountancy Manager
Julie Murray	Chief Officer - IJB
Steven Reid	Policy, Planning and Performance Manager
Louisa Yule	Audit Scotland

**APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Lesley Bairden	Head of Finance and Resources (Chief Financial Officer)
Michelle Blair	Chief Auditor (East Renfrewshire Council)

**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 23 June 2021

## **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.

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.

Referring to plans for the development of an easy-read version of the annual report and accounts, Ms Monaghan suggested that this could possibly be expedited by outsourcing the work. In reply the Chief Officer indicated that she would pursue this with the Chief Financial Officer on her return from leave.

The committee noted the report.

## **ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT 2020-21**

5. The committee considered a report by the Chief Officer providing details of the performance of the HSCP over 2020-21.

Having referred to the legislation and guidance setting out the prescribed content of a performance report for an integration authority, and also having highlighted the delayed reporting timescales due to COVID-19, the report explained that this was the third and final year of the 2018-21 Strategic Plan and the fifth Annual Performance Report that had been prepared. It was noted that the report was a high-level report principally structured around the priorities set out in the Strategic Plan.

The report explained that the Annual Report, a copy of which accompanied the report, set out how the HSCP had delivered on its vision and commitments over 2020-21, recognising the exceptional circumstances of the pandemic, its impact on ways of working, and potential disruption to performance trends. The report was principally structured around the priorities set out in the Strategic Plan and linked to the National Health and Wellbeing Outcomes as well as those for Criminal Justice and Children and Families.

The main elements of the report set out the HSCP's current strategic approach; response to the pandemic; work to deliver the strategic priorities and meet the challenges of the pandemic over the preceding 12 months; financial performance; and detailed performance information illustrating data trends against key performance indicators.

Additional sections on public protection; the hosted Specialist Learning Disability Service; and support for staff were also contained in the report.

The report highlighted the unprecedented challenge of the pandemic during 2020-21 and how staff had responded with incredible resilience, commitment and creativity, with examples of some of the work carried out being given. It was explained that COVID-19 response activity had taken place in addition to planned operational priorities and that much of the performance data for 2020-21 reflected the direct impact of the pandemic on operational activity and changed behaviours among the population during lockdown and the pandemic period more generally.

Having referred to the performance update provided to the Board in June, the report then listed summary headline performance information across 7 service areas.

The Policy, Planning and Performance Manager was then heard further on the report. Having responded to comments from Councillor Grant on how performance trends were reflected in the report and that this could be reviewed, some further examples of performance improvements as well as areas where performance levels had dropped were provided.

Responding to comments from Mrs Kennedy and Provost Fletcher, the Chief Officer explained that consideration could be given to providing separately to IJB members details of how service delivery had been adversely impacted by the pandemic. She also stated that it was likely that home working had contributed to a reduction in staff absence. Comment was also made on the challenges in relation to the demand for physiotherapy services locally.

Ms Monaghan highlighted that some information contained in the report was out of date, referring by way of example to the plans for reviewing the needs of care home residents, where the report stated these would be complete by the end of June. She sought confirmation that such matters would be addressed in the final version of the report and sought an update on whether the reviews had been completed. In reply, and having confirmed that the report would be updated to reflect the up to date position, the Chief Officer indicated that there were 3 reviews still to be completed but they would be carried out within the coming week. She highlighted that many of the reviews related to local residents living in homes outwith the area and this had lengthened the time taken for the exercise to be completed. Notwithstanding East Renfrewshire was one of the first HSCPs to complete the exercise.

Ms Monaghan highlighted that for performance information provided in percentage terms it would be helpful for numbers to be provided to enable the percentage information to be put in context. She also suggested that it may be useful for expected performance information to be included in graphs and charts where possible as this would help to provide further contextual information. In reply the Policy, Planning and Performance Manager explained that this may not be possible in relation to all the performance information provided cases but confirmed it could be reviewed for future reports.

The committee noted the report.

## **AUDIT UPDATE**

**6.** Under reference to the Minute of the previous meeting (Item 9 refers), the committee considered a report by the Chief Officer providing an update on new audit activity relating to the HSCP since last reported to the committee in June, summarising all open audit recommendations and providing information on internal audit planned activity for the IJB and the HSCP. Accompanying the report were a series of appendices. These contained information regarding audit activity relating to the IJB and HSCP; and information on recommendations from previous audits. Summary information in relation to the appendices was contained in the report

Responding to questions from Ms Monaghan in relation to whether there was a threshold below which Option 1 Self Directed Support clients did not need to provide receipts, the Chief Officer indicated that clarification on this would be sought. She indicated that if there was no threshold the possibility of a threshold being introduced was something that could be discussed further with the SDS Forum and the Chief Auditor.

The committee noted the report.

## **REVIEW OF INTEGRATION JOINT BOARD FINANCIAL REGULATIONS AND RESERVES POLICY**

7. The committee considered a report by the Chief Financial Officer submitting for consideration the Integration Joint Board Financial Regulations and Reserves Policy, a copy of which accompanied the report.

The report explained that both the Financial Regulations and Reserves Policy were part of the governance arrangements to support the IJB. It was further explained that both the Financial Regulations and Reserves Policy were reviewed in March 2020 when it had been agreed that reviews should take place annually thereafter.

It was reported that following review no changes had been made to either. However, it had been recognised that the Financial Regulations mirrored to some degree elements of the Integration Scheme so should there be any change to the scheme then a further review would be carried out.

The report also highlighted that whilst no changes had been made to the Reserves Policy the policy had supported the Reserves Strategy which had operated well over a significant and continued period of change.

Whilst the optimum/maximum level of general reserve in accordance with the policy was 2% of the budget, the tensions between holding free reserves and not protecting spend on front line services were recognised with the IJB having taken a clear decision on this in prior years.

The report also reminded the committee that it would be possible to ask the IJB to un-hypothecate certain earmarked reserves should this be required, this having been discussed in March 2021 when the IJB budget was approved.

The Accountancy Manager having been heard further on the report, Ms Monaghan noted that the opportunity for the IJB to un-hypothecate some earmarked reserves could be considered to be a safety net, but acknowledged that in doing so there may be an adverse impact on the IJB's strategic priorities.

The Chief Officer highlighted that the IJB was running with a recurring deficit and that reserves were being used to smooth the deficit. However it needed to be acknowledged that reserves were finite.

Ms Forbes, supported by the Accountancy Manager, referred to the challenge of meeting agreed savings targets and the twin challenge of making savings whilst at the same time trying to make sure the deficit did not increase. In addition, the Accountancy Manager explained that there were £3 million unachieved savings in the current year and this was being included in the COVID returns submitted to the Scottish Government.

Ms Monaghan highlighted that due to the length of time that the IJB and its predecessor Community Health and Care Partnership had operated, and the operational changes made over the years, the IJB was already very lean and less able to make more changes compared to other IJBs.

Councillor Grant also referred to the amount of ring-fenced funding provided by the Scottish Government. In reply, the Chief Officer explained that whilst this did in some instances have adverse impacts on the ability to direct funding locally, it also had provided an element of protection with councils being required to pass funding on to IJBs when they may have directed it elsewhere without Scottish Government instruction. She suggested that Scottish

Government appeared now to better understand the pressures in relation to social care and was hopeful that increased funding and spending flexibility would be available in future. Responding to a question from Provost Fletcher on whether any of the additional funding to be provided to the Scottish Government as a consequence of the increase in National Insurance contributions would be made available for health and social care, she suggested that it was anticipated that there would be funding increases over the next few years.

The committee noted the Integration Joint Board:-

- (a) Financial Regulations; and
- (b) Reserves Policy.

## **IJB STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER UPDATE**

8. Under reference to the Minute of the previous meeting (Item 10 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 23 June 2021 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.

However, it was clarified that there had been changes to the risk description of 5 risks with the risks and the changes to the descriptions being set out. In addition 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.

Details of those risks still considered as 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.

## **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

9. It was reported that the next meeting of the committee would take place on Wednesday 24 November 2021 at 9.00am.

CHAIR