



## Executive Meeting

1 December 2004

14:00-16:00

CNET Building, Room 1

### Notes of meeting

Item		Action
1	<p><b>Present:</b> Anthony Clipsom – Bradford CVS; Phil Cutler – BACC; Sue Gledhill – Community Network; Eleanor Green – Bradford NHS; Jane Gregory – LGB Network; Paul North – CBMDC (representing Roz Hall); Caroline Schwaller – Keighley CVS; McMillan Serrant – ABCD;</p> <p><b>In attendance:</b> Evie Chandler, Mick Charlton, Titch Kavanagh, Steve Skinner – CBMDC Community Development Policy Unit; Tony Sheeky – CBMDC CFU</p> <p><b>Apologies:</b> Corine Campbell – CBMDC; Sally Collins – Bradford Vision; Ann Griffin – Bradford District Women’s Forum; Frank Hanley – CBMDC; Jenny Scott – Springfield Tenants &amp; Residents</p>	
2	<p><b>Minutes of last meeting</b></p> <p>From 20<sup>th</sup> October – Approved. Correction needed: Change of date on page 1 needed From 29<sup>th</sup> September – Approved. Correction needed: Phil Cutler was in attendance.</p>	
3	<p><b>Matters Arising – Meeting on 20/10/04</b></p> <p><b>3.1</b> In future Martin Baines would represent West Yorkshire Police instead of Colin Western.</p> <p><b>3.2</b> Letters referred to in minutes from 29/9 and 20/10 to be circulated <b>(attached to the e-mail covering these minutes)</b></p>	

	<p><b>3.3 BCExec Attendance</b> – Evie reported on attendance issues. Some people had not attended for 3-6 months. There were various reasons for this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Contact details needed updating</li> <li>➤ Some people could not manage the time commitment.</li> <li>➤ Others could attend on a different day e.g. Gill Bowskill could not attend on Wednesday afternoons.</li> <li>➤ There was lack of understanding of the role of BCP in Bradford. This needed to be made clear to all VCS organisations and relationships with C-Net needed to be clarified.</li> </ul> <p><b>3.4 Infrastructure Commissioning Sub Group</b> - Issue with VCS representation now solved.</p> <p><b>3.5 CNET Protocol</b> – Would be approved by VISION Board in early December.</p>	<p><b>3.3 Caroline and Evie</b> to identify reasons for lack of attendance and look at solutions.</p>
<p><b>4</b></p>	<p><b>Chair’s Report</b></p> <p><b>4.1 CDS</b> – Corine reported developments and lengthy debate on the way forward took place</p> <p><b>4.2 General Compact</b> – Question was being raised at the next Full Council meeting about lack of progress with Compact within the Council. PEX now led this area of work and they proposed to take it forward in early January 2005.</p> <p><b>4.3 BC Exec Forum</b> – Questions were raised about links with Forum members and accountability/openness of BCExec. The need to re-examine the structure and purpose of B C P was identified. This was pressing as VISION was required by Government Office to re-examine and streamline its own structures and partnerships working in Bradford on the whole. Any future discussions needed to involve both the Executive and the Forum.</p>	<p><b>4.1</b> Invite Mark Carriline to next meeting to explain way forward. <b>Evie</b> to contact his office. <b>Caroline</b> to write and invite.</p> <p><b>4.2 Frank</b> to report future progress.</p> <p><b>4.3</b> Agreed that <b>Caroline</b> would invite Helen Platts to facilitate a BCExec review/development meeting with BC Exec on Feb 2<sup>nd</sup>.</p>

<p><b>5</b></p>	<p><b>BC Action Plan</b></p> <p>Titch Kavanagh reported on progress with the Action Plan. It was now based on the nine objectives in three main headings. Each of the headings had a ‘guardian’/ lead person to lead the delivery of the Plan.</p> <p>Key points from discussion were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The change process in CDS presents some opportunities for new roles and funding.</li> <li>• Some of the actions will not have resource implications.</li> <li>• Details on funding for each action need further input by the relevant ‘guardian’ and lead groups.</li> <li>• Concerns about the effect of the LAA on the progress of the Action Plan. A threat or an opportunity?</li> <li>• Concerns that the supporting groups section does not address key needs or relate to infrastructure development as identified in Change Up.</li> <li>• It is too long.</li> <li>• Concern that the first objective does not include the Volunteers Bureaus.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Caroline</b> will write a letter to thank people who contributed to the Action Plan.</p> <p><b>Anthony &amp; McMillan</b> – To contribute to the further development of the SUPPORTING GROUPS section.</p> <p><b>Sue</b> to contribute to the SUPPORTING PARTICIPATION section</p> <p>Further developed version to be put to BC Exec for formal approval at next meeting - <b>Titch</b></p>
<p><b>6</b></p>	<p><b>Local Area Agreement</b></p> <p>The background of the LAA initiative was described. A summary table was circulated with proposed targets, indicators and budgets for .</p> <p><b>Key points:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It now includes Neighbourhood Renewal funding streams</li> <li>• LAA does not include base budgets, but what is a base budget?</li> <li>• Concern that LAA focuses on indicators rather than quality of life issues</li> <li>• Concerns that guidelines are unclear e.g. why are existing budgets already allocated to projects included?</li> <li>• Will the LAA allow “bigger players” to dominate the process?</li> <li>• The LAA is funding-led rather than strategic.</li> <li>• Indicators were put forward that were more strategic yet rejected by the planning meeting.</li> <li>• Question of where ‘ChangeUp’ allocation has come from.</li> <li>• There are no clear funding streams for Building Communities, so consequently it is not able to contribute to indicators.</li> </ul>	

<b>7</b>	<b>AOB</b>  Evie reported that the BCP MOA with Vision needed to go to Vision by the end of the week. Any comments to be sent to Evie asap	
<b>8</b>	<b>Next meeting</b>  General business meeting to be week commencing 24 <sup>th</sup> January 2005. Evie to confirm date time and venue. <b>2005 meeting dates to be decided at January meeting.</b>	