

Highland Community Planning Partnership

Community Planning Board

Minutes of Meeting of the Community Planning Board held in the Council Chamber, Council Headquarters, Glenurquhart Road, Inverness on Friday 16 December 2016 at 10.00 am.

Present:

Representing the Highland Council (HC):

Mrs I McCallum
Mr S Barron
Ms M Morris
Mr B Alexander
Mr S Black
Ms A Clark
Ms E Johnston
Mr C MacLennan

Representing Highlands and Islands

Enterprise (HIE):

Mr J Gibbs

Representing the Highland Third Sector Interface (HTSI):

Ms M Wylie

Representing High Life Highland (HLH):

Mr I Murray

Representing NHS Highland (NHSH):

Dr D Alston
Ms E Mead
Mrs J Baird
Ms C Steer

Representing Police Scotland (PS):

T/Ch Supt P MacRae

Representing the Scottish Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS):

Dr M Foxley (also representing Lochaber
Community Partnership)
Mr J MacDonald

Representing Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH):

Mr G Hogg

Representing the University of the Highlands and Islands (UHI):

Ms I Peterson

Community Partnership Chairs:

Mr R Kirk, Caithness
Ch Insp I Maclelland, Sutherland
Mr M Loynd, East Ross
Mr R Muir, Skye, Lochalsh and West Ross
Dr M Foxley, Lochaber (also representing the
Scottish Fire and Rescue Service)
Ch Insp B Mackay, Nairn
Mr F Nixon, Badenoch and Strathspey

In attendance:

Mrs R Duly, NHS Highland Board Secretary
Miss M Murray, Committee Administrator, Highland Council
Miss J Green, Administrative Assistant, Highland Council

Dr D Alston in the Chair

Business

Preliminaries

The Chair of NHS Highland Board welcomed everyone to the meeting, highlighting that this was his first meeting as Chair of the Community Planning Board. It was an exciting time, the membership having been expanded to include Community Partnership Chairs, and he intended to devote as much of the meeting as possible to them so that they had time to ask questions

and get the information they needed. He emphasised that the success of the Community Planning Partnership (CPP), both at Board level and in support of Community Partnerships at a local level, would depend, to a considerable extent, on the quality of the relationship between partners and the aim today was to move forward on building that relationship.

In relation to item 7 – Delivering Partnership Outcomes, rather than spend a significant amount of time on officer introductions, it was intended to move straight to questions.

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were intimated on behalf of Mr P Argyle, Mr G Moir, Mrs M Davidson, Mr A Rhind, Ms M Smith, Mr D Oxley, Mr D McLachlan, Ms D Mackinnon, Ms S Wedgwood and Mrs H Carmichael.

2. Minutes of Meetings

i. Community Planning Board

The Board **APPROVED** the Minutes of the previous meeting held on 7 October 2016.

ii. Chief Officers' Group

The Board **NOTED** the draft Note of the meeting held on 11 November 2016.

It was highlighted that the meeting had taken place following a day of discussion on community action and thanks were expressed to the HTSI for organising and hosting what had been a productive event. A number of priorities had been identified, including making the new Community Partnerships work, and these were reflected in the draft Note. Some of the themes of the event related to communities and community empowerment and it was necessary to reflect on those through much of the Board agenda.

In response to a question regarding the proposed Community Gateway/Grants Subgroup, the Chief Officer, HTSI, explained that further discussions were required before a timescale could be provided. It was confirmed that the Subgroup would report back to the Chief Officers' Group (COG).

3. Values and Behaviours – how the Community Planning Partnership would operate and scene setting for the future

There had been circulated the Shared Values and Behaviours for Community Partnerships previously considered by the Board together with the Values and Principles that it had been agreed be used in discussion to guide proposals for local community planning.

The Chair commented that relationships had developed considerably since the inception of the CPP, with partners working together, sharing information and taking joint responsibility. It was now necessary to realise that at a local level. At both levels, successful partnership working depended on sharing common values and a common approach that ensured that, when partners challenged each other, it was done in a respectful way. He referred to the documents that had been circulated and sought confirmation that partners were signed up to them, adding that any issues/areas for development should be fed back to the Board.

The Board **AGREED** to operate in accordance with the circulated Values, Behaviours and Principles and that any issues/areas for development be fed back to the Board.

4. Local Outcome Improvement Plan (LOIP) - Development Plan

There had been circulated Report No CPB/12/16 dated 8 December 2016 by the Acting Head of Policy, Highland Council, on behalf of the LOIP Subgroup, which provided a summary of the requirement on Community Planning Partnerships to develop a Local Outcome Improvement Plan and set out proposals for how to take this forward for the Highland CPP.

During discussion, the following issues were raised:

- it was reiterated that the LOIP should be a new approach, not be a continuation or refresh of the Single Outcome Agreement;
- the LOIP was a significant piece of work and it was necessary to be realistic and smart about what the CPP was trying to achieve;
- in relation to the proposed principles to guide LOIP development, it was suggested that any plan must be recognisable, as well as accessible, to communities;
- with regard to the identification of priorities, it was important to ensure that they were coming up from Community Partnerships. That might seem like a challenge for Community Partnership Chairs and it was suggested that it was necessary to identify a small number of priorities that would start to make a difference;
- one of the lessons from the former District Partnerships was that people didn't feel particularly engaged or that they were making a difference and that was one of the challenges for the Board and COG;
- in relation to the early years and children and young people, work was already underway to reduce the number of outcomes in For Highland's Children 4 (FHC4). So far they had been reduced from 14 to 10, still based on SHANARRI. It was also recognised that it might be necessary to enhance the infrastructure to include partners who had not been regular participants in integrated children's services planning, such as HIE and UHI. However, one of the challenges was that the infrastructure should not become too complicated;
- officers working with Community Partnerships on the plan for children had been informed that it should reflect strategic priorities but it was hoped that, in the future, strategic priorities would reflect local intelligence;
- it was important to ensure that the data provided to Community Partnerships was accessible and relevant;
- reference was made to the existing theme groups and it was emphasised that it was necessary to reorganise the thematic structure. This was particularly important for colleagues in SNH and other groups who needed to ensure that their specific issues were properly reflected;
- it was important that Community Partnership Chairs were clear about the role of Community Partnerships in the development of the LOIP;
- as well as being meaningful to communities, it was important that the LOIP, Locality Plans and other plans were cross-cutting in terms of partners' organisational plans;
- whilst engagement was necessary, concern was expressed that over-engagement could lead to communities becoming disenfranchised and it was therefore important to try and capture as much information as possible during the initial engagement;
- there had been some real successes as a result of the existing theme groups and it was important not to lose some of the branding – eg Safer Highland. In that regard, T/Ch Supt P MacRae explained that a piece of work was underway, which included Community Partnership Chairs, looking at the delivery of the Safer Highland agenda as well as the governance arrangements. The results would be fed back to the Board;
- it would be helpful for the Chief Officers' Group to have a clear affirmation from the Board that the proposed tests to be applied when identifying outcomes, particularly that

they be strategic/high level priorities that required partnership intervention to be achieved, would be adhered to. There might be a wish to see a large number of priorities identified and, if they did not meet the criteria, it was necessary to find alternative ways to deal with them so that the LOIP did not become such a large document that it became inaccessible and less relevant than it needed to be;

- it was highlighted that there was a limit to the extent Elected Members could be involved during purdah, from mid-March to early May 2017;
- some partners expressed reservations regarding the proposed life stages approach but were willing to try it;
- whilst supportive of reducing the number of outcomes, it was important not to lose sight of all the important work taking place, and which could continue to be improved, that contributed to delivering the outcomes the CPP was trying to achieve for communities in the Highlands; and
- in relation to the recommendations, given that there was an element of crossover with item 6 on the agenda, it was suggested that the Board note, rather than agree, the proposed approach at this stage.

Thereafter, the Board:

- NOTED** the duty on the Community Planning Partnership to develop a Local Outcome Improvement Plan; and
- NOTED** the proposed approach for taking this forward in Highland which included:
 - Principles to guide development
 - Timetable for development
 - Initial outcomes and framework development; and
- AGREED**, in relation to the proposed principles to guide development, that any plan must be recognisable, as well as accessible, to communities.

5. New arrangements for the CPP Board and Chief Officers' Group

There had been circulated Report No CPB/13/16 dated 8 December 2016 by the Acting Head of Policy, Highland Council, which asked the Board to agree to invite the other bodies named in the Community Empowerment Act to participate in the Board and Chief Officers' Group.

During discussion, the following issues were raised:

- whilst all of the bodies listed should be invited to attend, it was suggested, given the significance of transport as an issue throughout Highland, that HITRANS be strongly encouraged to participate in the COG;
- if new partners were being brought on board, clarity was required in terms of what was expected from the COG and it was suggested that a review of the role and remit be undertaken;
- discussions had taken place with SEPA who, like SNH, would struggle to regularly attend Community Partnerships but saw a role for themselves within the Board/COG structure. They would make themselves available to Community Partnerships, either proactively or reactively, as and when issues arose that were within their remit; and
- in response to a question, it was clarified that the recommendation related to the Board and Chief Officers' Group. It was not anticipated that all of the named bodies would be core members of Community Partnerships but rather they would be brought in as and when appropriate to discuss specific issues.

Thereafter, the Board **AGREED** that:

- i. the Chair of the Board write to the named organisations set out in the report and invite them to participate in the Highland Community Planning Partnership and that this should include a representative from the Further Education Regional Board;
- ii. HITRANS be strongly encouraged to participate in the Chief Officers' Group given the significance of transport as an issue throughout Highland; and
- iii. a review of the role and remit of the Chief Officers' Group be undertaken.

6. Developing Local Community Partnerships

i. Community Partnership Development – Update

There had been circulated Report No CPB/14/16 dated 8 December 2016 by the Acting Head of Policy, Highland Council, on behalf of the Community Partnerships Subgroup, which provided the Board with an update on the development of Community Partnerships across Highland and the accompanying documentation which had been developed to support them.

During discussion, the following issues were raised:

- the support for Community Partnership Chairs was welcomed;
- localities were often selected on the basis of socio-economic performance (SEP) or the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD) and it was necessary to increase understanding in that regard;
- in addition to the Self-Assessment Framework, it would be helpful to provide common metrics that would allow Community Partnerships to demonstrate improvement. In response, the Director of Care and Learning, Highland Council, explained that discussions were required in that regard and suggested that they take place at the Community Learning and Development (CLD) strategic group. However, the Director of Adult Care, NHS Highland, suggested that the issue was wider than CLD and that it be remitted to the Community Partnership Subgroup to consider;
- whilst driver diagrams were a useful tool, they were not particularly user friendly and it might be helpful to develop a narrative. In response, the Director of Care and Learning, Highland Council, explained that the driver diagram model had been recommended as it was simple and had been seen to work. However, it was recognised that there was an issue in terms of helping people understand the model and he offered to provide facilitation to Community Partnership Chairs/lead officers in the same manner as had been provided to children's managers in relation to the plan for children;
- in light of the fact that training was required to understand the driver diagram model, the Chief Officer, HTSI, questioned how accessible the various statutory plans would be to communities;
- whilst welcoming the proposed CPP website, it would be interesting to look at social media and other communication tools;
- in addition to all Community Partnership Chairs getting together, it would be helpful for Chairs in close geographic proximity to develop informal relationships and share some of the ways issues were being dealt with;
- the Director of Care and Learning, Highland Council, explained that in each Community Partnership there was a team working on the plan for children and a CLD lead, supported by HLH, to support the Locality Plan. The plan for children would be discussed at the FHC4 meeting to ensure the necessary links. Similarly, Locality Plans would be discussed at the CLD strategic group;

- there would be a lot of crossover between the various plans and, whilst the guidance was clear in that there should be a specific Locality Plan for each locality identified, it was suggested that, in terms of the community interface and in order to reduce the complexity, there was a need to merge Locality Plans with the plans for children, adults and CLD. If communities did not understand the structure they would not participate and it was essential to make it clear;
- identifying and branding localities, particularly in more rural areas, was challenging;
- in terms of timescales and getting plans in place, it was important that Community Partnership Chairs knew what needed to be included. The Chair having asked whether Community Partnership Chairs felt there was sufficient clarity, it was confirmed that they were content to progress with the guidance available but that further work was required on the interface with communities;
- it was suggested that any concerns be captured at the meeting of Community Partnership Chairs immediately following the Board; and
- ongoing support was vital, not only for Community Partnership Chairs but for lead officers, and, further to the decision at item 5 to review the role and remit of the COG, it was suggested that the COG should also consider how it was going to support Community Partnerships effectively. In addition, it was necessary to consider the future role of the existing theme groups and it was suggested that the Chairs of the theme groups be included in the discussions.

Considerable discussion took place regarding the proposed use of SHANARRI outcomes, during which the following issues were raised:

- the Director of Adult Care, NHS Highland, commented that the strategic plan for adult services was a requirement of the Public Bodies Act and was based on health and wellbeing outcomes for adults. The purpose of Community Partnerships was to try and bring together the requirements of the complex legislation that was now in force and concern was expressed about putting another overarching framework in place and trying to merge existing health and wellbeing outcomes into SHANARRI. It was not considered that SHANARRI outcomes would work for adult services – “Nurtured”, for example, did not readily apply. The health and wellbeing outcomes were well understood by communities and were written in plain English;
- the Director of Care and Learning explained that the use of SHANARRI had been discussed at the Community Partnership Subgroup and the Chief Officers’ Group had agreed that it be recommended to the Board. It had previously been intended to use four of the outcomes – Safe, Healthy, Achieving and Active – for Locality Plans but, subsequently, the view had been taken that localities should be able to choose which of the eight outcomes were relevant to them. However, if SHANARRI did not work for adult services then it should not be used;
- reference was made to the adaptive management approach employed by SNH and it was suggested that the Board try the proposed use of SHANARRI, be responsive to feedback from Community Partnerships as to how it was working in practice and adapt if necessary. However, given the timescales and the confusion that already existed, the Director of Adult Care, NHS Highland, expressed reservations about testing and changing within a short space of time;
- a generous interpretation of the eight outcomes would allow Community Partnerships to make SHANARRI fit and it was suggested that a short definition of each, for both children and adults, be produced; and
- SHANARRI was such a powerful brand within children’s services that it could distract people from its potential wider use.

In summing up, the Chair noted that there was a willingness to try the SHANARRI approach. However, there was work to be done in terms of whether it could incorporate everything that adult services needed to report on and whether it could be presented in such a way that the outcomes were truly adapted beyond children's services to the wider community planning agenda.

Thereafter, the Board **AGREED**:

- i. the Toolkit developed to support Community Partnerships, including the Planning Framework, subject to further consideration of the use of SHANARRI to structure local outcomes and further work being undertaken to ensure that the Planning Framework worked for adult services in the wider community planning agenda;
- ii. to establish a website for the Community Planning Partnership as outlined in section 3 of the report;
- iii. to establish and support a network for the Chairs of the Community Partnerships as outlined in section 5 of the report;
- iv. that it be remitted to the Community Partnership Subgroup to consider the development of metrics to demonstrate improvement;
- v. that facilitation be provided to Community Partnership Chairs/lead officers on the use of driver diagrams and the associated development process; and
- vi. further to the decision at item 5iii to review the role and remit of the COG, that the review should include how the COG was going to support Community Partnerships effectively and the future role of the existing theme groups.

ii. **Community Partnership Chairs' Verbal Feedback**

Verbal updates were provided on the status of the nine new Community Partnerships including membership, structure, frequency of meetings, identification of localities and community engagement.

In particular, the following issues were highlighted:

- a number of Partnerships had decided to hold evening meetings to make them more accessible to the public;
- achieving a balance between meeting in public and a public meeting was challenging. However, it was considered that it had to be weighted towards community involvement and allowing the public to participate. Lochaber Community Partnership now allowed an opportunity for the public to ask questions at the end of each section of the agenda;
- there was a significant amount of community interest and it was necessary to manage expectations until such time as Partnerships were fully up and running;
- communities would look to Community Partnerships to resolve local issues that arose as a result of financial constraints and restructuring within partner organisations and this would be a challenge going forward;
- good support was being provided by local officers but this was already presenting challenges and it was necessary to be mindful of what support was being provided to Partnerships as a whole;
- social media was an useful tool for community engagement but there were other means;
- the importance of engaging hard to reach communities and "the silent majority" was emphasised;

- a number of Partnerships had established engagement subgroups and had arranged or would be arranging VOiCE (Visioning Outcomes in Community Engagement) workshops;
- it was necessary to examine SIMD and SEP data in more depth to establish the factors at play in the areas identified as having the greatest inequalities;
- it was important for Partnerships to have strong branding that communities identified with;
- in relation to statutory plans, the importance of consistency of approach was emphasised;
- the positivity with which partners were approaching Community Partnerships was a good starting point;
- consideration was being given to extending core and wider memberships to include housing associations, colleges and HLH. In addition, it was important to include frontline personnel such as Head Teachers and the Scottish Ambulance Service;
- it was necessary to consider how to work effectively across areas that did not see themselves as being particularly joined, such as Skye and West Ross;
- it was important not to duplicate work already being done by individual partners;
- in order to achieve better engagement, it was necessary to hold Community Partnership meetings in the localities identified;
- in order for Partnerships to operate effectively, a significant amount of administrative follow-up was required and concern was expressed regarding the capacity of some partners to provide this;
- in relation to Nairn and Ardersier Community Partnership, there was an issue in that the community of Ardersier wanted to be Inverness-focused;
- discussions had taken place regarding what each individual/organisation could bring to the Partnerships in terms of skills, knowledge and resources;
- values and meeting conduct would be important going forward and there was a need for a “high challenge, high cohesion” approach;
- small changes could have a positive impact at a local level;
- in order to cut down on administration and bureaucracy, some Partnerships had elected not to produce Minutes but to have a live Action Plan;
- sharing partner organisations’ event calendars was a useful way to increase opportunities for partnership working; and
- in relation to Inverness Community Partnership, in addition to the three localities identified (Merkinch, Hilton and Raigmore), it had been agreed that there should be a plan specifically for the city centre.

During discussion, the following issues were raised:-

- it was important to share good practice and the meeting of Community Partnership Chairs following the Board was welcomed;
- given the timescale for completion of statutory plans, it was necessary to have a consistent message in terms of what could realistically be achieved;
- in relation to whether Ardersier should come within the boundary of Nairn or Inverness Community Partnership, it was essential that a true community view was obtained and it was suggested that the issue be explored in more detail and the outcome reported to the Board for a final decision;
- the enthusiasm and positivity at local level was reassuring and the Chairs were commended for their efforts in getting Community Partnerships up and running;
- in response to a question regarding Fort Augustus, it was confirmed that discussions had taken place and the view of the community was that it should be

part of Inverness Community Partnership. It was suggested that the Board formally agree the position;

- in relation to Inverness city centre, the Director of Planning and Development, Highland Council, highlighted that there was a lot of work taking place from a planning perspective and suggested that it would be helpful to join up with the Community Partnership as much as possible to avoid confusion amongst the public when consulting on the various plans;
- reference was made to the sizeable investment by the new owners of the smelter in Lochaber. This was a significant opportunity, which could lead to the creation of numerous jobs, and it was essential to respond collectively; and
- it was necessary to minimise administration and bureaucracy and make locality planning arrangements as flexible as possible.

Thereafter, the Board:

- i. **NOTED** the verbal updates by Community Partnership Chairs;
- ii. **AGREED** that Fort Augustus should come within the boundary of Inverness Community Partnership;
- iii. **AGREED** that the issue of whether Ardersier should come within the boundary of Nairn or Inverness Community Partnership be explored in more detail and the outcome reported to the Board; and
- iv. **AGREED** that Community Partnership Chairs, at their meeting following the Board, consider the timetable for development of the Local Outcome Improvement Plan, as set out on page 27 of the papers, and whether it provided sufficient opportunity to feed in from a local level prior to the Board agreeing the initial priorities.

7. Delivering Partnership Outcomes

The following reports had been provided by Responsible Officers on progress within the themed groups, as well as the SOA Development Plan, and how this work would be carried forward into the life stages approach proposed for the Local Outcomes Improvement Plan:

i. Economic Growth and Regeneration

The circulated report by HIE, as lead partner on this theme, summarised the progress made in 2015/16 against five high level indicators, namely, the number of jobs created or sustained through public sector interventions; the number of Business Gateway volume start up clients who had begun trading; the number of existing businesses accessing advisory services through Business Gateway; the number of VAT/PAYE registered enterprises per 10,000 population; and the percentage of working age population (16-64) in employment. The report also detailed the performance indicators under each of the sub-headings in the Economic Growth and Regeneration strand, namely, Enabling Infrastructure; Support for Business; and Creating Successful Places.

The Area Manager - Caithness and Sutherland, HIE, provided a verbal update during which he explained that there were a number of positive initiatives taking place including the MeyGen deployment in the Pentland Firth, the Liberty House acquisition of the smelter in Lochaber, growth in distilleries, potential for an Isle of Skye Air Service, the Beatrice offshore windfarm, the development of the North Coast 500 and the potential development of Coul Links in Dornoch. However, there were issues in relation to a lack of affordable housing limiting economic growth in some areas, low

investment in the oil and gas industry and the impact of the vote to leave the European Union.

The Board scrutinised and **NOTED** the update.

ii. **Employability**

The circulated report by the Council, as lead partner on this theme, provided a brief overview of developments following the annual review presented to the Board in October 2016. In particular, it summarised the progress being made in relation to the Inverness and Highland City Region Deal and Developing Scotland's Young Workforce Agenda/Skills Investment Plan, highlighting that both programmes were currently heavy on activity and outputs and that there was a need to refine the outcomes sought in the future.

During discussion, the Council's Youth Convener drew attention to the Youth Forums that took place throughout Highland and suggested that partners contact him for information on date/locations or if they had any queries regarding young people. In response to a question, he undertook to find out whether Youth Forums were involved in Developing the Young Workforce and report back to the Director of Development and Infrastructure.

Furthermore, a view was sought on how Developing Scotland's Young Workforce would become self-sustaining. In response, the Director of Development and Infrastructure confirmed that the Scottish Government had provided initial funding for three years and consideration would be given to how activity could continue in the future.

The Board otherwise scrutinised and **NOTED** the update.

iii. **Early Years/Children**

The circulated report by the Council, as lead partner on this theme, explained that the Council and NHS Highland had agreed a performance framework for children's services as outlined in For Highland's Children 4. A number of performance measures related specifically to the early years and these were set out together with a commentary on the current situation. The report also provided an update on the Children and Young People Improvement Collaborative.

The Board scrutinised and **NOTED** the update.

iv. **Safer and Stronger Communities**

The circulated report by Police Scotland, as lead partner on this theme, provided an update on the crime position and overview of Safer Highland for the second quarter of 2016/17. This included an update on the activities undertaken in relation to the Violence Against Women Partnership, Highland Child Protection Committee, Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements, Adult Support and Protection Committee, Alcohol and Drugs Partnership, Road Safety Group, CONTEST, Serious Organised Crime Group, Anti-Social Behaviour Group and the Hate Incident Steering Group.

The Board scrutinised and **NOTED** the update.

v. Health Inequalities and Physical Inactivity

The circulated report by NHS Highland, as lead partner on this theme, provided an update on the progress made by the Health Inequalities and Physical Activity Theme Group in relation to targeting partnership action in Badenoch and Strathspey and European Social Fund projects which included two programmes of activity, namely, “Move On” Intensive Support Service; and Preventing Poverty and Increasing Financial Capability.

During discussion, the detailed breakdown of the various communities in Badenoch and Strathspey was welcomed and the need to tackle inequalities and deprivation, particularly in remote and rural areas of Highland where the cost of living could be as much as 40% higher, was emphasised

The Board otherwise scrutinised and **NOTED** the update.

vi. Outcomes for Older People

The circulated report by NHS Highland, as lead partner on this theme, provided an update on progress in relation to performance management, carers, care equality, fatal fires, end of life care, and adult support and protection.

The Director of Adult Care, NHS Highland, highlighted that one of the requirements of the Carers (Scotland) Act, due to be implemented in 2018, was the provision of short breaks and communities were being asked to consider how carers could best be supported at a local level.

The Board scrutinised and **NOTED** the update.

vii. Environmental Outcomes

The circulated report by SNH, as lead partner on this theme, explained that progress had been made across the range of identified environmental outcomes although ongoing funding constraints within public sector bodies continued to have an impact on delivery of a number of actions. The report detailed specific highlights in relation to the three long-term outcomes, namely, the environment will be managed sustainably in order to optimise economic, health, natural heritage and learning benefits; the effects of climate change in the Highlands will be minimised and managed; and people will have greater outdoor access and volunteering opportunities across Highland.

The Board scrutinised and **NOTED** the update.

viii. Community Learning and Development

The circulated report by the Council, as lead partner on this theme, explained that, in response to the legislation requiring Local Authorities to introduce three year CLD Plans which were embedded within their Community Planning arrangements, the Highland CPP had established a CLD Strategic Partnership to develop the Highland CLD plan, which was approved by the Council’s Education, Children and Adult Services Committee on 27 August 2015. The report outlined the new support arrangements, including the functions to be carried out by HLH to support the implementation of the Highland CLD plan and local CLD planning, review and

evaluation. It also provided information on Locality Plans and the opportunity to combine these with the nine local CLD plans as they had a similar focus.

The Board scrutinised and **NOTED** the update.

ix. **SOA Development Plan**

The circulated report by the Council provided an update on the progress in relation to the SOA Development Plan 2016 including areas for improvement, improvement activity and timescales.

At this point, the Chair explained that, both for the purposes of audit and to allow an opportunity for issues to be raised, update reports on SOA themes would continue to be provided until such time as the LOIP came into force. However, it was not intended to devote a large part of the meeting to officers introducing reports and partners were encouraged to attend the meeting with questions prepared. Going forward, it was necessary to consider how to bring together reporting on the various themes with what was happening at local level and it was suggested that the COG consider what the best means of reporting would be.

The Board otherwise scrutinised and **NOTED** the update.

8. **Dates of Future Meetings**

It was **AGREED** that the Board would meet on the following dates in 2017:-

Wednesday 15 March	10.00 am – 1.00 pm
Wednesday 7 June	10.00 am – 1.00 pm
Wednesday 4 October	10.00 am – 1.00 pm
Tuesday 19 December	10.30 am – 1.30 pm

The meeting ended at 12.05 pm.