

MINUTES of the meeting of the **COUNCIL OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE** held at 10.00 am on 13 March 2013 at Ashcombe Suite, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its meeting on Wednesday, 17 April 2013.

Members:

- * Mr Mel Few (Chairman)
- * Mr David Harmer (Vice-Chairman)
- Mr Mark Brett-Warburton
- * Mr Stephen Cooksey
- * Mr Steve Cosser
- * Mrs Clare Curran
- * Mr Eber A Kington
- * Dr Zully Grant-Duff
- * Mrs Sally Ann B Marks
- * Mr Steve Renshaw
- * Mr Nick Skellett CBE
- Mr Chris Townsend
- Mrs Denise Turner-Stewart
- * Mr Richard Walsh
- * Mrs Hazel Watson

Ex-officio Members:

Mrs Lavinia Sealy, Chairman of the County Council
Mr David Munro, Vice Chairman of the County Council

Substitutions:

Mr Tom Phelps-Penry

Present:

Mr Peter Martin, Deputy Leader
Mr Tony Samuels, Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration Programmes

* = present

27/13 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Mark Brett-Warburton, Denise Turner-Stewart and Chris Townsend. Tom Phelps-Penry acted as a substitute for Chris Townsend.

28/13 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING: 1 FEBRUARY 2013 & 13 FEBRUARY 2013 [Item 2]

These were agreed as an accurate record of the meetings.

29/13 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were no declarations of interest.

30/13 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4]

There were no questions or petitions to report.

31/13 RESPONSES FROM THE CABINET TO ISSUES REFERRED BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE [Item 5]

There were no issues referred by the Committee at its last meeting, so there were no responses to report.

32/13 RECOMMENDATION TRACKER [Item 6]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses: None.

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Committee was informed that in reference to COSC 132 the following update had been provided by the Transformation and Development Manager: "There have been a number of technical difficulties in the build of the Finance Dashboard but the project team have worked hard to overcome these difficulties and are in the process of testing the technical solution. However, these difficulties have resulted in a delay in the planned go live. A project healthcheck is being undertaken this week and the project plan is being revised to reflect activities outstanding and resource requirements to ensure that there are no further delays to the project. A full update will be presented to Council Overview & Scrutiny Committee in April 2013."
2. It was noted that details of the influence of Select Committee recommendations on the Cabinet (COSC94) would be reported as part of the 2012/2013 Scrutiny Annual Report at the April 2013 meeting.

Recommendations:

None.

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

Committee Next Steps:

The Committee will receive an update regarding the progress of the implementation of the financial dashboard at the April 2013 meeting.

33/13 FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 7]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses: None.

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Committee was asked to note that two additional items had been added to the Forward Work Programme for April 2013. These were a progress report on the implementation of the financial dashboard, and a discussion around potential future agenda items for the Committee.
2. The individual Select Committee Chairmen were invited to give verbal summary on the status of their respective Select Committee Task Groups.
3. The Chairman of Environment & Transport informed the Committee that the following Task Groups would continue their work in order to monitor the progress and implementation of their recommendations: Countryside Management Task Group, Utilities Task Group, and the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Task Group. It was commented that the work related to the Prioritisation of Highways and Highways Structures Maintenance Task Group would be monitored at a Local Committee level.
4. The Chairman of Communities Select Committee commented that the Engagement with High Needs Area in Surrey Task group would commence its work after May 2013. Both the Fire Governance Review Members Reference Group, and the Combined Cultural Services PVR Implementation Members Reference Group would both continue their work after May 2013.
5. The Chairman of Communities Select Committee commented that the Registration Members Reference Group and Library Members Reference Group had both concluded their work. It was queried whether the savings proposed by the reduction in mobile libraries and the introduction of Community Partnership Libraries had been validated. The Chairman of Communities Select Committee confirmed that this would be followed up with the Service.
6. The Chairman of the Children & Families Select Committee informed the Committee that the Supporting Families Task Group was due to make its recommendations to Cabinet. Following this, monitoring would be conducted both by Local Committees and the Children & Families Select Committee. It was commented that the programmes were being implemented on a District & Borough level, but that the Children & Families Select Committee would monitor how the programmes co-ordinated strategically at a County level.
7. Members raised that the Communication Review Members Reference Group was not included on the Task Group Tracker. It was confirmed that this would be updated.

Recommendations:

None.

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

Committee Next Steps:

None.

34/13 FOLLOW UP OF TASK GROUP REPORT ON THE MANAGEMENT OF VACANCIES [Item 8]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses: Neil Bradley, HR Group Manager

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Committee was provided with a report that outlined the proposals for implementing recommendations following the Task Group report on the Management of Vacancies. It was highlighted that there was a level of complexity in the relationships between staff budgets, contracted staff and agency staff. The Committee was informed that there were two specific areas in terms of where the control of costs lay: with the authority to recruit and with the establishment budget.
2. Members commented that the proposed actions addressed the recommendations and offered clearer definitions around staff vacancies. It was noted that the next step would be to begin discussions with individual services for comment on the feasibility of the proposals.
3. Members queried whether the difficulty of identifying agency and bank staff occupying contracted vacancies on the Organisational Management structure was a technical or organisational issue. The HR Group Manager clarified that the tagging of positions within the Organisational Management structure would potentially create a significant additional volume of work if applied to every agency worker however short their tenure. The Committee was informed that there were 120 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) work vacancies at any one time, with over 200 new appointments a month. It was also outlined that Manpower provided over 400 shifts a month in a diverse range of roles. As consequence it would not be feasible to map every position covered on a temporary basis, but it was confirmed that there would be efforts to tag OM where agency workers or locum staff were covering a vacancy for a medium term.
4. Members asked for clarification about the term "delimited". The HR Group Manager confirmed that the Organisational Management structure would hold vacant positions until a budget was reduced. At that stage the vacant post would be removed from the structure.

5. One Member raised concerns about the number of temporary staff who could become entitled for staff benefits and rights over the long-term, and what legal implications might come as a result of this. It was suggested that the Council should be looking to reduce the number of temporary workers that it employed. The HR Group Manager commented that there was a positive aspect to maintaining a degree of flexibility through the use of temporary workers, as this enabled services to meet increases in volumes or funding reduced. The Committee was informed that agency workers are the employees of the agency for example, Manpower.
6. Members queried the volume of appointments that were being made on a monthly basis. It was clarified that this included internal and external appointments, with a roughly even split between the two. The Committee raised a question about the number of internal appointments being made, but it was clarified that this included restructuring and transfers between positions, as well as internal promotions.
7. Members commented that they would like to see an analysis of how the use of temporary staff was distributed across the Council's services.

Recommendations:

- a) That the proposals outlined within the report are explored with Directorate leadership teams to confirm their feasibility.
- b) That a further progress update is provided to the Committee following the feasibility assessment.

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

Committee Next Steps:

None.

35/13 BUDGET MONITORING [Item 9]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses: Kevin Kilburn, Financial Reporting Manager

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Chairman of the Select Committee provided an update on the discussions held by the Finance Sub-Group in relation to the January 2013 budget report. It was noted that there was a favourable variance of £3.5 million within the Properties budget. There were also an underspend of £1 million in the planned maintenance budget, and

savings of £1.2 million in relation to the Carbon Reduction Commitment (CRC) budget. This saving was a result of a reduction in the likelihood of a fine from the CRC commission.

2. The Committee was informed that these savings were offset against an overspend of £1.7 million within the Information Management Technology (IMT) budget. This was attributed to changes in the network that did not take place within the projected timeframe. It had been highlighted that a number of the savings were being made through the management of vacancies, and would not be guaranteed in the future.
3. Members asked for clarification around the £0.2 million increase in spending in the Customer & Communities budget. It was confirmed that this was in part due to a number of late invoices in relation to the Olympics look and feel government grant.
4. Members raised a query regarding the savings being made by the Strategic Director for Customers & Communities acting as Chief Executive for Mole Valley District Council, and when these savings would be permanently built into the directorate's budget.
5. Members raised a query about an underspend in staffing budget in relation to Highways, and asked whether further detail could be provided.

Recommendations:

None.

Actions/further information to be provided:

The Cabinet Member for Environment & Transport to be invited to the next Committee meeting to provide comment regarding the underspend in staffing budgets.

Action by: Bryan Searle/Andrew Spragg

Committee Next Steps:

None.

36/13 DETAILED SERVICE BUDGETS 2013/14 [Item 9a]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses: Kevin Kilburn, Financial Reporting Manager

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Chairman presented the key points from the Finance Sub-Group meeting to the Committee. With regards to Central Income & Expenditure it was noted that there had been an increase in the Risk Contingencies budget to £13 million. The Sub-Group had raised

projected cash-flow as a possible future item for the Committee's agenda.

2. The Chairman highlighted that a loan repayment of £68 million was due in September 2013, and that the minimum cash level had been reduced in order to repay this. The view was expressed that it may be prudent to refinance at that stage instead, given current Public Sector borrowing rates were favourable.
3. The Committee was asked to note that the Change & Efficiency budget for 2013/14 had been reduced by 2% with £1.4 million savings anticipated as being 'amber' risk. The Chairman noted that there had been an increase in the staffing budget for Shared Services and it had been confirmed that this had been a result of taking on additional staff due to partnership work. It was clarified that the increase in staffing costs had been offset against an increase in income.
4. The Committee highlighted that there was a decrease in the Transformational Change budget to £1.8 million. Members commented on the staffing figures for the Chief Executive directorate, and expressed the view that there should be a consideration around how this staffing was configured in the future.

Recommendations:

- a) That a review of staffing levels in the Chief Executive's Office be included in the Committee's future Forward Work Programme.

Action by: Andrew Spragg

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

Committee Next Steps:

None.

37/13 INTERNAL AUDIT REPORTS [Item 10]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses: Sue Lewry-Jones, Chief Internal Auditor

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Chief Internal Auditor presented a summary of the Internal Audit Reports completed since the last Committee meeting in February. There were no further comments.

Recommendations:

None.

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

Committee Next Steps:

None.

38/13 PROCUREMENT PARTNERSHIP WITH EAST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL [Item 11]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses: Laura Langstaff, Procurement & Commissioning Manager
Julie Fisher, Strategic Director for Change & Efficiency

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Procurement & Commissioning Manager gave an update as to the progress of the Procurement Partnership between East Sussex Council and Surrey County Council. The Committee was informed that there had been some staffing changes within the leadership of the Procurement team, but the view was expressed that officers were confident the structures and people in place would effectively manage any transition. It was highlighted that an interim head of service was due to be appointed in East Sussex.
2. Members asked for clarification on how the joint procurement process worked when it involved both authorities. The Procurement & Commissioning Manger explained that this process was decided on a project by project basis, in order to identify the best resource in each instance. When it was the case where the procurement relationship was already established with one authority then they would take the lead. In some cases procurement was done jointly in order to ensure that the best value for money.
3. The Strategic Director for Change & Efficiency clarified that the procurement process did not involve duplication, and that it was the case that the majority of procurement projects were undertaken using one staff member. It was highlighted that there were areas where more than one individual was required, for example in the case of particular procurement projects for Adult Social Care.
4. Members raised a question about policy differences between the two local authorities and asked for clarification about the governance arrangements for the partnership. Officers confirmed that Member oversight lay with the respective portfolio holders for each local authority. It was confirmed that they met on a regular basis to ensure a consistency of vision.
5. Members asked a question as to how differences in practice had been managed, with particular reference to Highways. It was confirmed that Surrey was seen to have an innovative approach in some areas.

However, it was also stated that joint procurement allowed both local authorities to maximise their savings. The May Gurney contract was highlighted as a positive example of this.

6. Members queried how well joint procurement reconciled with the commitment to sourcing 60% of goods and services from local businesses, given that procurement was taken across two counties. It was clarified that what was procured on a local level was category specific, and that officers were yet to see any detrimental impact on Surrey-based suppliers. The Committee was informed that the partnership was focused on common commissioning and procurement processes, and that it was not always the case of combining spend in securing one single contract. It was confirmed that there was still a focus on securing local suppliers where appropriate, particularly in cases where 2nd and 3rd tier suppliers were required. The launch of the Surrey Build portal was highlighted as a particular example of the commitment to sourcing local suppliers.
7. The Committee asked a question regarding the projected savings of £500,000 for 2012/13 and whether these had been achieved. Officers confirmed that approximately £420,000 had been achieved with the remainder being made in the early part of 2013/14. It was agreed that details of the savings split between the two authorities would be circulated to the Committee.
8. The Committee discussed possible developments and opportunities of expanding the partnership. The Strategic Director for Change & Efficiency commented that a long term ambition would be exploring the feasibility of an SE7 partnership. However, it was highlighted that there were different approaches to procurement that might prove a barrier to achieving this.

Recommendations:

None.

Actions/further information to be provided:

Details of the savings split between the two authorities to be circulated to the Committee.

Action by: Laura Langstaff

Committee Next Steps:

None.

39/13 SUPPORT FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH [Item 12]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses:

Kevin Lloyd, Senior Policy Manager

Trevor Pugh, Strategic Director for Environment & Infrastructure

Julie Fisher, Strategic Director for Change & Efficiency

Peter Martin, Deputy Leader

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Deputy Leader outlined for the Committee the details of the recent Cabinet paper on supporting economic growth. It was recognised that Surrey's economy was comparatively successful despite the national economic downturn of recent years. The Committee was informed that the paper set out ways of developing this economic growth in the future, and proposed a number of initiatives that ranged from immediately achievable to very challenging.
2. The Committee was informed that amongst the most challenging of the initiatives was addressing congestion through infrastructure improvements. It was also highlighted that there was a plan to develop an innovation agenda that would be focused on economic redevelopment and regeneration. Partnership working with both Local Economic Partnerships (LEPs) and Districts & Borough councils was recognised as an integral part of this.
3. Members raised the question of how the Council intended to proceed with approaching central Government to gain greater support for economic growth. The Deputy Leader stated that a number of conversations were taking place with civil servants about possible ways of working together, but that it was still in the early stages of the discussions.
4. There was a question raised regarding the proposals to provide small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs) with advice, support and access to finance. It was clarified that work was being undertaken with the University of Surrey to identify possibly ways of developing this. The Committee was informed that Surrey had a comparatively high number of SMEs and business start-ups.
5. The Committee asked how the Council intended to measure its success in relation to its role in supporting economic growth. The Deputy Leader highlighted Surrey Connects as sharing a common target with the Council, in that it set out an aspiration to double the size of the County's economy by 2030. The Committee was informed that this meant a 3.5-4% increase on a year by year basis.
6. Members queried what resources had been identified with regards to the plan to support economic growth. Officers commented that a large part of the Council's work already contributed to developing the economy. However, the Strategic Director for Environment & Infrastructure commented that there were identifiable budget figures that would be shared with the Committee.

7. Members commented that there was a potential role for Local Committees in improving congestion, in particular around investment for semi-regional projects. It was commented that the congestion programme developed through Surrey Futures did not identify bigger sub-regional and regional schemes that affected the Surrey economy. The Committee asked how this would be done now that the regional planning bodies had been disbanded. The Strategic Director for Environment and Infrastructure responded saying that South East England Councils (SEEC) and South East Strategic Leaders (SESL) groups had recently produced a report identifying these strategic infrastructure schemes. They would be campaigning for them with Government and also the County Council would campaign for those that would benefit the county.
8. The Committee asked for further details about the Rail Strategy. It was confirmed that this was in development, but it would be a long-term piece of work. This was due in part to the need to have input into the franchise agreements, and also to ensure suitable long-term input to the works programmes of the rail companies. It was also highlighted that Surrey Future was consulting on both the rail strategy and the congestion strategy.
9. Members asked for clarification around how the proposals to support economic development worked in conjunction with the Strategic Asset Management plan, in particular on a District & Borough level. The Deputy Leader commented that there was a positive challenge at looking at opportunities to get the best use out of the County Council's properties. The Strategic Director for Change & Efficiency commented that this would be included in the Strategic Asset Management Plan.
10. Members commented that there was a high demand for small business units, and that the District & Borough Councils were often not in a position to develop these given the current emphasis to provide housing. The Deputy Leader commented that there were a number of possibilities in redeveloping unoccupied office spaces. The Strategic Director for Environment & Infrastructure commented that part of the intention of Surrey Future was to secure a greater consensus with District & Boroughs around planning decisions, as well as planning policies that support economic growth.
11. Members highlighted the possibility of alternative options to address congestion, such as improvements to the bus services. Officers recognised there was a need to investigate a range of options, highlighted amongst these were the possibility of park & ride services, as well as securing additional monies for cycling schemes.
12. The Committee commented on the development strategy for encouraging tourism and asked for further details with regards to this. The Deputy Leader commented that the success of the Olympics had highlighted a number of possible opportunities to raise Surrey's profile as a tourism destination.
13. Members asked for clarification with regards to the proposals for asset backed investments. The Deputy Leader commented that a number of exciting opportunities had emerged from the Localism Act, and that

there was a recognised risk to reward ratio with regards to these. It was confirmed that Members would be given the opportunity to challenge any specific individual proposals that came out of this work.

14. It was highlighted that there needed to be further consideration around the likely increase in housing and how this would impact on infrastructure.
15. Members raised concerns that the principle focus of the report was on west Surrey, and queried what consideration had been given to the east of the County. The Deputy Leader commented that the focus was on where the majority of current economic activity was based. However, the Committee was asked to note that there was a great deal of work in progress with Reigate and Banstead. It was also raised that particular District & Borough Councils had been more engaged in discussing economic development than others.
16. The Committee praised the long-term strategic view that the report was taking, and Members commented that they would like to see suitable forums to be able to discuss these matters.

Recommendations:

None.

Actions/further information to be provided:

The Strategic Director for Environment & Infrastructure to provide budget figures in relation to the support for economic growth.

Committee Next Steps:

None.

40/13 PROPERTY SERVICES: STRATEGIC ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN [Item 13]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses:

Tony Samuels, Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration Programmes
John Stebbings, Chief Property Officer

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Committee and officers agreed that the nature of the Strategic Asset Management Plan did not require discussions to be held in Part 2.
2. The Committee was informed that the Strategic Asset Management Plan was intended to be a reference point for officers within Property Services. It was commented that the principal drafting had been undertaken by the various departments within the service, the intention

being to create an evolving document. It was clarified that a series of actions plans sat behind the Strategic Asset Management Plan, and that these would be updated as new elements developed. The Committee was invited to make comments on the draft plan, which was due to be published in the forthcoming week.

3. Members commented on concerns with regards to current office occupancy, and asked when a review would be undertaken to address low occupancy. The Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration confirmed that there was ongoing work to address this. It was stated that survey data would be essential for deciding what the next steps would be in terms of addressing occupancy concerns; however, it was also highlighted that there was a need for this data to be accurate. The Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration informed the Committee that office occupancy was considered a priority for Property Services.
4. Members queried the absence of overall financial targets contained within the Strategic Asset Management Plan and asked for clarification around the drivers behind the document. The Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration commented that the main objective of the Strategic Asset Management Plan had been developing a one team approach and ethos. The paper was intended to bring together Property Services under one framework to ensure they were co-ordinating better. The schools building programme and its co-ordination in relation to the increase in demand to schools was highlighted as being a successful example of this one team approach. The Chief Property Officer clarified that the financial targets were embedded in the contracts, and that the Strategic Asset Management Plan was intended as a reference document that defined the joined-up process and acted as a starting point for the work of Property Services.
5. Members asked for clarification regarding the proposals for the rural estates, in particular what was meant by the development of new income streams. The Chief Property Officer commented that the intention was to enhance rural estates, with an identification of what would improve and benefit the estates. The setting up of apprenticeship programmes with Merrow College was highlighted as an example of what was being proposed. It was also clarified that housing would be a long term strategic consideration, but was not currently planned as part of the development of the Council's rural estates. Members commented that this needed to be made clearer in the documentation, as the current wording was felt to be too ambiguous regarding the proposals for rural estates.
6. The Committee raised a query regarding the decision to assess estate potential for biomass energy production. It was clarified that this was viewed as a way of adding value, not changing how rural estates operated but exploring opportunities to develop the estates, as well as support occupants.
7. Members raised concerns around the backlog of maintenance in relation to Schools properties. It was highlighted that the Internal Audit Report in relation to building maintenance (included in the agenda papers under Item 10) had raised concerns regarding the number of

works categorised as condition “C” or “D” (major defects/ life expired, potential imminent failure). Members asked how many of the identified backlog would fall into the aforementioned condition categories. The Chief Property Officer agreed to share this information with the Committee. It was also highlighted that there was funding available from central government to assist with addressing these issues, and that Property Services would be preparing a bid.

8. It was noted that all schools had been invited to participate in discussions about Buy-Back schemes, but Members were asked to let the Chief Property Officer know of any schools which were unaware of the scheme.
9. The Chairman of the Select Committee commented that the proposed actions coming out of the Strategic Asset Management Plan relied on the Property Asset Management Systems (PAMS) being operational. Officers were asked to comment on how confident they felt regarding the implementation of PAMS. The Chief Property Officer confirmed that PAMS would be operational by 2 April 2013. The Committee was informed that bi-weekly meetings were taking place with Property Services and IMT to ensure that the work was progressing on time.
10. The Committee raised a question regarding the approvals of capital projects, and what provision was being made to ensure local member involvement and consultation. The Chief Property Officer commented that a monthly “drop-in” meeting had been set up for Members to engage with Property Services, and that there would also be a refresh of this provision after May 2013. The Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration commented that there was a need for Members and officers to liaise more closely, given an increasing awareness in properties and asset management.
11. Members asked for clarification of the role of the Properties Cluster. The Chief Property Officer outlined that this was a partnership between Surrey County Council, Hampshire County Council and Reading Borough Council, and was aimed at delivering large capital works. An example of this was the large schools project undertaken by the Properties Cluster.
12. Members asked when an investment strategy would be finalised. It was confirmed that this would be published by the summer 2013. A question was raised with regards to the proposed Community Asset Transfer scheme. The Chief Property Officer confirmed that this scheme would enable communities to take on the management of assets that were recognised as being of significant community value.
13. Members raised a question regarding the action plans that were being developed in conjunction with the Strategic Asset Management Plan, and what processes were in place to enable these to be subject to Member scrutiny. It was further added that there was still felt to be a lack of clarity about how the success of the Strategic Asset Management Plan would be measured. The Chief Property Officer confirmed that the document formed the basis of the key actions, with the targets sitting below each of the identified action. The Committee was informed that each action had an identified timeline and criteria,

and that these would be available to scrutiny following the identification of owners for each action. The Committee was informed that this would be anticipated in the coming few months, following the plan's publication. The view was expressed that the measurable success of the Strategic Asset Management Plan would be a cultural shift within the service. Members raised the point that they would like to see the Key Performance Indicators (KPI) for the cultural shift to be based around energy consumption, value of the estate and revenue generated. The Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration confirmed that these would be included in the finalised action plans.

14. The Committee commented that the links between the corporate strategy and the Strategic Asset Management Plan should be made more explicit within the final version of the plan.

Recommendations:

- That a further report is made in July 2013 regarding the outcomes of the Strategic Asset Management Plan following its publication.

Action by: John Stebbings

Actions/further information to be provided:

The Chief Property Officer to provide information with regards the number of repairs in the identified schools maintenance backlog fall within "C" or "D" categorisation.

Committee Next Steps:

The Committee will receive an update at its meeting in July 2013.

41/13 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 17]

It was noted that the next meeting of the Committee would be on 17 April 2013 at 10am.

Meeting ended at: 12.55 pm

Chairman