

# Corporate Affairs Overview & Scrutiny Panel

Date: **Wednesday 12 May 2010**

Time: **10.00am**

Venue: **Edwards Room, County Hall, Norwich**

**Persons attending the meeting are requested to turn off mobile phones.**

## **Membership**

Mr M Brindle  
Mr S Clancy  
Mrs D Clarke  
Mr B Collins  
Mr J Dobson  
Mr S Dorrington  
Mr R Hanton  
Mr M Hemsley  
Mr C Jordan  
Mr M Langwade  
Ms J Mickleburgh  
Mr A Proctor  
Mr R Smith  
Mrs J Toms  
Mrs C Walker  
Mr A White  
Mr T Williams

## **Cabinet Members (Non-Voting)**

Mr B Borrett                      Corporate Affairs & Efficiency  
Mr I Mackie                      Finance and Performance

## **Deputy Cabinet Members (Non-Voting)**

Mr J Herbert                      Corporate Affairs

**For further details and general enquiries about this Agenda  
please contact the Committee Administrator:**

Jo Martin on 01603 223814  
or email [jo.martin@norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:jo.martin@norfolk.gov.uk)

## **A g e n d a**

1. **To receive apologies and details of any substitute members attending.**

2. **Election of Chairman**

3. **Election of Vice-Chairman**

4. **Minutes**

To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 17 March 2010.

(Page **1**)

5. **Members to Declare any Interests**

Please indicate whether the interest is a personal one only or one which is prejudicial. A declaration of a personal interest should indicate the nature of the interest and the agenda item to which it relates. In the case of a personal interest, the member may speak and vote on the matter. Please note that if you are exempt from declaring a personal interest because it arises solely from your position on a body to which you were nominated by the County Council or a body exercising functions of a public nature (e.g. another local authority), you need only declare your interest if and when you intend to speak on a matter.

If a prejudicial interest is declared, the member should withdraw from the room whilst the matter is discussed unless members of the public are allowed to make representations, give evidence or answer questions about the matter, in which case you may attend the meeting for that purpose. You must immediately leave the room when you have finished or the meeting decides you have finished, if earlier.

These declarations apply to all those members present, whether the member is part of the meeting, attending to speak as a local member on an item or simply observing the meeting from the public seating area.

6. **To receive any items of business which the Chairman decides should be considered as a matter of urgency**

7. **Public Question Time**

15 minutes for questions from members of the public of which due notice has been given.

Please note that all questions must be received by 5pm on Friday 7 May 2010. Please submit your question(s) to the person named on the front of this agenda. For guidance on submitting public questions, please view the Council Constitution, Appendix 10, Council Procedure Rules at [www.norfolk.gov.uk/reviewpanelquestions](http://www.norfolk.gov.uk/reviewpanelquestions).

8. **Local Member Issues/Member Questions**

15 minutes for local members to raise issues of concern of which due notice has been given.

Please note that all questions must be received by 5pm on Friday 7 May 2010. Please submit your question(s) to the person named on the front of this agenda.

9. **Cabinet Member Feedback on Previous Overview & Scrutiny Panel Comments (if any)**

### Items for Scrutiny

10. **Forward Work Programme: Scrutiny**

(Page **29**)

Report by the Director of Corporate Resources which asks Members to review and develop the programme for scrutiny.

### Items for Overview

11. **Corporate Affairs Integrated Performance and Finance Monitoring Report for 2009/10**

(Page **35**)

Report by the Director of Corporate Resources which sets out finance monitoring information as at the end of March 2010. The Panel is asked to consider whether any aspects require further scrutiny.

12. **Asset Performance Report 2009**

(Page **43**)

Report by the Managing Director of NPS Property Consultants Ltd, which summarises details relating to Highways, ICT and operational property assets during the financial year 2008-09. The Panel is asked to consider and comment on the outputs and the actions that are being taken to improve performance.

13. **2010/11 Member Learning and Development Programme**

(Page **49**)

Report by the Head of Democratic Services, which asks the Panel to comment on and agree the proposed Plan.

14. **Risk Management within Norfolk County Council and the Department of Corporate Resources**

(Page **59**)

Report by the Director of Director of Corporate Resources which asks the Panel to comment on the risks reported and actions identified.

### Group Meetings

**Conservative**

**9.00am**

**Colman Room**

**Green Party**

**9.00am**

**Room 532**

**Liberal Democrat**

**9.00am**

**Room 504**

**Chris Walton**  
**Head of Democratic Services**  
County Hall  
Martineau Lane  
Norwich NR1 2DH

Date Agenda Published: 4 May 2010



If you need this Agenda in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Jo Martin 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.

## **Corporate Affairs Overview & Scrutiny Panel**

### **Minutes of the Meeting Held on 17 March 2010**

#### **Present:**

Mr C Jordan (Chairman)

Mr M Brindle

Mrs D Clarke

Mr J Dobson

Mr R Hanton

Mr M Hemsley

Mr M Langwade

Ms J Mickleburgh

Mr A Proctor

Mr R Smith

Ms J Toms

Mrs C Walker

Mr A White

#### **Cabinet Members Present:**

Mr I Mackie Finance and Performance

#### **1. Apologies**

Apologies were received from Mr B Borrett, Mr S Clancy, Mr B Collins, Mr S Dorrington, Mr J Herbert and Mr T Williams.

#### **2. Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 January 2010 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

#### **3. Declarations of Interest**

Mr Smith declared a personal interest in item 8 (South Norfolk Alliance), being a member of the South Norfolk Alliance.

#### **4. Matters of Urgent Business**

The Chairman encouraged Members to complete the 'Effectiveness of Scrutiny at Norfolk County Council' questionnaire that had been circulated to them.

#### **5. Public Question Time**

##### **5.1 Question from Mr John Martin**

The entire shareholding in Norse Group Ltd (Norse) is held by Norfolk County Council (NCC). Norse is the parent company of nineteen subsidiaries,

delivering a wide range of services throughout the UK to the private sector as well as the public sector. Some 5,300 people are employed. It has an annual turnover of more than £155m. Despite this, its most recent accounts show an operating loss of over £2.75m. What is NCC, essentially a provider of vital public services in Norfolk, doing owning and locking up assets in this unwieldy loss-making conglomerate particularly at a time when all of NCC's energies and resources should be concentrated on the provision of those services?

### **Reply by the Cabinet Member for Finance and Performance**

The Cabinet Member explained that the underlying financial health of the company was good and Norse had returned £12m to the County Council since 2002, which had then ploughed back into front-line services. By setting the company up 22-years-ago, councillors had ensured a cost-effective alternative to the private sector existed in Norfolk which provided 'market moderation' worth around £4m a year. The operating loss referred to for 2008-09 was due to extraordinary items such as write-offs and notional pension adjustments and the Group has retained profits, after tax, of £8.86m.

The Group had recently contributed £1.75m towards the remodelling of Norwich's Theatre Royal; it was currently providing apprenticeships through the successful Build Norfolk initiative and had helped more than 2000 staff through Skills for Life courses - all successes which had seen the company win the EDP's Community Impact award twice.

Norse predominately provided public services and the business model had proved an attractive and progressive way of working offering good value for money, which was why it has been embraced by councils up and down the country in recent years. Winning contracts outside the County brought jobs and boosted the Norfolk economy, so there was much to celebrate in what was an undoubted Norfolk success story with a national dimension.

Mr Martin asked the following supplementary question:

Norse has failed to declare a dividend in any of the three accounting years expiring on 31 January 2009, and has made a loss in two of those. What direct financial benefit, in the form of cash injections into its annual budget, has NCC derived from its ownership of Norse during that time and is it not now highly appropriate for NCC to dispose of those subsidiaries of Norse that are not exclusively involved with the provision of public services within Norfolk given Norse's heavy reliance upon the property and construction sectors, its poor profits record, its loan indebtedness to NCC, its huge pension scheme deficit and its lack of accountability to NCC?

The Cabinet Member recommended to Mr Martin that he should write to Norse. However, when Mr Martin stated that he had already written to Norse and had not received a reply to his detailed questions, the Cabinet Member agreed to provide a written response.

**6. Local Member Issues/Member Questions**

There were no local Member issues or Member questions.

**7. Cabinet Member Feedback on Previous Review Panel Comments**

There was no Cabinet Member Feedback.

**8. South Norfolk Alliance (Local Strategic Partnership)**

8.1 The Panel received the annexed report (8) from the Chief Fire Officer, which provided Members with the results of the partnership questionnaire completed for the South Norfolk Alliance.

8.2 The Chairman welcomed Councillor Martin Wilby, the Chairman of South Norfolk Alliance, and Sandra Dinneen, Chief Executive of South Norfolk Council, to the meeting. Councillor Wilby then gave a presentation and an information pack was circulated to Members, which included a copy of the presentation slides (attached at Appendix A to these minutes), an information leaflet on the South Norfolk Neighbourhood Fund and a copy of the Sustainable Community Strategy for South Norfolk (2008-2018).

8.3 Following the presentation a question and answer session took place during which the following was noted:

- \*\* The waiting list for affordable housing in South Norfolk was approximately 24,000 (an increase of around 3,000 during the year). A similar situation had been experienced in all areas.
- \*\* It was agreed that this minute be amended and was corrected at the committee meeting on 12/05/10. Please view the minutes of that meeting in order to note the correction made.
- South Norfolk promoted local housing for local people and worked with Parish Councils to deliver the many schemes that were currently running.
- Second homes monies had been used to boost the number of affordable housing in the area.
- The Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) used themed sessions to encourage people to attend those relevant to them. This had led to the concept of developing a business forum, as local businesses wanted a vehicle through which they could feed into meetings.
- The Chairman of Bunwell Parish Council had volunteered the village for the Green Village pilot. The village was lucky to have a very enthusiastic Chairman who was good at getting the community involved.
- South Norfolk had five Safer Neighbourhood Area Partnerships (SNAPs), which covered separate areas and met every four months. Each area had a special identity with different problems. There was a dedicated neighbourhood manager for each area who worked closely with the police. SNAPs had been joined with the Police for just over 12 months to streamline activities and were made up of five District Councillors, 1 County Councillor, a Police Sergeant and community

representatives. Every Parish had a voice at meetings and activities such as walk-about were undertaken to help find out about local issues. SNAPs had become much more positive and collaborative environments, moving towards spreading best practice rather than hearing complaints.

- South Norfolk Alliance provided a link between local and county policies and was an important part of a making things happen. It helped the County Council to be involved at a local level.

8.4 The Chairman thanked Councillor Martin Wilby and the officers present for attending the meeting.

**Resolved:**

8.5 The Panel agreed that:

- 1) Scrutiny of the South Norfolk Alliance was complete.
- 2) A summary of LSP best practice should be considered by the Panel after hearing from each of Norfolk's LSPs, to share with LSP partners.

**9. Scrutiny – Shared Services**

9.1 The Panel received the annexed report (9) from the Chairman of the Shared Services Working Group, which provided an update on recommendations reported to the Panel in January and details of the future work programme.

9.2 The Working Group Chairman, Mr Smith, introduced the report and explained that it was a holding report to update the Panel on work done to date and to seek the Panel's observations on the future work programme.

9.3 The Principal Consultant Shared Services updated the Panel on the outcome of the Public Services Leaders Board meeting that had taken place the previous day. He explained that the Board had been established in September 2009 and comprised the political Leaders of Norfolk's Local Authorities, Chairs of the two Primary Care Trusts, the Police Authority and the Broads Authority, supported by their Chief Executives. The Board had agreed a work programme around achieving efficiency savings, which focused on the following three areas:

- Waste management
- Asset management (with a focus on vehicles)
- Regulatory services

The total spend for these three areas, across Norfolk, amounted to approximately £100m each year. The Board had spent £40,000 on local consultants to look at service improvements and the conclusions had been reported to the Board the previous day. A range of potential savings had been identified, which totalled approximately £30m over a five year period. Chief Executives would discuss the options with their political Leaders during the coming week and the outcome of those discussions would be reported at the next Chief Executive Group meeting. The Principal Consultant Shared Services emphasised that the amount of savings made would be dependent on the level of ambition of leadership in the county and whether the bodies



involved wished to collaborate. In addition, it had been proposed that each District Council should identify a theme as part of the Total Place agenda and submit a bid to the Regional Improvement and Efficiency Partnership (RIEP) for funding to improve outcomes for citizens in Norfolk. A meeting was due to take place with the RIEP as a first step to securing this investment.

9.4 During discussion the Panel noted the following:

- In setting up shared services internally, the County Council needed to bear in mind that new arrangements might not necessarily fit all departments. It would need to look carefully at what some departments might have to sacrifice to implement new arrangements.
- The Working Group Chairman was commended for proceeding cautiously with the scrutiny and creating a strong platform from which the work could be taken forward.
- Some Members felt that the increasing amount of closer working between Local Authorities in Norfolk would result in a Unitary authority in all but name. They felt that Norfolk County Council should reconsider its position.
- Some Members felt that it would be wrong for some District Council functions, such as planning and housing, to be centralised across Norfolk.
- The Norfolk County Strategic Partnership Joint Scrutiny Panel had agreed that it should undertake scrutiny of the Public Services Leaders Board, which was currently accountable to nobody.
- Efficiency savings from shared regulatory services would be fairly modest (around £2m/year). The consultants had not recommended the option of establishing a single regulatory service for Norfolk.
- Waste Management had the biggest spend and was the area in which the biggest savings could be achieved (around £22m/year). The consultants had favoured an amalgamation between waste collection authorities, rather than a single set of arrangements for the county.
- Efficiency savings from the asset management area (vehicles) could amount to £5m over five years. This would come from changing the way that local authorities spent money acquiring vehicles.
- Substantial savings could be made by changing the way that items are procured, to get the best market value.

**Resolved:**

- 9.5 The Panel noted the report and agreed that the Principal Consultant Shared Services should provide the following information to the Working Group:
- 1) A copy of the reports considered by the Public Service Leaders Board.
  - 2) A thematic breakdown of the potential £30m savings over five years to Members.
  - 3) A briefing note containing his thoughts on procurement.

**10. Scrutiny – Review of the Council’s Constitution**

- 10.1 The Panel received the annexed report (10) which set out initial findings and recommendations of the Working Group.
- 10.2 The Assistant Head of Democratic Services circulated a list of the items contained in the existing Policy Framework (attached at Appendix B to these minutes). He also highlighted that the proposed amendments to Overview and Scrutiny Panel arrangements would achieve some savings from the reduced number of meetings held each year.
- 10.3 During discussion the Panel noted the following:
- It was important that the Council didn't lose the flexibility to add other plans and strategies to the Policy Framework. The Working Group's recommendations included that the Panel review the content of the Framework annually and it was important to consider the process for that in due course.
  - The Working Group would look at the procedure rules for Full Council meetings at a later stage in the review. At that point it would discuss how those meetings could be made more inclusive and how it could become a forum for proper debate.
  - Concerns were raised about whether anyone would have the ability to cover an Executive role for more than one local authority. Members were assured that the aim of the recommendation at paragraph 3.1 of the report was to enable the Leader of the County Council to appoint who he or she wanted to. In reality, if someone with a District Executive position agreed to join the County Council's Cabinet, the assumption was that from a practical point of view they would have to resign from their District Executive position.
  - Concerns were raised that there were a number of documents covering scrutiny processes that had not been agreed by an Executive body and that there was no single document covering scrutiny policy for Norfolk County Council. It would be helpful for Members and third parties if those documents could be brought together within the Constitution.

**Resolved:**

- 10.4 The Panel endorsed the recommendations set out in the report, with the following amendments and additions:
- 1) The Working Group should consider a process for the annual review of the Policy Framework.
  - 2) The title of the Corporate Affairs O&S Panel at paragraph 4.4 of the Panel report should be changed to Corporate Resources O&S Panel.
  - 3) County Farms Policy and Scrutiny at Norfolk County Council should be added to the list of the items contained in the existing Policy Framework.

**11. Forward Work Programme: Scrutiny**

- 11.1 Members received the annexed forward work programme for scrutiny (11) and were advised that updates relating to the Treasury Management Strategy and Policy would be presented to the Panel as appropriate.
- 11.2 It was suggested that it would be helpful and timely for the Panel to add Norse to its scrutiny work programme, given that it had recently featured on a number of committee agendas, to clarify the intricacies of Norse arrangements. The Scrutiny Support Officer confirmed that Terms of Reference no longer needed to be considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Strategy Group. A draft would be agreed at the next scrutiny planning meeting, for presentation to the Panel.

**Resolved:**

11.3 Members agreed:

- 1) The scrutiny topics listed and reporting dates as presented.
- 2) That scrutiny of Norse should be added to the forward work programme.

**12. Chief Executive's Department Service Planning 2010-13**

12.1 Members considered the annexed report (12) by the Director of Corporate Resources, which set out the main proposed activities within the Chief Executive's Department Service Plans.

12.2 Members were advised that:

General

- Officers would take Members' comments on board before service plans were finalised.
- The County Council's service planning framework requires services to demonstrate how they are delivering against corporate objectives through a set of objectives that services contribute towards. Service plans were not drawn up in isolation and services worked together to ensure links were made between related activities to avoid duplication. The service actions were for the year ahead and had a planning horizon of three years.

Corporate Finance

- There was no specific financial plan linked to Norfolk Forward. The overall County Council Plan stated that finance needed to support the organisational changes taking place through Norfolk Forward.
- Procurement was currently part of Corporate Finance, but reporting arrangements would change with the implementation of shared services.
- Oracle R12 was the latest software version for the County Council's finance systems.

Democratic Services

- The service plan needed to be realistic about what could be delivered and was the tool to help focus staff on what should be achieved by the end of the year. It set out how Members could be supported to help the County Council achieve the relevant service objectives. Other service plans, such as Communications and Customer Service, dealt with public engagement. Members currently scrutinising the Constitution might wish to consider matters such as public engagement.
- Work by the Registration service to develop links with schools around Citizenship was just beginning. Feedback for the ceremonies held at County Hall, which involve the whole family, is very positive and involving schools would foster an understanding by young people of the process that people have to undergo to become British Citizens. The Head of Democratic Services would be pleased to hear from any Members who had experience or ideas to bring to bear on this topic.
- The bullet point 'work with Parish and Town Councils on implementing any Unitary structures' could be removed.
- The Head of Democratic Services would be pleased to work with political groups to encourage Members to 'Blog' and 'microblog'. He would also look into whether this might include using Twitter.

12.3 Members made the following comments, which the Policy and Performance Officer agreed to feed back to heads of service.

#### Communications and Customer Service

- The service needs to ensure that activities such as 'developing a Community Engagement Strategy' and 'delivering a countywide campaign to increase awareness of the many ways residents can influence decision making' are not done in isolation and are properly integrated.

#### Corporate Programme Office

- The strength of business process re-engineering would come not just from identifying new or improved processes but putting them into practice. Implementation needed to be reflected in service actions.

#### Human Resources/Organisational Development

- The service might wish to clarify phrasing such as 'Develop a plan to assist worklessness in the community' and 'including the development of job families'.

12.4 The Policy and Performance Officer also agreed to seek written responses to the following detailed questions about service actions for the year ahead:

#### Communications and Customer Service

- How will the research with those groups in the county who currently feel less well informed be done? Is this the same research as that proposed for finding out Norfolk residents' most preferred media outlets?
- What is meant by the phrase 'Develop a picture of key bloggers and microbloggers in and about Norfolk and develop a plan to better engage them'?

## ICT Services

- What is the Ideas Laboratory?

## Policy and Performance Team

- What is a community tension monitoring contingency plan?

### **Resolved:**

12.6 The Panel noted the draft key actions and agreed that:

- 1) Members' comments should be fed back to heads of service.
- 2) Written responses should be obtained for detailed questions.

### **13. Corporate Affairs Integrated Performance and Finance Monitoring Report for 2009/10**

13.1 Members considered the annexed report (13) by the Director of Corporate Resources which set out performance and finance monitoring information for the third quarter of 2009/10.

13.2 Members were advised that:

- The number of employees declaring a disability had been on a downward trend for some time. At the third quarter data showed that numbers were starting to increase, although the County Council was unlikely to meet the end of year target.
- A Disability Action Group for employees had recently been set up to help improve our understanding of the issues and inequalities experienced by disabled staff working at the County Council and what actions might be taken to improve them. Other work involved addressing under-reporting by encouraging employees to declare their disability through confidential routes, including those who find their status had changed.
- There was a proactive approach to improving the numbers of Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) employees in the workforce and those declaring a disability. An example was given of a recruitment fair which had been designed with the help of a local group from BME communities, to ensure that it was accessible and visible to those communities.
- A sum of money had been set aside for Strategic Ambitions, which had been allocated by the Leader and reported to Cabinet. An equivalent amount of money had not been set aside for future years. This had been one-off funding and had been utilised.
- Property Management and Corporate Minor Works capital budgets were managed by NPS. Corporate Minor Works was a lump sum allocation, prioritised by officer groups and given to service to spend to meet ad hoc/one-off spends as they arose.

13.3 The Policy and Performance Officer agreed to seek written responses to the following detailed questions:

- Could Members have more information about what was being done to increase the diversity of the workforce in terms of BME communities and those declaring a disability? How many were offered an interview and how many were appointed?
- Had potential delays in inputting sickness absence data, following the recent upgrade of the Oracle HR system, impacted the data received by the working group looking into sickness absence?
- Was there room for a more coherent approach for sickness absence reporting, to allow statistics to be comparable between departments?

**Resolved:**

- 13.4 The Panel noted progress made and agreed that written responses should be obtained for detailed questions.

The meeting closed at 11.55am.

**Chairman**



If you need these minutes in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Jo Martin 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.

## **Forward Work Programme: Scrutiny**

Report by the Director of Corporate Resources

### **Summary**

This report asks Members to review and develop the programme for scrutiny.

## **1. The Programme**

1.1. The Outline Programme for Scrutiny (Appendix A) has been updated to show progress since the 17 March 2010 Overview and Scrutiny Panel.

1.2 Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel can add new topics to the scrutiny programme in line with the criteria below: -

(i) High **profile** – as identified by:

- Members (through constituents, surgeries, etc)
- Public (through surveys, Citizen's Panel, etc)
- Media
- External inspection (Audit Commission, Ombudsman, Internal Audit, Inspection Bodies)

(ii) Impact – this might be significant because of:

- The scale of the issue
- The budget that it has
- The impact that it has on members of the public (this could be either a small issue that affects a large number of people or a big issue that affects a small number of people)

(iii) Quality – for instance, is it:

- Significantly under performing
- An example of good practice
- Overspending

(iv) It is a Corporate Priority

## **2. Section 17 – Crime and Disorder Act**

2.1. The crime and disorder implications of the various scrutiny topics will be considered when the scrutiny takes place

### 3 Equality Impact Assessment

3.1 This report is not directly relevant to equality, in that it is not making proposals that will have a direct impact on equality of access or outcomes for diverse groups.

#### Action Required

- (1) The Overview and Scrutiny Panel is asked to consider the attached Outline Programme (Appendix A) and agree the scrutiny topics listed and reporting dates.
- (2) The Overview and Scrutiny Panel is invited to consider new topics for inclusion on the scrutiny programme in line with the criteria at paragraph 1.2.

#### Officer Contact

If you have any questions about matters contained in this paper please get in touch with:

Name	Telephone Number	Email address
Jessica Reeve	01603 224424	<a href="mailto:Jessica.reeve@norfolk.gov.uk">Jessica.reeve@norfolk.gov.uk</a>



If you need this report in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Jessica Reeve on 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.



## Outline Programme for Scrutiny

Standing Item for Corporate Affairs O & S Panel: Update for 12 May 2010

### **This is only an outline programme and will be amended as issues arise or priorities change**

Scrutiny is normally a two-stage process:

- Stage 1 of the process is the scoping stage. Draft terms of reference and intended outcomes will be developed as part of this stage.
- The Overview and Scrutiny (O&S) Panel or a Member Group will carry out the detailed scrutiny but other approaches can be considered, as appropriate (e.g. 'select committee' style by whole O&S Panel).
- On the basis that the detailed scrutiny is carried out by a Member Group, Stage 2 is reporting back to the O&S Panel by the Group.

This Panel welcomes the strategic ambitions for Norfolk. These are:

- A vibrant, strong and sustainable economy
- Aspirational people with high levels of achievement and skills
- An inspirational place with a clear sense of identity

These ambitions inform the NCC Objectives from which scrutiny topics for this Panel will develop, as well as using the outlined criteria at paragraph 1.2 above.

#### Changes to Programme from that previously submitted to the Panel on 17 March 2010

Added – Scrutiny of NORSE

Deleted – None

Topic	Outline Objective	Cabinet Portfolio Area	Stage 1 (scoping report)	Stage 2 (report back to Panel by Working Group)	Requested by	Comment
<b>Scrutiny Items Outstanding/ Ongoing</b>						
1. Partnership Reviews	To review all partnerships within the Corporate Affairs remit using the Partnership Questionnaire Tool	Corporate Resources	N/A	1 <sup>st</sup> Partnership Report Jan 09	CAOS Sept 08	All partnership reviews added into forward programme. Next report is West Norfolk LSP at July 2010 meeting.
2. Review of Councils Constitution	A wide ranging review of the Councils Constitution to make it effective and fit for purpose.	Corporate Resources		Jan 2010	CAOS Nov 08	Meetings scheduled for 2010. Next paper due at the July CAOS meeting.
3. Sickness Absence	To consider a detailed analysis of sickness absences to establish whether any action could be taken to reduce the average numbers of days lost and improve the councils performance	Corporate Resources		TBC	Cabinet Jun 09	Meetings scheduled for 2009/10. Report due at July 2010 meeting.
4. Shared Services	To examine the framework that this Council uses to deliver Shared Services (both internally and with public, private and third sector bodies).	Corporate Resources		January 2010	CAOS Sept 09	Next working group meeting June 2010 to look at Procurement and Commissioning. Report to July 2010 panel.

5. Effective use of County Buildings	Review existing policies and processes in relation to properties occupied by the County Council to ensure that the corporate property portfolio is being managed in the most effective way	Corporate Resources		Jan 2009	CAOS Jan 08	Following the report to CAOS in Jan 09 it was agreed that the template developed to look at the Councils estate in Kings Lynn could be used across the County. Overview & Scrutiny Strategy Group agreed in Oct 09 to suspend any further work on this group until the outcome of LGR and the 2010 general election was known.
6. Scrutiny of the Norse Group	To clarify the intricacies of Norse arrangements				CAOS March 2010	Scrutiny Leads are meeting after May 2010 CAOS meeting to develop a Terms of Reference. Terms of Reference will be reported to the July meeting of the CAOS for agreement.

### Completed Scrutiny Items:

Pay and Grading - Equality Impact Assessment – Nov 2007  
 2<sup>nd</sup> Homes Council Tax Money – Nov 2007  
 Work Experience (Working Group) – Dec 2007  
 Risk Management Presentation – Mar 2008  
 Invest to Improve/Save Reserve – Jul 2008  
 Partnership Working (North Norfolk LSP) – Sept 2008  
 Strategic Ambitions Reserve – Jan 2009

Lone Working – Jan 2009  
 Breckland LSP – Mar 2009  
 Broadland Community Partnership – Sept 09  
 Great Yarmouth LSP – Nov 09  
 South Norfolk LSP – March 10

**Corporate Affairs Integrated Performance and Finance Monitoring report for  
2009/10**

Report by Director of Corporate Resources

**Executive Summary**

This report provides finance monitoring information for the period to 31 March 2010. The report monitors progress against the Organisational Objectives set out in the County Council Plan that are covered by the Corporate Affairs Overview and Scrutiny Panel. The first section covers key performance information and the second financial performance.

- **Performance** – Performance information for the 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter was reported to the last meeting of this Panel in March. Performance information for the 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter will be reported to the Overview & Scrutiny Panel at its meeting in July.
- **Revenue Budget** – The overall revenue budget for this panel was -£11.770m at the end of March 2010 and a net underspend of -£5.177m was forecast; -£4.707m of this underspend related to Finance General and -£0.470m to Chief Executive's. An update on the position regarding the Icelandic banks is also provided.
- **Reserves and Provisions** – The combined balances of £50.456m held at the end of 2008-09 are currently expected to decrease by -£2.051m to £48.405m at the end of March 2010.
- **Capital Budget** – The overall capital budget for this panel was £7.373m at the end of February 2010. Slippage of -£3.313m is currently forecast principally in respect of the Offices capital programme.

**Action Required**

Members are asked to note progress and consider whether any aspects should be identified for further scrutiny.

## 1. Performance update

- 1.1 Performance information for the 3rd Quarter was reported to the last meeting of this Panel. Performance information for the 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter will be reported to this Overview & Scrutiny Panel at its meeting in July.

## 2. Revenue budget

- 2.1 The original overall approved revenue budget for this panel was £21.634m. The overall revenue budget at the end of March 2010 was -£11.770m. The decrease relates principally to capital accounting budget adjustments applied within Finance General.
- 2.2 Details of the overall budget and the projected outturn at the end of March 2010 are shown in the table below.

Division of service	Approved budget £m	Forecast Outturn £m	Forecast +Over/- Underspend £m	Forecast +Over/Underspend as % of budget	Variance in forecast since last report £m
Chief Executives	33.947	33.477	-0.470	-1.4%	-0.470
Property Services	3.421	3.421	0.000	0.0%	0.000
Finance General	-49.138	-53.845	-4.707	-9.5%	-1.066
<b>Total</b>	<b>-11.770</b>	<b>-16.947</b>	<b>-5.177</b>	<b>-44.0%</b>	<b>-1.536</b>

- 2.3 Of the overall projected net underspending of -£5.177m, -£4.707m relates to the Finance General budget and details of the variances are shown in the table below.

<b>Finance General -£4.707m forecast underspend (budget -£49.138m)</b>				
Area of budget	Projected Variance		Variance as % of approved budget	Reasons for variance and movement since last report
	Total £m	Movement £m		
Interest payable/receivable	-1.014	-0.214	-2.1%	Additional income is forecast to be received principally due to the repayment of debt and the difference between interest paid on external borrowings and interest earned on cash balances.
Debt repayment	-0.381	-0.010	-0.8%	Saving on a revised debt repayment calculation due to slippage in the 2008-09 capital

				programme after the 2009-10 budget was approved.
Miscellaneous income	-0.807	-0.534	-1.6%	Additional VAT recovery, including accrued interest, from previous years.
Local Authority Business Growth Incentive	-0.364	0.000	-0.7%	Local Authority Business Growth Incentive Scheme (LABGI) funding received in 2009-10.
Miscellaneous expenditure	+0.010	-0.048	+0.0%	Cost of providing swine flu clinics for eligible staff (+£0.043m) offset by Department of Health grant (-£0.033m).
Pay Award	-1.891	0.000	-3.8%	Adjustment in respect of the 2009-10 NJC pay award.
NORSE income	-0.489	-0.489	-1.0%	Additional income expected from the NORSE Group.
Duplicate payments	-0.107	-0.107	-0.2%	Recovery of duplicate payments following external review.
Thetford Forum costs	+0.200	+0.200	+0.4%	Thetford Forum costs to be refunded to Breckland Council as per Cabinet decision on 23 June 2009.
Compensation payment to NORSE	+0.345	+0.345	+0.7%	For NORSE interests in sites transferring to the County Council as part of property transactions agreed by Cabinet on 26 <sup>th</sup> January 2009.
Recovery of rates	-0.059	-0.059	-0.1%	Recovery of rates.
Members Allowances	-0.053	-0.053	-0.1%	Projected underspend on Members Allowances.
Industrial Estate Income	-0.097	-0.097	-0.2%	Forecast additional income from share of Norwich Airport Industrial Estate.
Total	-4.707	-1.066	-9.5%	

2.4 The remaining -£0.470m of the projected underspend relates to the Chief Executives budget and details of the variances are shown in the table below.

<b>Chief Executives -£0.470m forecast underspend (budget £33.947m)</b>				
Area of budget	Projected Variance		Variance as % of approved budget	Reasons for variance and movement since last report
	Total £m	Movement £m		
Independent Safeguarding Authority	-0.200	-0.200	-0.6%	Underspend on Independent Safeguarding Authority costs due to a delay in commencement of the programme.
Customer	-0.270	-0.270	-0.8%	Forecast underspend relates to

Access Development				£0.130m brought forward from 2008-09 for potential reorganisation costs for the Council Information Centres and a further £0.140m underspend in 2009-10 which are no longer required.
Total	-0.470	-0.470	-1.4%	

### 3. Icelandic Banks

- 3.1 At Cabinet on the 13 October 2008, Members were informed of the Council's exposure to Icelandic banks. £32.5m of the Council's investments (then around £300m) had been invested with 3 Icelandic banks; Landsbanki (£15m), Kaupthing (£10m) and Glitnir (£7.5m). The banks were taken into administration in early October 2008 by the Icelandic Government and their assets frozen.
- 3.2 The Local Government Association (LGA) continues to coordinate recovery action on behalf of local authorities, with legal support being provided by Bevan Brittan and Icelandic lawyers, Logos.
- 3.3 In December 2009, Glitnir's Winding Up Board (WUB) announced that local authorities were to be treated as "general unsecured" rather than "priority" creditors. This is on the basis that the WUB believes local authority claims are loans rather than deposits. Without priority status, recoveries from Glitnir are expected to be around 31% rather than 100%.
- 3.4 In contrast, the Landsbanki WUB has recognised local authorities' claims as having priority status under the Icelandic Bankruptcy Act. The forecast recovery level for Landsbanki remains at 88%. However, other creditors (notably bond holders, including various international banks) have objected to this decision. Local authorities have raised separate objections over Landsbanki's WUB's decision not to accept claims for penalty interest and costs.
- 3.5 Mediation meetings held with the respective WUB's in January 2010 were unsuccessful in resolving differences. Claim settlement will now be determined by the Icelandic District Court.
- 3.6 The County Council is one of a number of authorities chosen by the Glitnir and Landsbanki WUBs as test cases to allow the full range of issues to be argued before the Icelandic Courts. Test cases for Glitnir and Landsbanki will be heard separately and each will have their own judgement.
- 3.7 It is anticipated that local authority test cases will be referred to Court shortly.
- 3.8 The Administrators of Kaupthing Singer & Friedlander (Ernst & Young) paid a third dividend payment of 5p in the £ (£0.520m) on the 1 April 2010. Total dividend payments received to date total £3.641m. The total recoverable forecast for Kaupthing Singer & Friedlander is unchanged at between 60p and 75p in the

£. The Administrators are due to publish a 6-monthly report in early May which will provide a full update on progress to date.

- 3.9 The latest projected cash recovery from all 3 banks is £23.545m. The total “impairment” value provided for in the 2010-11 Budget is £10.225m.

#### 4. Capital programme

- 4.1 The current overall capital budget for the services reported to this panel is £7.373m. This is a decrease in funding of £1.692m since the last report and relates principally to the transfer of the ISSIS-R (Modern Social Care) budget of £1.732m to Adult Social Services; this is offset by an increase in the Offices budget.

Scheme or programme of work	Approved 2009-10 capital budget £m	Forecast 2009-10 capital outturn £m	Slippage since the previous report	Reasons
Chief Executive's (ICT)	0.328	0.000	0.000	The second phase of the IHRIS project is now expected to start in 2010-11.
Offices	5.982	3.211	-2.771	Slippage includes -£1.200m re Fire Safety requirements, -£0.490m re Carrow House & -£0.450m re County Hall's 6 <sup>th</sup> Floor plus a net -£0.631m for several other schemes.
Property Management	0.291	0.077	-0.214	Slippage is -£0.151m re Corporate Asset Management Development, -£0.041m re Norwich Bus Station site & -£0.022m re Police Roads.
Corporate Minor Works	0.772	0.772	0.000	
Total	7.373	4.060	-2.985	

#### 5. Reserves and Provisions

- 5.1 For Reserves and Provisions (as reported monthly to Cabinet) the latest position is set out in the table below.
- 5.2 On the 15<sup>th</sup> February 2010, the County Council agreed to re-allocate the 25% of second homes funding retained by the County Council (as part of the 2010-11 budget to spend on affordable housing projects) into a newly formed “Norfolk Infrastructure Fund”. This affects the monies currently held in the Affordable



Housing allocation and it was agreed that any underspend from 2009-10 would be transferred into the Norfolk Infrastructure Fund in 2010-11. The County Strategic Partnership allocation has not been affected by this decision.

- 5.3 The balance left in the Redundancy and Pension Reserve at the end of March of £0.826m has now been merged with the balance of £2.972m on the Organisational Change Reserve to create a new Organisational Change and Redundancy Reserve as agreed at Cabinet on the 25<sup>th</sup> January 2010. The creation of a Redundancy provision of £0.539m has been funded from the new Reserve to meet the expected costs of specific redundancies arising from Organisational Review in early 2010-11.

<b>Reserve/ provision</b>	<b>Balance at 31-03-09 £m</b>	<b>Forecast balance at 31-03-10 £m</b>	<b>Variance £m</b>	<b>Reason for variance</b>
Building Maintenance	0.550	0.427	-0.123	The balance of the funding will be carried forward into 2010-11.
Insurance Provision	6.173	8.636	2.463	The increased balance includes the transfer from the Car Lease Reserve previously approved by Cabinet and reflects the increase in outstanding claims at year end.
Insurance Reserve	0.000	0.000	0.000	
IT Earmarked Reserve	5.059	2.285	-2.774	Planned expenditure by e-services re ICT Medium Term Plan, Efficiency Programme and Customer Services Initiatives.
Repairs and Renewals Fund	0.252	0.041	-0.211	Funding held for Joint Strategic Needs assessment has been transferred to revenue.
Usable Capital Receipts	1.222	2.493	1.271	Level held is dependent on the level of receipts used in funding the Capital Programme.
Industrial Estate	0.044	0.010	-0.034	Spend due to expiration of North Walsham Estate lease.
Capital Funding Reserve	3.846	2.500	-1.346	Reflects funding of the 2009-10 Capital Programme.
Affordable Housing & County Strategic	1.283	1.208	-0.075	Monies not yet spent in accordance with the agreement reached through the Norfolk LGA

Partnership				but see para 5.2 above.
Potential Pension Liability Provision	1.270	1.270	0.000	
Modern Reward Strategy Reserve	6.210	6.760	0.550	The balance has been increased to meet additional MRS project team costs in 2010-11.
Strategic Ambitions Reserve	2.902	1.477	-1.425	Monies transferred to services for expenditure approved in accord with Strategic Ambitions.
Modern Reward Strategy Provision (for 2007/08 & 2008/09)	17.219	17.500	0.281	It is expected that compensation payments to staff resulting from the Modern Reward Strategy will now be made in May 2010.
Organisational Change & Redundancy Reserve	4.426	3.259	-1.167	See para 5.3 above
Redundancy Provision	0.000	0.539	0.539	See para 5.3 above
Total	50.456	48.405	-2.051	

## 6. Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA)

6.1 This report is not making proposals that will have a direct impact on equality of access or outcomes for diverse groups.

## 7. Section 17 – Crime and Disorder Act

7.1 There are no direct implications of this report for the S17 Crime and Disorder Act.

## 8. Conclusion

8.1 The overall revenue budget currently shows a forecast underspending of -£5.177m against a budget of -£11.770m. The balances on reserves and provisions are forecast to decrease by -£2.051m during the current financial year to £48.405m. Slippage of -£3.313m is currently forecast within the overall capital budget of £7.373m.

## 9. Action Required

9.1 Members are asked to note progress and consider whether any aspects should be identified for further scrutiny.

## **Officer Contacts:**

If you have any questions about matters contained in this paper please get in touch with:

Harvey Bullen 01603 223330

Linda Bainton 01603 223024



If you need this Report in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Harvey Bullen or Linda Bainton on 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.

## **Asset Performance Report 2009**

Report by the Managing Director of NPS Property Consultants Ltd

### **Summary**

This report introduces the Asset Performance Report 2009 which is available on Members Insight and in the Members Room. It summarises details relating to Highways, ICT and operational property assets during the financial year 2008-09.

Performance of the highways and ICT assets are contained in Norfolk's Transport Asset Management Plan 2008/9 – 2011/12, Highways Asset Performance and the ICT Strategy and Plan.

This report provides an overview of how Norfolk County Council's fixed assets perform against the corporate objectives, in particular with regard to environmental issues, and its three organisational objectives of customer focus, value for money and supporting the workforce. It describes the vision for property assets, how this will be achieved and the expected outcomes.

The report illustrates the progress that has been made to improve efficiency and sufficiency, reduce the environmental impact and meet maintenance requirements based on nationally agreed performance measures for property, as well as any local indicators.

The report also includes updates to the contextual information contained in the Corporate Property Asset Management Plan 2009-2012.

Members are asked to consider and comment on the outputs and the actions that are being taken to improve performance.

### **1. Background**

- 1.1 This report summarises Norfolk County Council's Asset Performance Report 2009 which is available on Members Insight and in the Members Room.
- 1.2 The Asset Performance Report sets out the energy use, carbon emissions and required maintenance priorities for Highways, ICT and property assets. It also sets out the performance of the operational property against the National Property Performance Management Indicators, the vision for property assets and how this will be achieved including the expected outcomes.

- 1.3 The report includes updates to the contextual information contained in the Corporate Property Asset Management Plan 2009-2012.
- 1.4 Detail on the performance of the highways and ICT assets are contained in Norfolk's Transport Asset Management Plan 2008/9 – 2011/12, Highways Asset Performance and the ICT Strategy and Plan.

## 2. **Current performance**

- 2.1 The Asset Performance Report 2009 contains figures for the performance of Norfolk County Council's fixed assets for 2008-09. It also provides figures, where available, for previous years and for specific departments.
- 2.2 In summary, the headline figures for Norfolk County Council are:
- The sale of non-operational and surplus properties generated £5m in capital receipts.
  - Energy consumption for street lights and signals is 22,443MWh and for buildings was 261,148MWh the latter equating to approximately 217kWh/m<sup>2</sup>.
  - Total CO<sub>2</sub> emissions were 85,698 tonnes of which 10,683 tonnes came from street lighting and 75,015 tonnes from buildings. The latter equates to approximately 62.4kg/m<sup>2</sup>.
  - Total water consumption for operational property was 589,277m<sup>3</sup>, which equates to 0.53m<sup>3</sup>/m<sup>2</sup> for buildings.
  - Of the 115 buildings that are open to the public, 94 are fully accessible to people with disabilities compared with a target of 98.
  - Norfolk County Council's total expenditure was £2,228m, of which £64m related to premises expenditure.
  - Highway maintenance expenditure totalled £81m, comprising:
    - Integrated Transport Block and Others £24m
    - Bridges £ 3m
    - Structural Maintenance £25m
    - Routine Maintenance £29m
  - Premises expenditure on repairs and maintenance was £22m, of which £10m came from the Building Maintenance Fund (BMF) or Building Maintenance Partnership Pool (BMPP). The split between planned and reactive works was 65/35.
  - Total expenditure on energy was £16m, of which £2m was for street lighting and £14m for buildings.

- The overall maintenance backlog is £273m, comprising:
  - Highways (excluding street lighting) £127m
  - Operational properties £146m
- On average, there are 11 workstations to every 10 full-time equivalent (FTE) members of staff.

### **3 Vision for the future**

- 3.1 In September 2009 the Leader of the Council set out his vision for Norfolk County Council and the Chief Executive's report 'Norfolk Forward' set out the programme of change to support delivery of this including the rationalisation of properties.
- 3.2 This proposal is supported by the Corporate Property Asset Management Plan 2009-2012, the Corporate Offices Accommodation Strategy and Norfolk County Council's Carbon Management Strategy which identify key actions to improve corporate asset use which include:
- Rationalisation of the number of properties and floor area
  - Reduction in maintenance liability, carbon emissions and operating costs
  - Office space utilisation increased and unit cost reduced
  - Improved accessibility
  - Measuring the return on non-operational properties
- 3.3 The main focus is therefore to create a leaner, higher performing, operational property portfolio through review, rationalisation and investment to enhance integrated working and reduce operating costs and maintenance liability.

### **4. Achieving the vision**

- 4.1 A number of property reviews, on both a geographical and service basis, have been undertaken as part of an ongoing programme, resulting in action plans for rationalisation and investment to achieve greater efficiencies.
- 4.2 Revised Office Space Standards were produced in June 2009 and are being delivered across Norfolk County Council.
- 4.3 Energy costs for operational properties have risen disproportionately to the increases in their use and this has been recognised with the setting up of a Carbon and Energy Reduction Fund with a budget of £2.9m in 2010/2011 and a total of £13.9m over five years to progress reductions in carbon emissions and reduce the trading costs of central Government's Carbon Reduction Commitment Energy Efficiency Scheme.

4.4 The annual BMF budget was increased in 2008-09 by £0.5m to reflect the above inflationary increase in building costs over a number of years. A new BMPP scheme is due to start in April 2010 and any changes will be reported in next year's report.

## 5. **Outcomes**

5.1 Based on the actions outlined in section 4.0 above, the expected outcomes are:

- Agreed action plans resulting in a reduction in the number and floor area of operational properties
- Reduction in the total required maintenance and the proportion identified as Priority 1 for operational properties.
- Reduction in revenue spending on operational properties
- Reduced energy and water consumption
- An average annual 5% reduction in carbon emissions over the next five years, with improved Display Energy Certificate ratings for operational properties
- A 25% reduction in floor space per employee in office accommodation; a maximum of 10m<sup>2</sup> per workstation, and a 50-75% reduction in the number of sites for offices
- Greater utilisation of space including a reduction in the ratio of desks to employees, with all new office accommodation having 7 workstations for every 10 FTE employees
- The introduction of performance measures for non-operational properties in terms of both financial performance and socio-economic benefits.

## 6. **Resource Implications**

6.1 None

## 7. **Section 17 – Crime and Disorder Act**

7.1 There are no direct implications in this report for the Crime and Disorder Act.

## 8. **Recommendation**

8.1 Members are asked to consider and comment on the outputs and the actions that are being taken to improve performance.

## Background Papers

- Asset Performance Report 2009
- Norfolk County Council Organisational Framework 2009-2012 – Cabinet report by the Leader of the Council 14 September 2009
- “Norfolk Forward” – Implementing a programme of change for Norfolk County Council – Cabinet report by the Chief Executive 14 September 2009
- Norfolk’s Transport Asset Management Plan 2008/9 – 2011/12
- Highway Asset Performance – Planning and Transportation, the Environment and Waste Overview and Scrutiny Panel - 8 July 2009
- ICT Strategy and Plan
- Corporate Property Asset Management Plan 2009-2012 Council Plan
- Corporate Offices Accommodation Strategy
- Norfolk County Council’s Carbon Management Strategy
- Carbon and Energy Reduction Fund

## Officer Contact

If you have any questions about matters contained in this paper please get in touch with:

Mike Britch  
Managing Director  
NPS Property Consultants Ltd  
01603 706100 [mike.Britch@nps.co.uk](mailto:mike.Britch@nps.co.uk)

Ben Forsdick  
Asset Management Officer  
NPS Property Consultants Ltd  
01603 224256 [ben.forsdick@nps.co.uk](mailto:ben.forsdick@nps.co.uk)



If you need this report in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Ben Forsdick 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.



## **2010/11 Member Learning and Development Programme**

Report by the Head of Democratic Services

### **Summary**

This report takes forward the areas agreed by the Panel at its January 2010 meeting for inclusion in the Member Learning and Development Plan for 2010/11. It sets out the timetable for delivering the areas and asks the Panel to agree them. It also provides the results of the Personal Development Plan Process and feedback from members who have undertaken it

### **1. Background**

- 1.1 The Member Development Strategy sets out the process for agreeing the Member Learning and Development Plan. The Member Support and Development Advisory Group made recommendations to you at your January meeting on areas for inclusion in the 2010/11 Plan. You agreed these areas and supported the recommendation to timetable them to allow members to plan their attendance.
- 1.2 Discussions have been ongoing with Chief Officers to ensure a spread of briefing sessions for members through the year and offering a variety of dates and times (including early evenings) to suit all members' needs.

### **2. Personal Development Plans (PDP)**

- 2.1 The Council's Learning and Development Strategy was agreed by Cabinet in March 2008. This established the process which was followed after the 2009 County Council elections to support members with their personal development. As a result, 22 Members came forward to undertake PDPs and a programme, setting out the development needs of all the members seen, has been drawn up and officers are currently working with the individual members to support this training. The Council successfully bid for £3000 from Improvement East to support the PDP process and deliver PDP outcomes.
- 2.2 All Members have been invited to have a biannual Personal Development Plan (PDP) interview, with a mid-term review. Interviews are held with a senior NCC Human Resources Officer. The purpose is

to help Members to identify their development priorities for their role as Councillors.

- 2.3 The PDP process involves Members reviewing their achievements of the previous year and considering their aspirations for the year ahead, and whether there are any personal development activities that might help them to achieve those aspirations. The PDP process will seek to identify and keep records of training and learning experiences Members have outside the County Council.
- 2.4 The development requirements identified through the PDP interview process have been analysed and taken into account in the preparation of an annual Member Learning and Development Programme. Where a Member's role changes significantly in between scheduled reviews, we will offer an additional review of their development needs to identify any key issues for the new role.
- 2.5 The programme of PDPs began with one-to-one interviews during the months of December, January and February after the election, i.e. late 2009/early 2010. The next full PDP interviews will then take place in late 2011/early 2012. There will however be mid-term review interviews in late 2010/early 2011. There will be no PDP interviews in the year leading up to the scheduled elections in May 2013. Development focus in the year following an election will be on induction for new members and refresh for existing members. The results of this process are attached at appendix 1. Feedback from members who have been through the process is attached at appendix 2

### **3. The 2010/11 Plan**

- 3.1 The Plan will also cover areas identified as part of the Personal Development Plan process. We intend to make sessions available both in the day and early evening to comply with one of the recommendations from the action plan arising from the award of Elected Member Charter status by IDeA earlier this year and this will be key action in making development more accessible to members.
- 3.2 The 2010/11 Plan is attached for Member's comment (appendix 3). It gives an indication of the dates which will be offered to members, these include briefing dates which take advantage of the Member Development Days, the last Wednesday of every month when efforts are made not to arrange meetings, keeping free the day for members to consider engaging in training activities.

### **4. Resource Implications**

- 4.1 The Plan will be delivered within the resources allocated.

## **5. Other Implications**

- 5.1 Officers have considered all the implications of which members should be aware. Apart from those listed in the report (above), there are no other implications to take into account.

## **6. Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA):**

- 6.1 These proposals will have no direct impact on equality of access or outcomes for diverse groups.

## **7. Section 17 – Crime and Disorder Act**

- 7.1 There are no direct implications.

## **8. Conclusions**

- 8.1 Feedback from the member induction programme has been very positive and the proposed areas for learning and development will enhance Councillor's skills in fulfilling their multiple roles as elected members.

## **9. Recommendation**

- 9.1 To comment on and agree the attached Member learning and Development Plan 2010/11.

Background papers: None

## **Officer Contact**

If you have any questions about matters contained in this paper please get in touch with: Chris Walton, Head of Democratic Services 01603 222949, [chris.walton@norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:chris.walton@norfolk.gov.uk)



If you need this Report in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Chris Walton on 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help

## Members Personal Development Plans 2010

---

### Development Required

### Action Required

---

#### Constitutional Support

Copy of Constitution

Council and Committee procedure rules

Decision making process - new department structures

Ethical Framework

Local member protocol

Role of Member Liaison Officer

Speed Reading

Systems/Policies –Political structures/roles of cabinet, committees

Christine Byles has provided this

link sent of Member Handbook on Members Insight

Christine Byles to provide information

Christine Byles to advise

link sent of Member Handbook on Members Insight

link sent of Member Handbook on Members Insight

EERA to do In house training session date still to be arranged

link sent of Member Handbook on Members Insight

#### Finance Support

Finance

Local government finance

1-1 Session to be arranged with with Peter Rowe

Information on Learning Hub demonstration soon to take place

#### IT Support

IT – newsletter prep

IT – phone and blackberry training

IT Blackberry training

IT information around using Twitter

IT skills

IT support

Training Session to be booked

training session arranged May with CTD

training session arranged May with CTD

training session took place March

External training to take place

Referred to Karen O'Kane

---

**Development Required**

IT support around creation of newsletters  
Powerpoint presentations

**NCC based Info/Update**

Corporate Parenting  
Further information around Emergency Planning  
Further information around Highways, Public Rights of Way  
Induction sessions to be repeated  
Information on funding streams.  
NCC organisational systems - various  
Roles and responsibilities of other councils in Norfolk  
Total Place, Norfolk Ambition, CAA

**Personal Development**

Action Learning Sets  
Assertive/facilitation skills  
Chairing meetings  
Facet5 profile  
Facilitation Skills  
Impact and Influencing skills  
Media Skills  
Public Speaking  
Self Awareness  
Time Management

---

**Action Required**

Training Session to be booked  
External training to take place

'Priority Area' session arranged in July  
1-1 Session to be arranged with with John Ellis  
1-1 Session to be arranged with with Highways and Legal  
Christine Byles to steer Member to Induction information  
Economic Development officer arranged to contact Member  
Christine Byles to advise/organise  
Christine Byles to source suitable officer for this work  
'Priority Area' session arranged in July

From May 2010 – CTD to organise  
CTD offering 1/2 day session in June  
CTD offering 1/2 day session July and September  
From May 2010 – CTD to organise  
CTD offering 1/2 day session in June  
CTD to organise  
training session offered to Members in May  
training session took place March  
From May 2010 – CTD to organise  
CTD to organise customised workshop for Members

---

**Development Required****Action Required**

---

**Teamwork Support**

Constructing large case, scrutiny

Focus group – managing the process

Team development with colleagues (certain Cabinet areas)

Christine Byles to organise with appropriate officer

Christine Byles to liaise with Communications

Consultant at CTD to facilitate members

## **Appendix 2 - Feedback from Members undertaking the PDP Process**

We had twenty two members book an appointment for a PDP (Personal Development Plan) session with our CTD consultants earlier this year. These sessions were offered to suit Members needs e.g. early morning and after work in the evening i.e. not just daytime. The session lasted approximately one and a half hours. Please see some of the very positive feed back we received.

*"I found the PDP discussion (it is not an interview) very helpful. Whatever a member's style of learning, most of us are pretty good at talking about ourselves. To have a trained and sympathetic listener is a pleasure. The process including the pre-planning by the member is a valuable way of focussing the member on, "My effectiveness as a councillor," and on how to improve that effectiveness by reflection, discussion and target-setting. I would recommend the process to any open-minded councillor" Mike Brindle*

*"Having experienced PDP's in my previous career, I was sceptical when Members PDP's were mentioned but, having now completed my first PDP with Chris, it was well worth doing. It's an opportunity to review what I had achieved so far and to find out exactly what training opportunities and support are available to Members. If you haven't been yet I urge you to go, its most useful!" Paul Rice*

*"I attended a meeting today at County Hall to draw up my PDP. The format was carried out on a one to one basis and not on the interview style technique. I was happy with this format. Perhaps all Councillors should consider booking in a slot" Joe Mooney*

*"Yesterday I attended my PDP interview at CTD. I found it very useful enabling me to reflect on my time as a councillor and set out my aims and objectives for the forthcoming year. The training that will be provided will allow me to achieve my goals and become a more effective councillor. A must for any councillor!" Tom Garrod*

*"I found the PDP session extremely useful as the consultant was very focused on exploring my skills/ability to fulfil my particular requirements in my role as a Member; it was not at all a general "one size fits all" approach. In particular I was impressed by the way the consultant identified specific aspects of further training that would be clearly targeted to my needs, whether in terms of filling gaps or "fine-tuning" in areas where I am reasonably confident but could be helped to do better"! Janet Murphy*

*"I found the PDP session very helpful. It was a great boost to morale to realise just how much I did know whilst also identifying areas that I needed further development in. It is often hard to identify your own strengths/weaknesses! The facilitator was very friendly whilst also providing me with a professional viewpoint. I would recommend to all" Alison Thomas*

*"I had my PDP session last month and found it a very useful exercise. My consultant, Christine Nichols, guided me through the process in a professional way. After looking at my current role both in the Council and in my Division and discussing my future aspirations, we were able to agree my development plan for the coming year" John Ward*

*"The opportunity to get 2 hours of professional consultant time to discuss your personal role as a councillor is not to be missed. The insights provided to reflect on your initial 6 months were valuable. I learnt what I am doing well, and can do better. The explanation of the 'role of a councillor' made so much more sense than just reading it as a word on a sheet of paper. I was initially apprehensive about the prospect of an "Interview" but it is much more like a friendly conversation with a supportive knowledgeable friend that I quite enjoyed the time. I'd certainly do this again in 18 months time without any hesitation". - Richard Bearman*



## MEMBER DEVELOPMENT 'PRIORITY AREA' CALENDAR OF EVENTS 2010

28 April morning Member Development Day Edwards Room – *Community Services*  
**The Personalisation Agenda**  
**Local Government and it's work with the Health Sector**

17 May all day The Annex, CTD - *Communications & Customer Services*  
**Media Skills for Members**

21 May morning Edwards Room – *Emergency Planning*  
**Elected Members Business Continuity Seminar**

14 July afternoon following Corporate Affairs O & S Edwards Room – *Democratic Services*  
**A Toolkit for Scrutiny**  
**Councillor Call for Action**

20 July afternoon following Adult Social Services O & S Edwards Room – *Policy & Performance* **or**  
 15 September afternoon after Corporate Affairs O & S Edwards Room  
**Presentation on Local Strategic Partnerships**  
**Community Leadership/Empowerment/Public Involvement**  
**Comprehensive Area Assessment**

26 July afternoon following Full Council Edwards Room – *Children's Services*  
**Corporate Parenting**

28 July afternoon Member Development Day Edwards Room – *Environment, Transport & Development*  
**Climate Change and the Implications for Norfolk County Council**  
**Economic Development & Regeneration**

22 September afternoon following Environment, Transport & Development O & S Edwards Room – *Environment, Transport & Development*  
**Protecting Norfolk's Heritage**  
**Environment, Transport & Development Structure Priorities**

## MEMBER DEVELOPMENT 'PRIORITY AREA' CALENDAR OF EVENTS 2010

27 September afternoon following Full Council Edwards Room – *Children's Services*  
**The Role of School Governors**

29 September morning Member Development Day Edwards Room – *Children's Services*  
**Safeguarding Children**

27 October morning Member Development Day Edwards Room – *Policy & Performance* **or**  
24 November morning Member Development Day  
**Equality, Diversity and Community Cohesion**

27 October afternoon Member Development Day Edwards Room – *Legal Services*  
**Legal and Standards Update**

24 November afternoon Member Development Day Edwards Room – *Communications & Customer Services*  
**Customer Focus**

29 November afternoon following Full Council – Edwards Room – *Democratic Services*  
**The Member's Representative Role including the use of Divisional Profiles**

Still to slot in:

**Local Government Finance**

**Planning Regulatory**

**How to learn Techniques**

**Data Protection**

**Risk Management within Norfolk County Council and the  
Department of Corporate Resources**

Report by the Director of Corporate Resources

**Executive summary**

This report updates the Panel on the approach being undertaken to manage risk within Corporate Resources, as well as corporately across the authority. Produced in accordance with the authority's Risk Management Framework, this report provides information on the key risks facing the department and the controls in place to manage them.

In addition, we also present a summary of the risks on the corporate risk register to enable members of this Panel to understand how risks are managed across the authority, whether at departmental or corporate levels.

The corporate risk register is reported regularly to the Audit Committee. It was last reported on 29 April 2010 and the full details are not repeated here.

The key points of this report are:

- The risks within Corporate Resources have improved since they were last reported to this Panel in November and are being appropriately managed where we have control over the risks.
- There is a strong corporate commitment to risk management.
- The risks on the corporate risk register are generally being managed and mitigated sufficiently to meet their targets. There are some exceptions, primarily within Community Services, that arise through pressure on budgets and increasing demands but further controls and interventions have been identified.

The Panel is asked to consider this report and appendices, and provide any comments in relation to the risks reported and actions identified.

# 1 Risk review

- 1.1 The risk registers reflect those key business risks that, if not managed appropriately, could result in the services failing to achieve one or more of their key objectives. The risks that could impact on service delivery have been taken into account in the service planning processes.
- 1.2 It is important to note that the register wording is an assessment of events that might occur. If an identified risk did materialise it would then lead to a particular impact/s resulting in a particular consequence/s. The identification of the risk does not mean the event has occurred but it shows consideration has been given to the event and that with the listed controls in place, the risk is being managed. It should not be seen as an indicator that the service has 'failed' to manage its risks.
- 1.3 Risk registers are live documents. They are reviewed regularly by the Risk Owners and reported to and considered by departmental management teams. With the registers being kept as live documents and reviewed regularly, they do change over time – the level of some risks will change, some risks will be removed and new ones will be added.
- 1.4 Previous reporting to this Panel has included the details from two separate risk registers for the departments of Chief Executives and Corporate Finance. Following Organisational Review, there is now one register for the department of Corporate Resources, summarised at Appendix 1. This shows the risks that need to be managed and overseen by the departmental management team, as opposed to section management teams.
- 1.5 Any risks deemed to be of corporate significance or that require management at a corporate level are escalated to the Corporate Risk Register where they are monitored by the Chief Officer Group (COG). For Corporate Resources these are risk numbers 4, 5 and 6 on Appendix 1 (Deterioration of economic situation, Financial demands exceeding available resources, and Investments fail to be repaid).
- 1.6 The Corporate Resources register shows that most of the risks have good or improving prospects of being managed sufficiently to meet the targets (called the "aspiration scores"). Some of the risks on the register are shown as having met their targets. These have been retained on the register as they require regular monitoring by management to ensure they remain at the desired levels.
- 1.7 Two new risks have been added to the Corporate Resources register this time. The first, risk number 2, is the risk of significant disruption to the operations of the department in the event that the Norwich City Council unitary transformation goes ahead. This is rated a High risk. The second, risk number 8, is the risk that service standards may slip while shared support services are integrated into the department. This is a Medium risk.
- 1.8 Appendices 1 and 3 show summarised versions of the risk register for Corporate Resources department and the corporate risk register respectively. Those risks within the departmental register that are assessed as 'Very High' or

'High' and have prospects of "Poor", "Weakening" or "Uncertain" are set out in more detail in appendix 2.

1.9 Overall, the risks within this department have improved since they were last reported to this Panel in November.

- The project to bring in the Modern Reward Strategy is now progressing well and implementation is expected to be completed by the end of June this year.
- The setting up of the Corporate Programme Office should help manage some of the pressures on departmental resources when delivering the many change programmes.
- The recession and rising unemployment is making it easier for the authority to recruit to most positions, although some specialist positions are still difficult to fill with suitable candidates. Retention rates for staff are also higher than in the past leading to fewer vacancies.
- The Treasury Management function remains very high profile, closely scrutinised and while the situation with the Icelandic banks is not ideal, there is more certainty around expected outcomes.

## **2 Corporate risk register**

2.1 As mentioned above in 1.5 the corporate risk register contains those key risks that could impact on the achievement of County Council objectives. Most risks sit at the departmental or service level but those significant ones that are cross cutting, could directly affect key objectives or need to have corporate management are included on the corporate risk register.

2.2 COG reviews the corporate risk register on a quarterly basis. New risks arising, either escalated from departmental registers or new emerging risks, are considered by COG and included on the corporate register or referred back to a department where relevant.

2.3 The corporate risk register is reported to the Audit Committee on a quarterly basis with the last report being on 29 April 2010.

2.4 A summary of the corporate risk register that was reported to the Audit Committee is included at Appendix 3. This shows that there are several risks, particularly within the Community Services department, that are extremely challenging to manage to their targets, due primarily to a combination of increasing demand and pressures on financial resources.

2.5 The criteria used to determine the likelihood of a risk arising, and the impact if it did arise, were set out in the report to this Panel on 18 November 2009 and have not changed.

### **3 Resource implications**

- 3.1 There are no direct resource implications arising from this report. However, continuing improvement in the application of risk management within the authority will contribute to improving the use of resources, including financial resources, across the services.

### **4 Section 17 Crime and Disorder implications**

- 4.1 While there are no direct implications, the risk management activities within Corporate Resources and other areas do contribute towards maintaining robust controls against the risk of fraud, loss of information and loss of assets.

### **5 Equalities Impact assessment**

- 5.1 This paper does not require a decision or recommendation on a strategy or policy and therefore an equality impact assessment is not considered necessary.

### **6 Any other implications**

- 6.1 Officers have considered all the implications which members should be aware of. Apart from those listed in the report (above), there are no other implications to take into account.

### **7 Conclusion**

- 7.1 There is a strong corporate commitment to risk management which is an active and embedded process within the County Council and the services that report to this Panel. The risk registers demonstrate that key strategic and operational risks are being identified and effectively managed. Where indications are that targets may not be achieved, further actions and interventions are put in place.

### **8 Recommendation**

- 8.1 This Panel is asked to consider this report and appendices, and provide any comments in relation to the risks reported and actions identified for the continued embedding of risk management.

## **Background papers**

Report to Audit Committee - "Corporate Risk Register", plus appendices, dated 29 April 2010

## **Officer Contacts**

Paul Adams, Director of Corporate Resources, 01603 222635 or email [paul.adams@norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:paul.adams@norfolk.gov.uk)

John Baldwin, Risk and Insurance Manager, 01603 224466, or e mail [john.Baldwin@norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:john.Baldwin@norfolk.gov.uk)



**If you need this Report in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Derek Gorrod 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.**

# Corporate Resources Department Risk Register Summary







CAO&S – 12 May 2010  
Appendix 1

No.	Risk Description	Risk Score	Prospects	Risk Owner
1	The risk of failure of ICT, as a result of a major incident, infrastructure failure or other breakdowns. As NCC is now very ICT dependent in the delivery of services, any prolonged failure would lead to significant disruption.	15 High ▲	Uncertain	P. Adams
2	Establishing a Norwich Unitary Council may cause significant disruption to the department and could divert resources away from service delivery. This will put at risk the achievement of objectives and the meeting of performance targets.	12 High ▲	Uncertain	P. Adams
3	Failure to recognise that there needs to be sufficient capacity at the Corporate Centre as resources are switched to front line services as a result of funding constraints. Leading to key staff becoming overloaded and a failure to drive the organisation forward in key areas, such as performance management and partnership development.	12 High ▲	Uncertain	P. Adams
4	Protracted downturn in the UK economy leading to increases in the demand for the Council's services and adverse pressure on the Council's income. If the national and regional economic situation continues to deteriorate, this could lead to an increased likelihood of bad debts and fraud; a reduction in the number of key suppliers; and potentially, inflated prices for goods and services. It could also lead to increased demand for some services.	12 High ▲	Met target	P Brittain
5	Increased pressure on the Council's finances arising from inflationary, demographic/demand, legislative and employer pension contributions leading to cost demands exceeding available resources from government formula grant and council tax income. This in turn could lead to reductions in service and performance, including in the Council's capital investment programme in order to balance the finances at appropriate levels of tax increase.	12 High ▲	Good	P Brittain
6	NCC investments in financial institutions fail to be fully repaid in accordance with contract terms leading to loss of interest, loss of investments and loss of reputation.	10 High ▲	Revised target date	P Brittain



# Corporate Resources Department Risk Register Summary

CAO&S – 12 May 2010  
Appendix 1

No.	Risk Description	Risk Score	Prospects	Risk Owner
7	Failure to successfully deliver and implement an acceptable proposal for the Modern Reward Strategy. Leads to not meeting a national agreement and employee relations issues.	10 High 	Good	A. Gibson
8	There is a risk that the standards of support to the organisation may suffer while Shared Support Services are integrated and implemented within the department.	9 Medium 	Good	P. Adams
9	Failure to manage sickness absence will lead to reduced levels of productivity and raised costs in covering front-line staff.	9 Medium 	Improving	P. Adams
10	The Coroner's Service is demand driven and Coroners are not subject to local authority control or accountabilities in how they carry out their functions. There is the risk that the demands of the service could lead to an overspend on the allocated budget	6 Medium 	Improving	P. Adams
11	A failure to recruit and retain key staff could lead to a lack of leadership and possible deterioration of services.	6 Medium 	Met target	A. Gibson
12	Financial deficits for the trading units (eg CTD, Legal Services) or loss of external income for unforeseen reasons (eg Registrars) will lead to budget overspends and reductions in services.	6 Medium 	Met target	P Adams

**Detailed risk updates**

<b>Risk Name &amp; Description</b>			
<p><b>Risk No. 1</b> – The risk of failure of ICT, as a result of a major incident, infrastructure failure or other breakdowns. As NCC is now very ICT dependent in the delivery of services, any prolonged failure would lead to significant disruption.</p>			
<b>Risk Owner</b>	<b>Risk Score</b>	<b>Aspiration Score</b>	<b>Aspiration Date</b>
Paul Adams	15 High ▲ (3x5)	10 High (2x5)	on going
<b>Date Entered on Register</b>	<b>Prospects</b>		
2007	Uncertain		
<b>Risk Progress</b>			
<p>The ICT Security Forum meets regularly and areas of high risk are prioritised for action. Implementation of the Medium Term Plan is progressing well, incorporating actions to improve disaster recovery and business continuity. Implementation of the Support Services Review has improved resilience by bringing together skills and experience and enabling the consolidation of risk management for the whole organisation. The challenge is that significantly reducing the likelihood of this risk is dependent on continuing financial investment in back up systems and facilities. In the current economic climate, funding restraints make this less likely, meaning the prospects of this risk being at target are viewed as uncertain.</p>			
<b>Tasks to mitigate the risk</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implement ICT Medium Term Plan</li> <li>• Improve risk management processes</li> <li>• Maintain overall ICT Risk Register</li> <li>• Maintain risk registers for all major ICT projects</li> </ul>			
<b>Corporate Objective</b>			
CP00A – Customer Focus			

**Detailed risk updates**

<b>Risk Name &amp; Description</b>			
<b>Risk No. 2</b> – Establishing a Norwich Unitary Council may cause significant disruption to the department and could divert resources away from service delivery. This will put at risk the achievement of objectives and the meeting of performance targets			
<b>Risk Owner</b>	<b>Risk Score</b>	<b>Aspiration Score</b>	<b>Aspiration Date</b>
Paul Adams	12 High ▲ (3x4)	12 High (3x4)	March 2011
<b>Date Entered on Register</b>	<b>Prospects</b>		
April 2010	Uncertain		
<b>Risk Progress</b>			
<p>Legislation has now been passed to create a new City of Norwich unitary council based upon its current boundaries. This is due to take effect from 1 April 2011, in advance of Norwich elections in May 2011. An implementation executive has been set up which is being led by the City Council leader.</p> <p>The Council has brought a High Court Judicial Review against the government and this is due to be heard in late April.</p> <p>Should there be a change of government following the general election, this may also impact on the implementation of a unitary Norwich.</p> <p>The risk has prospects of “Uncertain” even though the actual risk score and the aspiration score are the same because this risk might have to be re-rated higher in the event that a unitary Norwich has to be set up by April 2011.</p>			
<b>Tasks to mitigate the risk</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Carefully consider what extra resources will be required to implement unitary change</li> <li>• Ensure that sufficient resources are in place</li> <li>• Maintain strong programme management arrangements to prioritise activity</li> </ul>			
<b>Corporate Objective</b>			
This does not fit with any of our corporate objectives			

**Detailed risk updates**

<b>Risk Name &amp; Description</b>			
<p><b>Risk No. 3</b> – Failure to recognise that there needs to be sufficient capacity at the Corporate Centre as resources are switched to front line services as a result of funding constraints. Leading to key staff becoming overloaded and a failure to drive the organisation forward in key areas, such as performance management and partnership development.</p>			
<b>Risk Owner</b>	<b>Risk Score</b>	<b>Aspiration Score</b>	<b>Aspiration Date</b>
Paul Adams	12 High ▲ (4x3)	6 Medium (2x3)	on going
<b>Date Entered on Register</b>	<b>Prospects</b>		
2007	Uncertain		
<b>Risk Progress</b>			
<p>Capacity at the Corporate Centre has been retained to date, but the quantity of change initiatives will continue to put pressure on this area. The establishment of the Corporate Programme Office will allow us to better manage pressures.</p>			
<b>Tasks to mitigate the risk</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrate value of capacity at centre</li> <li>• Engage wider group in activities</li> <li>• Prioritise work</li> </ul>			
<b>Corporate Objective</b>			
CP00A – Customer Focus			

# Corporate Risk Register Summary

(as reported to Audit Committee – 29 April 2010)

CAO&S – 12 May 2010

Appendix 3

No.	Risk Description	Risk Score	Prospect	Risk Owner
<b>0207</b>	Failure to match supply to the increased demand for Adult Social Services as a result of demographic change and lack of available budgets. Leads to an inability to meet the need for home care and residential services (in particular for the growing number of people with dementia and vulnerable people at home) through direct provision, third party provision and direct payments.	16 Very High ▲	<b>Not on Target</b>	H Bodmer
<b>3389</b>	The level of commissioning partners contributions to services, through the Learning Difficulties Pooled Fund and Continuing Care System, could fail to match the needs in the ASSD budget plan for 2009/10. This could expose the authority to financial risk leading to service fragmentation and ultimately an inability to provide some services.	16 Very High ▲	<b>Revised target date</b>	H Bodmer
<b>9829</b>	Inability to meet Learning Difficulties savings targets through PBB exercise and unpredictable service demand leads to over/under estimating cost pressures and setting inaccurate contributions and recovery plan targets to balance the budget.	16 Very High ▲	<b>Not on Target</b>	H Bodmer
<b>0201</b>	Failure to implement the northern distributor route (NDR). This would result in the inability to implement the remainder of the NATS strategy including pedestrian enhancements in the city centre, public transport improvements, traffic management in the suburbs, reductions in accidents and would result in an increase in congestion affecting public transport reliability. It would also result in a reduction in our capacity for economic development and negatively impact on the reputation of Norfolk County Council.	16 Very High ▲	<b>Not on Target</b>	M Jackson
<b>5207</b>	Strategic and operational plans could be delayed due to uncertainty around the outcome of the current Unitary proposals. This could impact upon partnership developments and proposals for future service developments.	16 Very High ▲	<b>Not on Target</b>	P Adams
<b>NEW</b>	Lack of available budgets to fund the outcome of the Personal Care at Home proposal and unpredictable demand for the service leads to over/under estimating cost pressures and setting inaccurate recovery plan targets to balance the budget.	15 High ▲	<b>NEW</b>	H Bodmer

# Corporate Risk Register Summary

(as reported to Audit Committee – 29 April 2010)

CAO&S – 12 May 2010

Appendix 3

No.	Risk Description	Risk Score	Prospect	Risk Owner
0199	Failure to divert biodegradable municipal waste from landfill leads to the authority being unable to meet the landfill directive targets. This results in significant fines and other penalties and increased landfill costs and adverse impact on Norfolk County Council's reputation.	15 High ▲	On target	M Jackson
6561	Failure to reduce delayed transfers of care in Norfolk could result in increased costs, poorer outcomes for people and a worsened performance score for Norfolk	12 High ▲	Revised target date	H Bodmer
8679	Protracted downturn in the UK economy leading to increases in the demand for the Council's services and adverse pressure on the Council's income. If the national and regional economic situation continues to deteriorate, this could lead to an increased likelihood of bad debts and fraud; a reduction in the number of key suppliers; and potentially, inflated prices for goods and services. It could also lead to increased demand for some services.	12 High ▲	Target Attained	P Brittain
0214	Increased pressure on the Council's finances arising from inflationary, demographic/demand, legislative and employer pension contributions leading to cost demands exceeding available resources from government formula grant and council tax income. This in turn could lead to reductions in service and performance, including in the Council's capital investment programme in order to balance the finances at appropriate levels of tax increase.	12 High ▲	On target	P Brittain
0202	Failure to achieve an investment of resources into early intervention and prevention and more formalised multi-agency working. Results in a delay to establishing new ways of working in line with the Older People's Strategy.	12 High ▲	On Target	H Bodmer
11210	Unforeseen extreme weather event (e.g. severe flooding, storm surge, windstorms, heatwave) causes major disruption to council services and/or assets, leading to unforeseen costs and budget pressures, delayed programmes of work and disruption to communities and businesses, with the attendant reputational risk.	12 High ▲	On Target	M Jackson

**Corporate Risk Register Summary**  
(as reported to Audit Committee – 29 April 2010)

**CAO&S – 12 May 2010**  
**Appendix 3**

No.	Risk Description	Risk Score	Prospect	Risk Owner
11211	Failure to secure resources to reduce the carbon footprint of our operations in 2009/10 and beyond or to prepare adequately for the Carbon Reduction Commitment (carbon trading) could lead to steeply rising energy bills, financial penalties under CRC and poor performance on NI185 under CAA. This would have a negative impact on Council's reputation for providing value for money and community leadership on climate change.	12 High ▲	On Target	M Jackson
8680	NCC investments in financial institutions fail to be fully repaid in accordance with contract terms leading to loss of interest, loss of investments and loss of reputation.	10 High ▲	Revised target date	P Brittain
0215	Major incident at County Hall. Risk of major disruption to services delivered from County Hall following a major incident (e.g., fire, flood, explosion or loss of power) leads to County Hall being unavailable for use, which impacts on delivery of IT and communications and how they support service delivery.	10 High ▲	On target	M Jackson
3390	Risk of influenza pandemic affecting service delivery which could lead to critical services unable to function with severely curtailed resources.	9 Medium ●	Target Attained	M Jackson
0200	Failure to ensure sufficient capacity within the organisation to effect changes and secure investment opportunities.	9 Medium ●	On target	P Adams