

**MINUTES** of the meeting of the **RESOURCES AND PERFORMANCE SELECT COMMITTEE** held at 10.00 am on 1 July 2020 as a REMOTE MEETING.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its meeting on Thursday, 8 October 2020.

**Elected Members:**

- \* Mr Nick Harrison (Chairman)
- \* Mr Will Forster (Vice-Chairman)
- \* Mr Graham Knight (Vice-Chairman)
- \* Ms Ayesha Azad
- \* Mr Chris Botten
- \* Mr Mark Brett-Warburton
- Mr Graham Ellwood
- \* Mr Bob Gardner
- \* Mr Naz Islam
- \* Rachael I. Lake
- \* Dr Peter Szanto
- \* Mr Chris Townsend

**1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]**

The meeting was delayed and started at 10:19am. Apologies were received from Graham Ellwood.

**2 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS: 24 JANUARY 2020 [Item 2]**

The minutes were agreed as a true record of the meeting.

**3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

Rachael Lake declared an interest as a family member is an employee of Surrey County Council.

**4 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4]**

Cllr Jonathan Essex submitted a question in advance of the meeting, which can be found in the meeting agenda, alongside officers' response.

As a supplementary question, Cllr Essex asked for details of what had been submitted to government and Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) as alluded to in paragraph two of the prior response, and how the Council was integrating the actions of the approved climate strategy with the economic strategy, including building insulation and sustainable transport, the two areas with the highest employment potential according to the Local Government Association report mentioned.

A written copy of the Executive Director's response and the schemes submitted to the LEPs are annexed to these minutes.

**5 2019/20 OUTTURN, COVID-19 COSTS & FUNDING & BUDGET LESSONS LEARNED [Item 5]**

**Witnesses:**

Anna D'Alessandro, Director of Corporate Finance

Mel Few, Cabinet Member for Resources

Leigh Whitehouse, Executive Director of Resources

Rachel Wigley, Director of Financial Insight

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. The Director of Corporate Finance presented headlines of the report. At outturn of the financial year 2019/20, a small surplus of £200,000 had been delivered on revenue. All services had contributed to this surplus. £2.6m had been added to the contingency, as well as £2.8m that had been added to the general fund reserve. In 2019/20, £82m of efficiencies had to be delivered, and there was slippage of £9.5m, comparing favourably to slippage of £22m in 2018/19.
2. The Director continued to explain that there had been two tranches of Covid-19 funding from government, totalling £47m. Of that, £900,000 had been spent on Covid-related costs and income loss in 2019/20, and the rest would be carried forward to 2020/21. A 'Delta 2' return had been submitted to the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) on 15 May. Work conducted with finance business partners had identified that £4.3m of efficiencies would be undeliverable because of Covid. The reporting to MHCLG was consistent with what other counties were reporting.

*Ayesha Azad joined the meeting at 10:33am.*

3. After the 2020/21 budget, the Finance team had conducted an extensive 'wash-up' exercise in partnership with Democratic Services around Select Committee involvement in the budget process. For the 2021/22 budget, Select Committees would be involved in the process more and earlier, conducting two rounds of scrutiny in September-October and December. The 2021/22 budget would be discussed at the first round of budget scrutiny in September/October 2020 and the second round in December 2020.
4. A Member noted that there had been an improvement in the final month of the year, with £5.6m additional savings. He asked why this had come so late and whether services were holding back savings until the end of the year. The Director of Corporate Finance said that the latter was not the case and services worked hard to achieve efficiencies all year. Sometimes efficiency needs did not become clear until the end of the year, as well as certain events that could only be undertaken at year-end from a Corporate Finance perspective. She acknowledged that the Council still had some way to go to refine forecasting. The Cabinet Member for Resources added that paragraph six of the report showed explanations for the delivery of efficiencies in month 11.
5. A Member remarked that in the years she had been a Surrey county councillor, she did not remember Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) ever coming within budget, despite promises that the numbers would be brought under control. Were there assurances that it would now be under control without this being detrimental to young people? The Director of Financial Insight responded that there

was now a transformation programme board chaired by Julie Iles as well as other relevant scrutiny. In 2019/20, there had been a £29m overspend had been projected; in reality, the overspend had been £1m higher than this, at £30m. The SEND overspend target for 2020/21 was £24m, and at the moment the Council was on target to achieve this; it was a top priority. The Executive Director of Resources acknowledged the long-standing nature of this issue and said it was a high-value and volatile area. At the moment, the Council was stuck between not being able to recognise SEND as a general fund pressure and not being funded for the pressure as part of the schools delegated budgets. In relation to the above point, a Member commented that surely projecting an overspend every year meant that the budget was incorrect in the first place. Was the Council being overoptimistic or setting our budget incorrectly? The Director of Financial Insight explained that SEND expenditure was funded through the dedicated schools grant (which came from the government), so in effect the Council was not being given enough government funding for SEND. New rules had been brought in that prohibited the Council from using its general fund for SEND expenditure. The Council was trying to bring SEND costs down. The Executive Director added that the Council was providing for the overspend and setting it aside on the balance sheet.

6. A Member referred to the £900,000 recovery relating to Children's services and asked what this entailed. The Director of Financial Insight replied that she did not have that information to hand and would respond to this outside the meeting.
7. The topic of performance data, particularly with regards to areas that fell outside this Select Committee's remit, was raised, and the Executive Director said that he was working on bringing performance data to other Select Committees.
8. Regarding Covid-19 related costs, a Member asked whether the Council had now received funding from the government for the Test and Trace system. Considering that Surrey was a leader in the South East, and that Surrey County Council's normal Public Health grant was one of the lowest in the country, the £3.5m Test and Trace funding seemed quite low. Would the Council supplement this using its own budget? The Executive Director responded that the funding was based on historic Public Health grant allocations, which could be problematic for Surrey County Council due to its low funding in the past. If more was needed, the same principles would apply as other Covid related spending. The Member enquired whether there was an indicative budget on how much Test and Trace would cost in total – how much more or less than £3.5m would it be? The Executive Director said that at the moment they were waiting for the Test and Trace plan to be finalised; once it was, they would conduct the appropriate reviews to ensure there was sufficient funding.
9. A Member queried whether there had been any feedback from the government on the Council's monthly Covid costs submissions. The report states that the Delta 2 submission to MHCLG (in May 2020) had forecast unmet efficiencies due to Covid of £15.8m, but that this had since been revised to £4.3m. A Member raised this and asked why this had changed. The Director of Corporate Finance said work had been done to determine in which services efficiencies would not be delivered, and the £4.3m represented unmet efficiencies in adult social care (ASC). She would share details of the movement from £15.8m to £4.3m. For Delta 1 (April 2020), there had not been a steer from

central government on how to fill in the Delta form, leading to discrepancies between different Local Authorities (LAs), so Grant Thornton had been commissioned by the County Councils Network to compare different LAs, which had since led to increased consistency.

10. A Member asked how infection control funding from government was distributed to care homes. The Executive Director explained that Surrey had been allocated around £19m for infection control in care homes, three quarters of which would be channelled straight to care homes. The remaining quarter could only be distributed to care homes once they had reached certain criteria to demonstrate implementation of effective infection control.
11. A Member praised the Council's initiative in setting up the Seacole Centre at Headley Court<sup>1</sup> and asked whether the building and equipment were leased or purchased. The Director of Financial Insight replied that the Council's involvement in that had been to prepare the building for the NHS, so the Council's spending on that would be fully reimbursed by the NHS. The Executive Director added that Headley Court was a privately owned property that had been leased until November at the earliest. The equipment was all owned by the NHS.

**Recommendations:**

1. That a summary of the following be presented in the next report at the October Select Committee meeting:
  - a. the latest financial situation around COVID-19 and the latest information regarding the government's Test and Trace programme;
  - b. the updated assessment of the impact of COVID-19 on Surrey County Council's short- and medium-term financial position; and
  - c. the financial support being provided to the Council's most vulnerable.

**Actions/further information to be provided:**

1. The Director of Financial Insight to provide details on the £900,000 recovery in Children's services;
2. The Director of Corporate Finance to share details of why the forecast efficiencies unmet due to Covid changed from £15.8m (Delta 2) to £4.3m.

**6 MIDAS HOUSE CANCELLATION DECISION [Item 6]**

**Witnesses:**

Michael Coughlin, Executive Director of Transformation, Partnerships and Prosperity

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. The Executive Director introduced the report. It focused on the decision to cancel the move of County Hall to Midas House in Woking, which was taken under the uncertainty of Covid. There were four key strands to the decision: the impact on staffing, digital capabilities, property implications, and communications and change management.

---

<sup>1</sup> One of the Nightingale hospitals set up to ensure sufficient capacity for Covid patients.

The Moving Closer to Residents (MCTR) programme would continue to be progressed in autumn 2020.

2. A Member remarked that the decision to cancel the move to Midas House appeared to have been made very quickly. The Select Committee wished for more detail on this decision – firstly, the revised timetable for the move of County Hall. Would the County Hall still be based in Kingston after the May 2021 election? The Executive Director responded that the Council would continue to market the current County Hall building in Kingston in the uncertain property market, working with the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames. Surrey County Council was also reviewing its wider property portfolio in line with quantitative and qualitative research on how staff had been working during the pandemic. It was, however, impossible to put a strict timeframe on the programme at the moment.
3. A Member referred to the £183,000 figure of costs associated with the cancelled move to Midas House. This was detailed in the answer to a Member's question at the full Council meeting on 19 May 2020, which was annexed to the report on the agenda for this Select Committee meeting. Was this figure still up to date and comprehensive, and what was the current budget allocation? The Executive Director said that £183,000 was the final cost and fees; no further costs had been incurred since the cancellation decision.
4. A Member asked what the primary reason for cancelling the decision was. Had the Council been unsure anyway and used Covid as an excuse? The Executive Director stated that Midas House had been a serious contender, and the Council would not have progressed as it did if it had not been serious. However, the pandemic hit as negotiations progressed beyond heads of terms into deeper legal considerations, and with the acceleration of the number of staff members working from home, it became clear that the Council was not going to need a building of the size or nature of Midas House. The decision was made quickly in order not to incur any more costs. There were no other, hidden reasons. The strategic intent remained to move staff out of the Kingston County Hall.
5. A Member expressed concern about how the cancellation would affect the Council's credibility among councillors and, principally, the general public. He asserted that the communications regarding what happened had been poor and Surrey's credibility had been damaged. There would be credibility issues with any future move of County Hall. The Executive Director accepted the Member's comments on communications – when the decision was taken on 23 April 2020, the country was in lockdown because of Covid, so the Midas House communications may have been lost among other communications. The Council had communicated with staff, but it might not have conducted enough public communications. No one could be sure about the impact of Covid in the future, but the Council was attempting to plan for the future wherever possible.
6. A Member remarked that there had been issues with Midas House all along; for example, there was not a space for a council chamber, and there had been issues with the tenants moving out. Was due diligence conducted before the Council made the initial decision to move there, and what learning had been taken from the experience to ensure that there due diligence was conducted in future? The Executive Director said that the Council had considered 18 buildings across the county and taken a range of factors into account. The decision had been

brought to Cabinet and this Select Committee, and there was a specific working group assigned to the programme. Midas House had not been the wrong building at the time; rather Covid and lockdown had brought about change on a large scale. The extent to which staff were able to work and conduct meetings from home changed the amount of office space that would be needed going forward.

7. A Member expressed concern about the impact on staff, some of whom had made lifestyle changes or financial decisions based on the anticipated move to Midas House, such as early redundancy or moving house. Had the impact on staff been looked into? The Executive Director declared that the Council was committed to taking staff into account, and an all-staff survey on agile working was being undertaken. The Council wished to enable staff to work from home or near home where appropriate, and have access to an office if necessary. The communications effort would be informed by this work. The Member acknowledged that this was a positive way to conduct the programme in future, but it did not take into account the way staff had been affected by the cancellation already.
8. A Member suggested that the cancellation could have a net financial benefit for the Council, because office space may have less value in future due to the decrease in demand since the pandemic.
9. A Member indicated that there had been issues with the energy efficiency of Midas House. Would energy efficiency be a factor in the selection of a new County Hall building? The Executive Director affirmed that as the Council had adopted the climate change strategy, energy efficiency would be key in any new building. Moreover, while there had been issues with the energy efficiency of Midas House, the Council had begun work on how it would improve this.
10. A Member asked whether Woking was the only location the Council was considering for a new County Hall location. The Executive Director confirmed that the intention remained for Woking to be the prime location. The Council had undertaken travel analysis for staff, in which it had found Woking and Guildford would involve similar travel times and ease of access for staff, in particular for staff living in and around Kingston upon Thames. While Woking remained a preference, there would be further review when the working from home data was analysed. A number of Members suggested that locations other than Woking, including Guildford and other areas of the county, should be considered. The new County Hall should be accessible not only to staff, but to residents too. Another Member said that MCTR entailed a move to a number of different buildings, not only the new County Hall, and challenged the effectiveness of the way the Council had conducted its travel analysis. Woking and Guildford may be less accessible from areas other than Kingston. She suggested that the Council should look at travel times between each office site and staff members' homes. The Executive Director responded that he believed the analysis involved the home postcodes of staff working at County Hall. He acknowledged, however, that this did not include staff working at other Council offices.
11. A Member expressed concern that the Council had continued far into the process of preparing to move to Midas House, spending £183,000, without realising that there were tenants it could not move. The Executive Director said that the Council had known about the tenancy issue throughout the process, and that Woking Borough Council, the current owners of Midas House, had been transparent about it.

Woking Borough Council had been confident that two out of the three tenants would have left by May 2020, and while the other tenant would remain there a little longer, Surrey County Council had been confident that they would also move out in due course. However, this had become much more difficult when the pandemic struck.

12. A Member reflected that the Council must have learnt from this experience and the risk involved in the move of County Hall, and requested to see a list of protocols that had been modified and updated to take into account due diligence.

**Recommendations:**

The Select Committee:

1. Recommends that a comprehensive update report about the new County Hall/Civic Hub be presented to the Moving Closer to Residents Task Group for its October meeting;
2. Supports the principle of the Moving Closer to Residents programme;
3. Recommends at present that the Council's new Civic Heart should be based in either Woking or Guildford to ensure a consistent message to staff and residents and reassure staff that have already made a decision on their future.

**Actions/further information to be provided:**

1. The Executive Director of Transformation, Partnerships and Prosperity to share a list of protocols for the move of County Hall.

**7 QUARTERLY PERFORMANCE REPORT (Q4 2019/20) [Item 7]**

**Witnesses:**

Paul Booker, Corporate Health and Safety Lead Manager

Anna D'Alessandro, Director of Corporate Finance

Jackie Foglietta, Director of Human Resources and Organisational Development (HR and OD)

Susan Grizzelle, Head of Customer Services

Marie Snelling, Director of Transformation

Gary Strudwick, Head of Business Intelligence

Rachel Wigley, Director of Financial Insight

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. Discussion began on the HR section of the report. A Member noted that there were a number of unmet targets and asked what steps were being taken to address this. Were witnesses content with the range of targets and progress? The Director of HR and OD stated that the targets were set at the right level. Some were set by government – for example, the target on apprenticeships (HROD 06) – and were therefore out of the Council's control, while others were set through the transformation programme, and some took into account national benchmarking. Apprenticeships as a percentage of the workforce had stood at less than one percent 18 months ago, so progress had been made. She acknowledged that the target for indicator HROD 03 (percentage of staff under 30) was a stretch target, and the Council had been underperforming on that indicator for a number of years, but was continuing to work on attracting young people. Also, the public sector as a whole should be aiming for lower sickness levels (HROD 04). HROD 05 (off payroll workers as % of workforce) had been set up by the corporate leadership team in response to Members' concerns

on interim and agency workers. The number of off payroll workers increased slightly as a result of transformation work in SEND and the Agile programme.

2. The Director of HR and OD continued to explain that Councils had shown a one percent increase in their workforce from 1 March 2020 to 1 May 2020 due to the Covid pandemic. However, overall the Council had seen a steady decrease of employees in the last year (2019-2020). The Covid pandemic had also helped the Council to recruit to some areas where historically it had struggled, such as apprenticeships and healthcare assistant roles. On the other hand, colleges had been closed for some time due to Covid, so those undertaking apprenticeships had been unable to work on the qualification for some time.
3. A Member asked the director what could be done to continue to improve the uptake of apprenticeships. The Director explained that apprenticeship levy funding could only be used on training, so the Council still had to fund apprenticeship salaries. The Local Government Association (LGA) was lobbying government for more funding. She was of the opinion that the government had asked a lot of LAs by setting a 2.5% target for apprenticeships as a percentage of the workforce.
4. A Member stated that in 2018/19, there had been 407 employees earning over £50,000 per year; in 2019/20, this had risen to 558 employees. The Member proposed that the Council monitor the number of staff members on high salaries. The Director of HR and OD suggested that the People, Performance and Development Committee could look into this at their next meeting; however, it was noted that the Resources and Performance Select Committee should also remain updated on this, particularly with regard to the affordability of the transformation programme.
5. A Member observed that the indicator Customer 01 (ASC referrals to preventative services) had no target. She enquired when a target would be produced. The Head of Customer Services explained that it was difficult to formulate a target for this indicator, because in some cases referrals to partner organisations (as opposed to Surrey County Council ASC) were more effective and less expensive. A review was being conducted with Surrey ASC.
6. A Member asked whether all Health and Safety incidents were reviewed. The Corporate Health and Safety Lead Manager responded that all incidents reported should be reviewed. The reason the figure for indicator Health & Safety 04 (percentage of incidents reviewed) was only at 93% could be to do with timing and turnover of reviewing managers.
7. A Member noted that there were no targets for all but one of the Health and Safety indicators, and suggested that the target for these should simply be continuous improvement against the same quarter last year. The Corporate Health and Safety Lead Manager said that ideally the target would be zero incidents, but this was not realistic. He would take on board the Member's suggestion and look into continuous improvement targets for the future. Another Member suggested that the target should be 100% or zero (depending on the indicator), and if this was not met, this should be explained in an annotation. It was agreed that this could be the long-term target, while improvement on the previous year could be a short-term target.

8. A Member proposed that employee injury lost time (Health & Safety 05b) should be shown as a ratio rather than an absolute number. The Corporate Health and Safety Lead Manager informed Members that the Council assembled data around injury and incident rates, and this could be supplied at the next meeting of the Select Committee.
9. The Head of Business Intelligence introduced himself. He was new to the role and was aiming to move toward a more digital, visual, live reporting style using a software called Tableau, helping to create a transparent performance culture across the Council. The ambition was for Surrey to be an example of best practice. The Head of Business Intelligence welcomed Members' input into the new design and reset of performance reporting.
10. A Member said he would like to see the next level down of performance monitoring tools within services. The Cabinet Member for Corporate Support indicated that the new performance data style would allow Members to interact with and query data more easily; this could help the Select Committee stay up to date and identify areas of scrutiny. The Chairman suggested that Members should also look into the new performance style outside of formal committee meetings.
11. Moving onto the Transformation section of the report, a Member asked for reassurance that there was a system to ensure that staff working from home had an adequate internet connection, desk set-up and other equipment. Did the Council cover staff's internet costs? The Director of Transformation said that she recognised the swiftness with which staff had been asked to work from home, and it had not been perfect for everyone. Corporate leadership was discussing the issues mentioned and thinking about the next steps as part of the Agile programme.
12. A Member remarked that if the Council was going to transform and become more agile, it had to find suitable platforms to conduct business and broadcast to the public. Even today's meeting had been delayed in starting due to issues with the webcasting. The Director of Transformation replied that while there had been some issues with WiFi and bandwidth during the period of working from home due to lockdown, there had been examples of good use of technology, such as the outbound calls to shielded people. There was much further to go in developing the technology to enable agile working.
13. A Member questioned what system would be used to measure performance on the pathway of care programme. The best performing county council seemed to be Rutland; what could be learned from them? The Director of Transformation replied that that improvements would continue to be made on this programme, and there was a focus on supporting independence.

**Recommendations:**

1. The Select Committee is to be consulted on the new format of the report and a private workshop for members be arranged by the service area;
2. The Select Committee is to receive the Organisational Portfolio Risk Register as part of the aforementioned workshop, including details of how the Council is embedding a new risk management culture.

**Actions/further information to be provided:**

1. The Corporate Health and Safety Lead Manager to look into the possibility of having continuous improvement compared to the same quarter last year as a target for Health and Safety indicators;
2. The Corporate Health and Safety Lead Manager to provide data on injury and incident rates at the October meeting of the Select Committee.

## **8 CABINET MEMBER PRIORITIES UPDATE [Item 8]**

### **Witnesses:**

Mel Few, Cabinet Member for Resources

Zully Grant-Duff, Cabinet Member for Corporate Support

### **Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. Starting with the Cabinet Member for Corporate Support's portfolio, a Member asked whether the funding for the 700 laptops and deployment of Microsoft Teams (as mentioned in the report) was part of transformation expenditure or the Covid budget. The Cabinet Member explained that it was funded by transformation expenditure, as the rollouts were effectively a continuation of aspects of the transformation programme that had already been in the pipeline, just at an accelerated pace due to Covid. Some schemes, however, such as deploying technology to other organisations like Surrey Police, had been funded through the Covid budget.
2. The Select Committee raised the topic of remote care at home. The Cabinet Member for Corporate Support detailed that remote care was embedded into the Digital Strategy ambition and the lockdown had accelerated it further, as many people were not able to leave their homes. The remote care at home project looked at how artificial intelligence could be used in preventative services, to reduce pressure on acute health services. From a digital perspective, it represented an example of partnership working; Surrey County Council had a new Joint Strategic Chief Digital Officer, Katherine Church, who simultaneously fulfilled the same role at Surrey Heartlands, allowing the Council to look across both health and digital services, while also integrating ASC. The next stage of work would involve 1,000 of the most vulnerable households in Surrey.
3. Members expressed awareness of some failures in developing remote care at home. A Member asked whether the Cabinet Member for Corporate Support could assure the Select Committee that the Council would be using available technology and could overcome challenges; for instance, GDPR issues had to be considered. The Cabinet Member said that the implementation of remote care at home was being controlled by the Council and health partners and within that there would be contractual obligations for third parties, particularly relating to the databases. Funding came from Surrey County Council ASC and Public Health funding.
4. A Member stated that it would be useful when adopting the remote care system to find out which other councils or providers already used such a system and build on a system that already worked, rather than reinventing the wheel. The Cabinet Member for Corporate Support replied that Surrey County Council had put together the technology they were using at the moment, such as devices to measure temperature and heartrate. In future, there may be algorithms, databases and specialised devices for other measures made by third

parties. She did not have benchmarking with other LAs, but could refer the Select Committee to health partners who could give more information on this. The Council had not reinvented the wheel in the sense that the technology was already used by the NHS in Surrey, and had just been expanded and adapted by the Council in partnership with Surrey Heartlands. She acknowledged the Member's point, and added that, fundamentally, the Council had provided a service to vulnerable residents in a short space of time.

5. Moving onto the portfolio of the Cabinet Member for Resources, a Member asked if there were cost benefits and a timetable for the ERP (enterprise resource planning) replacement. What was driving the replacement? The Cabinet Member replied that the current SAP system was out of date and would cease to be supported by other software in the future. A report would be coming to the July Cabinet meeting about proceeding with a cloud service project as a better system.
6. A Member noted that at the end of month 1 of 2020/21, a risk of £15m had been identified, as well as a Covid-related risk of £16m. How confident was the Cabinet Member for Resources that these risks could be managed? The Cabinet Member stated that it was too early to say at the moment, but that the Council was looking at resetting the budget. On Covid, the Cabinet Member did not believe it would be possible to close those gaps without further government assistance. The area with the biggest Covid funding issue was ASC, due to the spread of Covid in care homes during the pandemic. Regarding business as usual, each service had a budget cap, and the Council was working towards achieving that.
7. A Member asked whether the possibility of a second peak of Covid was being taken into account when developing the 2021/22 budget. The Cabinet Member for Resources responded that he had given broad indications on what services should focus on during the pandemic, and this was open to change going forward.

**Actions/further information to be provided:**

8. The Cabinet Member for Corporate Support to provide details of health partners who can give more information on remote care at home in other LAs.

**9 TRANSFORMATION PROGRAMME UPDATE [Item 9]**

It was agreed that the questioning for this item would be conducted in written form after the meeting. The questions and answers are annexed to these minutes.

*Mark Brett-Warburton left the meeting at 1:13pm.*

**10 TASK AND FINISH GROUP UPDATES [Item 10]**

The Select Committee noted the minutes of the Customer Experience Task Group.

**11 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 11]**

The Select Committee noted the Recommendations Tracker and Forward Work Programme.

**12 DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING [Item 12]**

The next meeting of the Resources and Performance Select Committee would be held on 8 October 2020 at 10:00am.

Meeting ended at: 1.15 pm

---

**Chairman**