Building better lives
Using delivery chain workshops to improve local outcomes June 2009
The Audit Commission is an independent watchdog, driving economy, efficiency and effectiveness in local public services to deliver better outcomes for everyone.

Our work across local government, health, housing, community safety and fire and rescue services means that we have a unique perspective. We promote value for money for taxpayers, auditing the £200 billion spent by 11,000 local public bodies.

As a force for improvement, we work in partnership to assess local public services and make practical recommendations for promoting a better quality of life for local people.
‘A ‘delivery chain’ is the complex network of organisations, including central and local government agencies, and bodies from the private and third sectors, that need to work together to achieve or deliver an improved public sector outcome.’


Local authorities’ strategic housing role includes working with local partners to ensure that housing supply and services in their area meet the needs, aspirations and means of the current and future population. This role includes, but is not limited to, enabling new housing, providing effective housing advice, information and support and ensuring social and private sector homes are decent.

To deliver an effective strategic housing role, local authorities must work with local, regional and national organisations across different sectors. Effective partnership working can avoid delays and duplication of effort and improve the prospects of delivering improved housing outcomes that meet the needs and aspirations of local people.

**Delivery chain workshops – building effective housing partnerships**

The Audit Commission has found delivery chain workshops are an effective tool for:

- bringing partners together to plan and manage the delivery of shared objectives;
- facilitating joint working where it has previously been weak;
- helping partners understand their, and others’, contributions to delivery;
- offering a forum for sharing ideas and innovative approaches; and
- agreeing strategies and action plans that all partners have input into, and are signed up to.

Locally, councils and their partners can use workshops to look at the effectiveness of the local delivery chain for any shared objective or outcome, including:

- delivery of affordable homes;
- bringing empty properties into use;
- tackling homelessness; or
- private sector renewal.
In a six-hour workshop partners can generate ideas and solutions that they could otherwise struggle with for six months.

The Audit Commission used delivery chain workshops as part of the research for the national studies on Local Strategic Partnerships (LSPs) and on the strategic housing function. Each workshop focused on a single outcome identified by the attendees. Up to 15 people (from operational, executive and strategic backgrounds in their organisations) attended each workshop. The following case studies, drawn from the latter study, show examples of effective delivery chain workshops and the outcomes from each.

**Case study 1 – Housing young people project**

North Somerset Council and its partners chose to look at their housing young people project. The project had been successful in tackling the acute issues of providing suitable housing for care leavers and the partners wanted to build on this success to provide suitable accommodation for young people more generally.

The workshop identified a number of areas for improvement, including:
- redefining the objectives for the project having largely delivered the acute objectives;
- raising the profile of the project and its achievements within the council; and
- ensuring the project is adequately funded and resourced going forward.

Agreed actions included:
- drawing up a SMART project/operational plan that defines the issues and how these are to be addressed and resourced;
- seeking officer endorsement for the project through the Council’s corporate management team; and
- appraising what different agencies’ funding has achieved and is achieving, identifying the implications of a loss of funding and thus providing those agencies with the opportunity to review projects.

Since the workshop, the group has focused on future-proofing the project and is refining and costing new objectives. It is also engaging corporate support to raise the profile of the project.
Case study 2 – Delivering affordable homes

Stratford on Avon District Council identified the delivery of affordable housing as a priority for a delivery chain workshop. While Stratford on Avon has above-average household incomes, house prices are also high and lower quartile house prices are nearly nine times lower quartile earnings. This has created a high demand for more affordable housing.

The workshop identified a number of areas for improvement including:
- coordination between districts and the county (Warwickshire);
- long-term security of funding for affordable housing;
- increasing delivery of small sites and rural housing; and
- addressing member concerns about developments before the planning stage.

In the six months since the workshop:
- engagement between the districts and the County Council has improved;
- a county council officer now chairs the LSP key housing group and attends the strategic housing officers group;
- investment funding has been secured for the foreseeable future; and
- the risk to the delivery chain has been minimised by establishing a project team approach to affordable housing applications, ensuring key stakeholders address issues such as section 106 contributions, highways arrangements and aspects of the planning process prior to the project starting.

This new approach will speed up the development process, improve risk management and provide a formal structure to bring key stakeholders together at an early stage.

The Audit Commission conducted eleven workshops in summer and autumn 2008 as part of the fieldwork for a strategic housing study. Experiences from these workshops and participants’ feedback form the basis of this guidance. The Audit Commission will publish a national report detailing the findings of the strategic housing study in summer 2009.

Delivery chain analysis and Comprehensive Area Assessment (CAA)

Delivery chain analysis is not the same as CAA. The twelve delivery chain questions focus on one aspect of local collaboration to achieve agreed outcomes.

Inspectors’ judgements will be based on a wider range of evidence and performance criteria to inform area and organisational assessments.
Running a workshop

This guidance is designed for workshops involving people from the different organisations involved in the delivery of housing objectives and outcomes. It assumes external facilitation of the workshop to guide participants through the stages of delivery chain analysis in a structured way that helps build mutual respect and trust. An external facilitator can also offer an unbiased peer challenge to the delivery partners.

Delivery chain workshops enable the key stakeholders that deliver housing objectives and outcomes to get together to:
- assess their current delivery;
- remove obstacles to, and weaknesses in, the delivery chain; and
- plan and manage the delivery of shared objectives and outcomes.

A good delivery chain workshop brings people together, increases mutual understanding and gets agreement on future approaches to delivering objectives. An excellent delivery chain workshop does all of the above, while also encouraging innovative thinking for future approaches.

Figure 1 shows a typical delivery chain workshop and the importance of preparation, management of the day and follow up.
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Delivery chains in housing

Figure 1 Running a delivery chain workshop

Preparation

The workshop host organises the venue and invites participants.

Planning meeting. Agree focus for the delivery chain workshop.

The facilitator and host agree on the issue, who to invite to the workshop and send the questionnaire to attendees. They discuss the context and performance data.

On the day

The seating plan mixes people with different roles and from different organisations.

The workshop starts with introductions.

Discussion of why the issue was chosen - what is the impact of getting it right?

Presentation: What is a delivery chain? What will be done today?

Work in groups to map the partners and stakeholders in the delivery chain.

The workshop host should lead this. The facilitator leads the following sessions.

Individual scoring and group review against the 12 delivery chain questions.

Identification and discussion of priorities for in-depth work.

Work in groups to identify what an optimum delivery chain should look like and who will be involved.

This is a chance to think creatively. Take advantage of having different people together in one room.

Outputs and outcomes

Non-priority issues can be dealt with later in the day or through follow-up work.

Action planning. Who will do it, when and how?

What is planned?
What will be done?
How will it be measured?
How will progress be reported?
What else does the group need to do?
Is another session required?
Preparation

1 Delivery chain analysis and planning is complicated and involves a range of partners. The workshop host/organiser should consider the benefits of using an external facilitator to ensure the workshop delivers an effective session. The host and the facilitator must agree on the topic for the workshop. This could be an agreed area outcome from the sustainable community strategy (SCS) or housing strategy, a local area agreement (LAA) indicator or a local target. Examples of housing-related topics may be meeting homelessness targets, bringing empty properties back into use or delivering LAA indicators 155 (delivery of affordable homes) or 142 (increasing the number of vulnerable people supported to live independently).

2 Once the topic is agreed, the host and facilitator should then work out who to invite to the workshop. Ensuring the right people are at the workshop will be key to the day’s success and the impact it has going forward. This will require senior-level commitment to ensuring that the right people attend. In order for this to happen, the facilitator and host will need to convince the invitees of the importance of attendance. The host will need to explain what the day will consist of and what the benefits of attendance are, both in terms of delivering the topic objective and benefits to the invitee’s organisation. Attendees who understand and sign up to the concept and the benefits of the workshop will have a greater input on the day.

When thinking about who to invite it is important to recognise the organisations involved in delivery will vary depending on the objective. Organisations and departments involved in the delivery chain for building new houses will differ from those involved in dealing with domestic abuse. The facilitator and host need to think about organisations that are not currently involved but should be, as well as those that are involved. Examples of this may include inviting someone from the local health authority to a workshop on fuel poverty or a member of the private sector housing team attending a workshop on increasing the supply of affordable housing.
Delivery chains in housing

There should be no more than twenty people and everyone must have a chance to join in. Invitees should represent all the key stakeholders, and they should represent strategic, executive and operational roles.\(^1\)

There are four types of link or relationship in delivery chains, and hosts may find it helpful to consider these when making a decision on who to invite.

- **Single agency internal links.** For housing-related outcomes, internal links may include departmental links such as housing, planning and environmental health. Internal management oversees these links through performance measurement, management and review.

- **Contractual or regulatory links.** For housing-related outcomes these may include landlords, housing associations, developers or voluntary and community sector advice/support providers. These links define how one part of the chain performs for others. Contractual arrangements or external institutions and agencies may oversee these links.

- **Common purpose links.** For housing-related outcomes these may include housing associations, health, social care or the police. These are links where organisations are looking to achieve a shared objective. This could include an LAA target or SCS objective.

- **Wider community links.** These rely on influence and persuasion; for example, engagement with the private sector, the third sector and voluntary organisations. Councillors, community leaders, tenants and residents are also part of this group. Mutual respect and trust form strong relationships.

\(^1\) Strategic role – developing policy and setting the strategic direction.  
Executive role – managing and implementing the strategy.  
Operational role – frontline delivery.
3 The host should then work with the facilitator to identify who to send the twelve strategic questions to in advance of the workshop. This can be anything from four or five key people, to everyone who is attending the workshop. The host and facilitator may only send the questions to a selection of attendees if they think some attendees will not understand the questions without a verbal explanation or if some attendees will not have enough time to complete the questionnaire prior to the workshop. The questionnaire recipients return their answers to the facilitator before the workshop. Their answers will be useful to the facilitator to understand how different people rate performance. The answers will also assist with planning the day and identifying priorities for further delivery chain analysis. The twelve strategic questions, along with practical examples, are available in Appendix 1 and as part of the housing delivery chain toolkit at www.improvementnetwork.gov.uk.

4 The host organises a suitable, accessible room for the workshop. The room should be large enough to accommodate twenty people in café style with six to eight people at each table. Developing a seating plan in advance that mixes different organisations/departments/functions on each table can lead to wide-ranging discussions. There should be flipcharts and pens available for each table. The workshop lasts about six hours so there should be suitable arrangements for refreshments and comfort breaks. A model agenda for the day is attached in Appendix 2.

On the day

1 The host should introduce the workshop and lead the discussion on the choice of the topic for delivery chain planning. This discussion should cover why the topic was chosen, what the target or outcome measure is and what the impact of getting it right will be.

2 The facilitator gives a short presentation on delivery chains and what will be covered in the workshop. A model presentation is available as part of the housing delivery chain toolkit available at www.improvementnetwork.gov.uk/housing The facilitator can alter the presentation to fit the selected topic for the delivery chain workshop. It is important the attendees understand the delivery chain concept and the desired outcomes in order for them to contribute effectively to the workshop.
Following the introduction of the topic and presentation on the delivery chain concept, attendees should work in groups to map the partners and stakeholders in the delivery chain. Many of the stakeholders will be in the room but some may not, and it is important to record stakeholders that come up in these discussions for cascading information and future involvement. This exercise is also important in getting attendees to think of a delivery chain as partners and stakeholders working together, rather than individual organisations/departments working in silos.

In groups, the attendees then work through the 12 delivery chain questions and self assess their performance. Group members who completed the self-assessment will already be familiar with the questions but for those who are not the facilitator should be on hand to offer guidance and answer any queries. This exercise will stimulate a lot of discussion around each individual question, but it is important the groups answer all 12 questions in the time allocated. Gaining agreement on a specific score is not always necessary, and disagreements on the score for individual questions could highlight areas in the delivery chain that need further work or the need to develop a common understanding of the language used in housing.

Once the groups have self assessed their performance the attendees reconvene and the facilitator leads a session to compare the scores and select priority areas for more in-depth work. The selection of priority areas normally focuses on the red rated questions, although the attendees should decide on the priority areas where further work will have the greatest impact. The number of priority areas selected will depend on the number of groups in the workshop and each group should only tackle one priority area.

Once the attendees have selected the priority areas and assigned them to groups, each group discusses what the optimum delivery chain in their selected priority area could look like and who would be involved. For example, if the priority area is communication the group would identify who needs to be communicated with, how frequently and at what level to get the best outcomes. Once this exercise is completed, each group will feed back to the other attendees and note any comments.
The final stage is for each group to prepare an action plan for their priority area stating who will do what, and when, in order to move towards the optimum delivery chain. Using the communication priority area example an action plan may include identifying a key contact at each organisation or setting up a working group that meets regularly. If the attendees are unfamiliar with action planning the facilitator may need to spend a short time explaining it. The groups will feed back on what is in their action plans and note any comments.

At the end of the workshop, the participants should know what they and their partners are going to do next. They should also have a better understanding of their colleagues and have developed stronger social networks to support the delivery of area outcomes.

The final key to the success of the workshop is in the quality of the action plan, or commitment to develop the plan further. The workshop attendees should know:

- what area outcome they concentrated on;
- which delivery chain stages they focused on in the workshop;
- what the ideal position would be for those delivery chain stages;
- what actions they need to take to achieve the ideal position;
- when they would achieve it;
- who is responsible for achieving it; and
- what resources are necessary for achieving it.

The attendees at the workshop may go on to do workshops on other topics or return to those issues that were considered to be lower priority on the day but would also be worth looking at.

Conclusions

Delivery chain workshops are a powerful tool to bring partners together to tackle an issue of common concern. With the right preparation and an experienced facilitator they can create ideas and solutions in six hours that partners would struggle with for six months.

More details of how to run a housing delivery chain workshop are available on the Improvement network at www.improvementnetwork.gov.uk/housing

The appendix below contains the 12 strategic questions, and notes for interpretation in a housing context and a model agenda for running a workshop.
The 12 strategic questions

This self assessment helps in developing and improving delivery chains and planning the delivery of area objectives.

Attendees should score each question separately as red, amber, or green. Red responses should be scored -1, amber 0, and green +1.

Once each question has been scored, the totals can be calculated (if more than one assessment is completed, the total should be divided by the number of completed assessments). Scores of between 9 and 12 suggest an effective and efficient delivery plan. Between three and eight suggests risks to delivery and reduced efficiency. Scores of less than two indicate that significant improvement is needed.

Scores between -3 and -8 suggest inefficiency and ineffective delivery and -9 to -12 show a high degree of failure.

Where responses are shown as red then action is required urgently.
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1  Is the outcome clearly defined?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Red</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>amber</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>Green</th>
<th>+1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The outcome is vague and its measurement is complex.  
The outcome is clear but not all partners are signed up and measurement is difficult.  
The outcome is clearly defined, understood and agreed by partners.

A delivery chain for building new housing would score green if all partners know and agree with the desired outcome and understand how success is measured. Do all partners know how many homes are required, what type of homes and where? Are partners clear how performance will be measured? This may be through indicators such as number of homes completed, percentage of homes completed on brownfield sites or satisfaction of residents with the area they live in. It may also be through local measures such as whether homes are completed to timescale, whether environmentally sustainable build methods have been adhered to or whether section 106 planning agreements are delivered.

2  Is the evidence base sufficiently robust?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Red</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>Amber</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>Green</th>
<th>+1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Little research and no piloting resulting in a weak evidence base.  
Some research on existing evidence highlights factors on which to focus but this is not implemented at all levels, resulting in a high failure risk.  
Extensive preliminary research and piloting of interventions. Interventions at all levels and across agencies are aligned, maximising effectiveness and minimising cost.

A delivery chain for the provision of affordable housing would score green if partners have up-to-date information on their housing market and the housing needs in their area. This would include, but not be limited to, having a recent housing market assessment, housing need assessment, stock condition survey, analysis of the housing register, strategic housing land availability assessment and rural needs assessment (where appropriate). The efficiency of evidence collection can also be tested. Are the partners clear about the information each holds? Are they sharing information and effectively analysing the data they have? Have partners considered the cost benefit of doing joint market/needs assessments with neighbouring authorities? Are new approaches to building, for example environmentally sustainable developments, piloted and evaluated before rolling out across the area?
3 Is there sufficient capacity, including available resources, to deliver?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The delivery chain for housing adaptations to assist people with disabilities, for example, would score green if partners had a clear understanding of the capacity and resources available across organisations, that these had been targeted to meet priority needs and that effectiveness is reviewed regularly.

Do partners have up-to-date knowledge of the capacity of occupational therapists and housing staff to address applications in a reasonable timescale? Do they know whether the financial provision is adequate to meet demand? If external funding (i.e. from the Primary Care Trust) is in place, do they know how long it is for? Do they know the effect it will have on the service when the funding period ends? If an external agency is providing any part of the service (i.e. minor works and adaptations) do they know what current performance is and what effect an increased demand would have?

4 Is there a shared partnership operational plan describing how services / interventions will be provided?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is particularly important in delivery chains where different agencies are involved in delivering objectives. A plan for dealing with domestic abuse would require contributions from, for example, housing advice services, the homelessness section within the authority, refuge providers (e.g. housing associations), the police, Women’s Aid and other voluntary and community sector partners. Have all of the partners been involved in developing a plan? Are all the partners signed up to it? Do the relevant partners have access to the plan and understand it?
5 Are the objectives supported by a funding strategy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Red</th>
<th>-1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No funding identified or multiple short-term funding streams with funding not dependent on performance.

Longer-term funding allows more certainty, but there are still multiple overlapping streams. Some performance-related funding.

Funding streams mapped as part of strategy development; number of funding streams rationalised. Funding is structured to incentivise performance and awarded on proven performance. Where appropriate, funding periods are extended.

For private sector renewal the scale and location of the issue, as well as what the council and its partners are trying to achieve, is an important starting point when looking at the funding strategy. Is a robust strategy and action plan in place to deal with the issue and is funding aligned to this? Are all funding streams mapped and the timescales for each understood? If loans are being provided for private sector upgrades, what are the timescales for repayment? Are incentives in place for timely repayment (i.e. low or no interest)? Have potential future funding streams been identified (such as government initiatives) and, where appropriate, are funding bids being prepared?

6 Do the various partners and levels within them communicate regularly using reliable information so that there is good coordination?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Red</th>
<th>-1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No mechanism in place for the different partners and levels of the delivery chain to come together and address issues.

Some coordination but insufficient to create a common understanding of risks and issues facing delivery.

Regular contact between all levels of the delivery chain. Active communication between the frontline and the centre so that frontline information informs strategic decision making and across partners.

A delivery chain for new affordable housing developments in rural communities would require good communication between various partners. Partners would include rural housing enablers, planning, parish councillors, developers, housing associations and the local community. Were partners consulted at an early stage to get their views on the development? How regularly are the various partners in contact with each other? What are the communication channels to update on progress and raise issues? How are those involved in development coordinating with housing management to ensure they are meeting the needs of the rural community?
7 Are levers and incentives fit for purpose?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Red</th>
<th>-1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Making the best use of levers and incentives is particularly important when dealing with empty homes. Available levers include withdrawal of reduced council tax for unoccupied properties, the use of empty dwelling management orders or compulsory purchase. Incentives include advice and support to bring the property back into use and financial support through loans or grant aid. Do partners know the levers and incentives available? Have they assessed which are fit for purpose to achieve their desired outcomes? Where have they been used and what was the success of various interventions?

For new and affordable housing, levers may include section 106 planning requirements and single points of contact for developers negotiating with a council on site development. Incentives include council resources such as land, grant and staff time.

For the private rented sector, Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO) licensing can be used as a lever to raise the standards of such accommodation and ensure that landlords are managing their HMOs to the required standards. Enforcement of the Housing Health and Safety Rating System is another lever to ensure category one hazards are identified and dealt with. Incentives include grants and loans to help landlords undertake necessary work.
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8  Are the risks to the delivery chain well managed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Red</th>
<th>-1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No risk assessment is undertaken.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amber</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal partner risk assessment is undertaken; but awareness of key risks is not cascaded through the delivery chain.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Green</th>
<th>+1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thorough partnership risk assessment is undertaken; risk management culture exists throughout the delivery chain. Each stage of the chain has a high awareness of key risks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the housing strategy as an example, a risk assessment of its delivery should have been undertaken by partners, with measures in place to monitor and manage potential risks. For delivering new housing, what happens if developers stop building? What happens if demand for home ownership drops but demand for social rented rises? What happens if a large employer in the area goes out of business? What effect will this have on housing need? Many of these situations have arisen in the last year due to the credit crunch and recession. An area with a risk management culture is better placed to prevent and mitigate impact in these situations than one which is unprepared.

9  Do performance management systems enable tracking of delivery?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Red</th>
<th>-1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple performance management systems; hard to measure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amber</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance management systems can measure progress but indicators are not entirely accurate or have other weaknesses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Green</th>
<th>+1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared systems in place. Regular monitoring. Frequent stock takes. Performance easy to track against objectives. Routine corrective action.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A delivery chain for making the best use of social housing to meet local needs, for example, would need to know whether there are nominations arrangements in place and whether they are being used properly and the process effectively monitored. If there is a choice-based lettings scheme in place, how is it being monitored to ensure those in need are gaining access to a home? If there are incentives in place to deal with under-occupation, how successful have they been? If there is a housing register, is it monitored and managed to inform housing plans? How regularly is it monitored?
Is there strong leadership that is accountable through clear governance structures at all levels of the delivery chain?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Leadership for the delivery of the outcome and/or elements of the delivery chain is unclear.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>There is some agreement on roles and responsibilities, but incentives and measures are lacking to ensure accountability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Leadership at all levels of the delivery chain is in place, understood and resourced, backed by incentives and performance management. Strategic and delivery leadership are clearly distinguished and in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An effective homelessness service would demonstrate strong leadership through effective working with stakeholders and coordination of partner agencies. Does the council take ownership of the issue? Are the activities of delivery partners (including housing advice services, landlords and temporary accommodation providers) well coordinated? Do partners understand their responsibilities? Are partners clear how performance is measured? Is feedback from partners and stakeholders collected and fed into the delivery chain and action plans?
11 Are mechanisms in place for regular feedback and review supporting continuous learning?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Nothing in place to promote feedback. No facility to disseminate examples of good practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Guidance filtered down, but no mechanisms to communicate feedback from delivery level upwards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Frequent feedback between all delivery chain levels. Feedback reviewed, and guidance and examples of good practice shared.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When developing a new housing strategy, feedback and review is particularly important. Authorities need to collect feedback from a range of stakeholders including current and future residents (such as young people who will be entering the housing market in the near future) and internal partners (including planning, environmental health, social services and the various housing teams). Have external partners such as social and private sector landlords, developers and community and voluntary groups given feedback on the current strategy and their thoughts for the new strategy? Have good practice examples been collected on a regular basis including successful projects, interventions and notable ways of working? Good practice examples do not have to be limited to housing (or their own authority) and a good authority will be able to collect and translate a wide range of good practice examples to the development of future strategies and approaches.
12 Have systems to achieve efficiency been built into the delivery chain?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Red</th>
<th>-1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Assets and services not shared. High administration costs due to lack of innovation, internal review and challenge to working practices.

Opportunities to increase economies of scale not fully realised. Some asset and service sharing. Scope to further reduce transaction and administration costs.

Early engagement from key partners when designing delivery chain. Asset and service sharing where suitable. Frontline configured to best deliver services. Customers are encouraged to use the most cost-effective delivery channels.

Effective working with partners can create efficiencies when commissioning housing research. Has joint research with neighbouring authorities been considered (i.e. for Strategic Housing Market Assessments)? Has the suitability of secondary data, where available, been considered as an alternative to more expensive primary data collection? Has the success, and cost effectiveness of previous research (both within the council and externally) been considered prior to commissioning research? Does the council or its partners have suitable research skills that could be used as an alternative to commissioning work?
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Date

**Time**  Six hours are needed. The agenda provides an example with timings for each activity but facilitators can alter these for their own workshops.

Venue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Type of exercise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.30 Welcome, introductions and objectives of the day</td>
<td>Host and facilitator</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.45 Introducing the selected outcome</td>
<td>Host</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00 Map partners and stakeholders involved in delivering the outcome</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.15 The delivery chain concept and model</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30 Self-assessment using the delivery chain model</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30 Discussion and agree the priority red stages</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.45 Refreshment break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.55 Map the optimum delivery chain for the priority red stages</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.45 Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.30 Feedback and review chains for the priority red stages</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.45 Develop and agree the action plans</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.00 Feedback and review action plans</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.15 Next steps and evaluation</td>
<td>Host</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.30 Close</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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