

MINUTES of the meeting of the **RESOURCES AND PERFORMANCE SELECT COMMITTEE** held at 10.00 am on 21 January 2021 as a REMOTE MEETING.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its meeting on Thursday, 18 March 2021.

Elected Members:

- * Mr Nick Harrison (Chairman)
- * Mr Will Forster (Vice-Chairman)
- Ms Ayesha Azad
- * Mr Mark Brett-Warburton
- * Mr Tim Hall
- * Mr Naz Islam
- * Mr Graham Knight
- * Rachael I. Lake
- * Mr Wyatt Ramsdale
- * Dr Peter Szanto
- * Mr Chris Townsend
- * Mrs Hazel Watson

(* = present at the meeting)

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Ayesha Azad.

2 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS: 18 DECEMBER 2020 [Item 2]

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

3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

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

4 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4]

None received.

5 FINAL 2021/22 BUDGET [Item 5]

Witnesses:

Anna D'Alessandro, Director of Corporate Finance
 Mel Few, Cabinet Member for Resources
 Mark Hak-Sanders, Strategic Finance Business Partner
 Nicola Kilvington, Director of Insight, Analytics and Intelligence
 Becky Rush, Deputy Cabinet Member for Resources
 Rachel Wigley, Director of Financial Insight

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Chairman reminded the Select Committee that it had reviewed the draft budget in December 2020 and the comments, conclusions and recommendations of all four select committees would be presented to

the Cabinet at their meeting later in January 2021. There was one recommendation from this Select Committee, which concerned working with each district and borough council to agree assumptions about the collection fund and receipts of council tax and business rates to ensure the Council's 2021/22 budget was based on robust figures.

2. The Chairman noted that these final proposals being presented to the Select Committee highlighted the changes from the December 2020 figures, how the budget gap of £18.3m was to be closed, and provided further information requested from the December 2020 meeting.
3. The Director of Financial Insight shared slides and explained that the budget, which stood at circa £1bn, was now balanced and did not require any contribution from reserves. At the draft budget stage, there had been a circa £18m gap, which had been closed following the provisional settlement from central government. Moreover, the directorate position had improved by £3.3m since the draft budget, and two additional reserve contributions of £9m and £4.9m respectively had been made in special educational needs and disabilities (SEND) and Covid-19. The council was expecting the government to confirm details on collection fund losses soon; it was expected that central government would underwrite a 75% share of irrecoverable collection fund losses.
4. The Director of Corporate Finance described Surrey County Council's close relationship with the district and borough councils within Surrey. The Director of Corporate Finance and Director of Financial Insight attended regular Treasurer meetings with district and borough councils' Chief Financial Officers and collected information on collection rates from district and borough councils on a monthly basis, which was then sent to the Cabinet Members. Collection assumptions had been reviewed regularly throughout 2020/21. The Council had received a directive from central government allowing it to spread 2020/21 collection fund losses over the next three years. The Council currently had a £21m collection fund deficit (before the impact of grant-funded retail and nursery reliefs of £19.2m), which had decreased from £37m over the course of the development of the 2021/22 budget. The numbers could continue to change until the final budget, when Surrey County Council would receive confirmation from district and borough councils. The most up-to-date estimate for the 2021/22 collection fund deficit was £12.8m (again, before the impact of grant funded retail and nursery reliefs of £19.2m).
5. The Director of Corporate Finance explained that Central Income and Expenditure was different from a corporate resources budget; it was central and not allocated to individual service areas. In 2021/22 the Central Income and Expenditure budget totalled £83.2m. The number was proportionate to the relatively large size of Surrey County Council. Over the course of the Medium-Term Financial Strategy (MTFS), the largest contributor to the changes in the budget requirement in Central Income and Expenditure was the additional cost of the capital programme.

6. The Director of Corporate Finance stated that Earmarked Reserve would increase to £186.5m by the end of 2020/21, due to an increase in the budget equalisation reserve. Also, the general fund had been increased compared to previous years in order to provide more resilience. The Covid-19 reserve stood at £9.9m and any of this funding not used in 2020/21 could be carried forward into 2021/22.

Graham Knight joined the meeting at 10:29am.

7. A Member noted that the additional funding required because of the deterioration in assumed council tax base, updated collection fund loss assumptions (offset by business rate relief grant) and 'Covid-19 75% share of irrecoverable collection fund losses' were all listed in the report as 'to be confirmed'. If they were confirmed and involved more expenditure or less income, how would this be dealt with? The Director of Corporate Finance replied that the Council had been in a surplus position in 2020/21, so a reserve had been put aside to smooth any impact if more expenditure was required. The Cabinet Member for Resources provided assurance that it was unlikely there would be a significant difference between expenditure required and funding available.
8. A Member expressed confidence in the budget overall, but requested more information about the £9m additional contribution to the SEND reserve. The Cabinet Member for Resources explained that SEND expenditure was limited to the budget envelope agreed to by services, and these extra funds had therefore been put in as an added contingency. The Council was trying to reduce costs by providing in-county placements for people with SEND. The Director of Financial Insight stated that there was already a £24m contribution to the SEND overspend on the high needs block. SEND was undergoing an extensive transformation programme that included sufficiency of placements, inclusion of SEND children in mainstream schools where possible, preparation for adulthood, and partnership working. There was also an increase in the grant for 2021/22, but this was not sufficient to cover increased costs and demand. It would be necessary to find efficiencies of around £22m, which could be challenging. Therefore, the £9m reserve had been put aside in case the £22m efficiencies could not be made. The Council's position with regards to the High Needs Block was challenging, as it was not possible to contribute money to it directly. The offsetting reserve was a contingency factor. The Council was lobbying government for more central funding to be allocated to the High Needs Block.
9. A Member asked why the £27m Eco Park reserve was needed and whether it was sufficient. The Cabinet Member for Resources stated that work on the Eco Park had not yet been signed off. The amount referred to was not a reserve but a sinking fund, which would be used to offset the expected running costs once the full project had been certified as operational. The Director of Corporate Finance added that reserves were matched against risk and that there were ongoing pressures in SEND, waste, and environment, transport and infrastructure. The numbers were proportional to the budget. Covid-19 risk and uncertainty also needed to be taken into account.

10. The Director of Insight, Analytics and Intelligence outlined the budget consultation process. There were 213 responses to the consultation and opportunities for people to contribute to broader engagement activities prior to that. Thousands of residents were involved in the Community Impact Assessment research.
11. A Member expressed concern that only 213 people had responded to the budget consultation and suggested that the method of consultation might need to be re-examined. The Director of Insight, Analytics and Intelligence replied that there were multiple avenues to the consultation. More participatory consultation exercises were costly, and their value should be weighed up against this. The principle of meaningful consultation and engagement were important when setting the budget.
12. The Select Committee remained concerned about the low response rate and expressed the opinion that the budget consultation had been unsuccessful for this reason. The Director of Insight, Analytics and Intelligence stated that Surrey County Council did base its consultation on examples of best practice from other local authorities. It was important to note that recruiting a representative sample would require contracting an agency, which would be costly. It was agreed that the Director of Insight, Analytics and Intelligence would return to present an item to the Budget Sub-Group on the budget consultation early in the process in order to take into account Members' views.
13. In conclusion, the Select Committee thanked the Cabinet Members and officers for their work in successfully developing a balanced budget for 2021/22 and had no new recommendations for the Cabinet. The Select Committee also concluded that the updated information provided assurance on the robustness of the council tax and business rates budget for 2021/22.

Recommendations:

1. The Select Committee recommends that a report on the budget consultation is presented to the Budget Sub-Group early in the consultation process, and that Members' views are taken into account when conducting the consultation.

6 TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY [Item 6]

Witnesses:

Anna D'Alessandro, Director of Corporate Finance
 Mel Few, Cabinet Member for Resources
 Mark Hak-Sanders, Strategic Finance Business Partner
 Becky Rush, Deputy Cabinet Member for Resources

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Strategic Finance Business Partner stated that the purpose of the Treasury Management Strategy (TMS) was to set a strategy for the prudent management of surplus cash and for managing borrowing costs. The Council consulted treasury advisor Arlingclose for advice on the external economic background and on the strategy. The Strategic Finance Business Partner explained that the strategy and fundamental approach in the 2021/22 TMS remained generally

unchanged since the 2020/21 version. The aim was to maximise the Council's use of its available cash to avoid borrowing. Given low interest rates at present, using the Council's available cash instead of borrowing was currently more cost-effective than investing cash. Borrowing in the short term entailed an average 0.5% interest rate at the moment, whereas longer term borrowing through the Public Works Loan Board (PWLb) averaged a 1.5% interest rate. The Council currently held its surplus cash in money market funds, which were completely liquid. Moreover, the 2021/22 TMS proposed to remove the £150m limit on money market fund investment, in order to avoid having to hold any excess funds in the Council's current account on the rare occasions that that amount was exceeded. The limit on any one money market fund was £25m, in order to spread the risk of the investment over a number of parties.

2. The Strategic Finance Business Partner continued to explain that the Council had changed its approach to minimum revenue provision (MRP) in response to advice from its external auditors, Grant Thornton. Currently, Halsey Garton (the company owned by Surrey County Council through which the Council invested in property) owed debts to the Council on a long-term maturity basis. The proposed change was that, if any investment property fell below its carrying value in terms of the outstanding debt owed by Halsey Garton, Halsey Garton would start to make a principle payment immediately on that loan, thereby giving Surrey County Council the cash it would need to repay the external debt.
3. The Strategic Finance Business Partner informed the Select Committee that the other change set out in the 2021/22 TMS was an increase in planned borrowing over the course of the Medium-Term Financial Strategy (MTFS), increasing the proportion of borrowing costs against net revenue budget from 6% by 2024/25 in the 2020/21 TMS, to 8% by 2025/26 in the latest TMS. This figure was in line with other counties; the average proportion of borrowing cost was 7% and the range was 4-10%. In terms of the £0.2bn increase in borrowing, the majority of that figure represented borrowing that would generate income, such as investment in Extra Care Housing and Independent Living schemes, which would result in rental income and efficiencies, offsetting borrowing costs. Finally, the risk profile had been reduced in 2021/22 compared to 2020/21. The Council had the option of borrowing long-term at a fixed rate of 1.5% from the PWLB if desired. This rate had reduced by circa 1% during 2020/21.
4. The Select Committee thanked the Strategic Finance Business Partner for his comprehensive introduction. A Member asked what the main differences were between borrowing from the PWLB and borrowing through the UK Municipal Bonds Agency (UKMBA). The Strategic Finance Business Partner replied that the PWLB provided more certainty as the Council was guaranteed access to it; the PWLB published its rates, and the Council could draw funds from the PWLB on the same day with the rates fixed for up to 40 years. When borrowing via the UKMBA, the agency would put together a bond issuance for the Council with other local authorities, and the bond would be issued to the market. Whilst borrowing through the PWLB the Council would be responsible for its own debt and nothing else,

through the UKMBA, the Council would be signing up to a collective share of the risk of the whole bond. In order for the Council to consider borrowing from the UKMBA, it would need to see that the agency was able to offer a better rate than the PWLB.

5. A Member remarked that the Council aimed to minimise long-term debt, yet it was borrowing £100m for the Your Fund Surrey project. The Member suggested that the Council should borrow in order to invest in areas that would reduce future expenditure, rather than investing in new projects that might not help the Council to save money. The Strategic Finance Business Partner responded that the TMS aimed to set out how the capital programme would be financed through the use of cash balances and borrowing strategy while minimising the amount the Council would have to borrow; the TMS was not involved in the setting of the capital programme itself. Furthermore, the Council prioritised its capital expenditure, with a balance of schemes maintaining current assets and new developments. A large proportion of the capital programme would reap benefits in the long term. The Deputy Cabinet Member for Resources added that, with regards to Your Fund Surrey, the Council would not borrow £100m upfront; rather, funds would be borrowed as and when required. This was a long-term scheme.

7 CABINET MEMBER PRIORITIES UPDATES [Item 7]

a CABINET MEMBER FOR CORPORATE SUPPORT UPDATE [Item 7a]

Witnesses:

Zully Grant Duff, Cabinet Member for Corporate Support

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. A Member asked the Cabinet Member what the role of the County Council was in the new Tech 4 You service model. He raised concern that there had been several high-profile failures of this sort of model; what were the failsafes to ensure that the technology did not overlook people who needed help? He also asked whether Tech 4 You would be offered in addition to providing human contact, which was important. The Cabinet Member responded that the Tech 4 You project involved piloting tried and tested technology that was already in wide commercial use in a number of residential and supported living settings. The role of the project was to enable residents to live longer, more independent lives by understanding their individual needs. Surrey County Council was leading on the design of the service and monitoring the project to ensure its safety, while Mole Valley District Council would pilot the service. The pilot would begin in late January 2021 in the Mole Valley area and would last for a number of months, and then the service would be modified as needed based on the pilot. The pilot would be scrutinised by the Adults and Health Select Committee.
2. A Member noted that there was a national Test and Trace service covering the whole of Surrey, as well as a local Test and Trace service covering Elmbridge, Epsom, Runnymede and Spelthorne boroughs. How would the Council overcome the issues that had been experienced with the national Test and Trace service, ensuring the whole of Surrey had a functional system? The Cabinet Member replied

that when the Test and Trace success rates for the local and national services in Surrey were combined, the success rate stood at 85%. Surrey County Council was working in partnership with district and borough councils and using local knowledge to maximise chances of successful contact. Recently, there had been a significant increase in infection rates across Surrey, which had increased the caseload; there had been six new staff members recruited in Surrey County Council customer services to tackle this. At the end of January 2021, Woking and Surrey Heath would join the local Test and Trace system, and the remaining districts and boroughs would join the local system by mid-February 2021.

3. Regarding agile working arrangements within the Council, a Member commented that, according to the results of the travel survey recently conducted amongst staff whose administrative base had been relocated to Woodhatch Place, many staff intended to travel to the new office by car, the new journey entailed an increase in average journey time compared to the journey time to staff's previous administrative base, and most staff anticipated that they would travel into Woodhatch Place to work two days a week. Based on this, what was the total number of parking spaces at Woodhatch Place, how many staff would have Woodhatch Place designated as their administrative base, and would there be corporate WiFi installed throughout the buildings on the site? The Cabinet Member stated that there would be 473 standard parking bays, 11 disabled parking bays and 45 bicycle parking bays at Woodhatch Place. It would be the administrative base for 1,165 staff, whose different categories of work modality would determine how often they came to the site to work. The office space available at Woodhatch Place was based on a calculation of 40% of venue-based staff wanting to use office space at any one time post-Covid-19 pandemic, which amounted to 384 staff members. During the pandemic, however, only 192 staff members would be able to work at Woodhatch Place at any one time. There was currently no specific allocation of parking at Woodhatch Place. The office was designed with agile working in mind; it had no fixed workstations. Corporate WiFi, Gov WiFi and guest WiFi were installed at Woodhatch Place.

Naz Islam left the meeting at 11:46am.

4. Noting that 75% of staff anticipated that they would travel to Woodhatch Place in a single occupant car and only 2% of staff anticipated sharing a car to travel there, a Member asked how the Council could facilitate and encourage car sharing post-Covid-19 pandemic, as car sharing was cheaper and better for the environment. The Cabinet Member agreed that car sharing was positive and should be encouraged once it was safe to do so after the pandemic.

b DEPUTY CABINET MEMBER FOR RESOURCES UPDATE [Item 7b]

Witnesses:

Becky Rush, Deputy Cabinet Member for Resources

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. A Member asked which risks in the 2020/21 budget were currently RAG (red, amber, green) rated red and whether some risks that had

previously been red had now been rated black. How did this affect the position with regards to risks at year-end? The Deputy Cabinet Member replied that a £3.2m deficit was currently forecast for the end of the 2020/21 financial year. There had been little change in the forecast delivery of efficiencies in the last few months. Black rated (undeliverable) efficiencies stood at £4.6m at month 8 of 2020/21, and red rated (at risk) efficiencies stood at £5.5m. The majority of these risks were related to efficiencies in special educational needs and disabilities (SEND). All efficiencies were regularly reviewed within the transformation programme, and as well as this a review was being conducted on the effect of the current Covid-19 lockdown.

2. A Member requested to see the year-on-year level of Adult Social Care debts. The Deputy Cabinet Member stated that a full report was being compiled for the Adults and Health Select Committee and once the information was available, she would share it with the Resources and Performance Select Committee.

Chris Townsend left the meeting at 11:54am.

3. A Member requested that the monthly deep dives reported back to the Transformation Board also be reported to the Resources and Performance Select Committee on a monthly basis. The Deputy Cabinet Member agreed to share this information with the Select Committee monthly.
4. A Member asked what the modernisation review was, as mentioned in the report. The Deputy Cabinet Member responded that this was a monthly meeting with procurement, whereby discussions took place about how improvements could be made to procurement processes. The new Digital Business and Insights (DB&I) project would provide a new procurement programme. Also discussed at the modernisation review were a renewed emphasis on business partnering, changes due to Britain's exit from the European Union, and increased focus on climate change.
5. A Member enquired what the key risks in the Resources portfolio were and what issues the Deputy Cabinet Member would address once she became Cabinet Member for Resources from 26 January 2021 onwards. The Deputy Cabinet Member said that she was working closely with the current Cabinet Member for Resources and the finance team to ensure a smooth handover. The main budgetary risks included SEND and waste, as well as the agile office programme, agile IT, the relocation of the County Hall to Woodhatch Place and staff retention. Project governance, risk management, interim workplace solutions and regular communications led by the Executive Director of Resources mitigated these risks. Moreover, Covid-19 had impacted services, leading to staff sickness and redeployment, for example. Reprioritisation of the transformation programme and of critical functions within teams helped mitigate this risk. The focus at present was on delivery of the budget at 2020/21 year-end. The Deputy Cabinet Member commended the abilities of the team and the governance within the Resources directorate.

6. The Select Committee was informed that Mel Few, Cabinet Member for Resources, and Zully Grant Duff, Cabinet Member for Corporate Support, would be stepping down from their Cabinet roles from 26 January 2021 onwards. The Select Committee thanked these Cabinet Members for their work and diligence in these roles.

Actions/further information to be provided:

1. Deputy Cabinet Member for Resources to share the report on Adult Social Care debts (being compiled for the Adults and Health Select Committee) with the Resources and Performance Select Committee;
2. Deputy Cabinet Member for Resources to share monthly Transformation Board deep dives with the Select Committee.

8 EQUALITY, DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION [Item 8]

Witnesses:

Jackie Foglietta, Director of HR&OD

Zully Grant Duff, Cabinet Member for Corporate Support

Nicola Kilvington, Director of Insight, Analytics and Intelligence

Katie Stewart, Executive Director of Environment, Transport and Infrastructure

Adam Whittaker, Strategic Lead – Policy and Strategy

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Executive Director of Environment, Transport and Infrastructure explained that the new draft action plan on Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) covered both the Council's workforce and Surrey residents. The draft action plan aimed to be radical in its approach. Staff feedback on EDI had been collected in autumn 2019 and it indicated both some key areas of good practice across the organisation and some areas where the EDI agenda was not prioritised or where staff did not feel sufficiently supported. While the Council was not necessarily organisationally biased, it still had much to do in order to be seen as an organisation that took EDI seriously. The Covid-19 pandemic had also affected communities differently and evidenced the need for support for certain communities. Recently, the government had announced that they would be reviewing the national EDI agenda, and the Council wished to reflect this national agenda, while taking into account the views of the Select Committee.
2. Noting that a speech made recently by the Minister for Women and Equalities had implied that the EDI agenda should look beyond the legally protected characteristics, a Member asked for witnesses' comments on the minister's views. The Executive Director replied that, while it was too early to know the full implications of the minister's speech, the Council did share the desire to make a significant improvement in EDI and the minister's evidence-based approach was encouraging. The Council recognised that inequality went beyond the protected characteristics but that there was still a need to focus on protected characteristics. The Council's Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs) were designed to capture protected characteristics as well as other inequalities. However, there was currently no sign that central government would make changes to the Council's legal duties.
3. A Member enquired what support Members might need in order to be equipped to provide collective leadership and champion EDI.

Moreover, how would the whole of the Surrey community be engaged in EDI? The Executive Director responded that Members were key to the EDI plan and were seen as crucial representatives within the community. Locality profiles had been developed, which could help Members to understand the makeup of their division. Members could facilitate in reaching communities, and promote and celebrate diversity, by promoting LGBT+ history month or black history month, for example. The Director of Insight, Analytics and Intelligence agreed to send locality profiles to Members and added that the Community Impact Assessment (CIA) measured engagement with residents with protected characteristics, as well as other groups such as carers. The Select Committee requested that the Director of Insight, Analytics and Intelligence provide a briefing note on the CIA. Furthermore, there were communities transformation programmes such as Your Fund Surrey, and these encouraged engagement between residents and partners. The Surrey minority ethnic forum fostered engagement with the black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) community. The Director of Insight, Analytics and Intelligence attended a monthly forum attended by over 100 voluntary organisations, showing partnership working and gathering of information across the system.

4. A Member emphasised the importance on concentrating on digital exclusion, particularly amongst older residents. The Cabinet Member for Corporate Support concurred that digital inclusion was important in tackling health inequalities and it was at the forefront of her agenda. One example of action the Council was taking was to maintain access to computers in libraries as much as possible throughout the Covid-19 pandemic.
5. Members remarked that refreshed EDI training for Members should concentrate on what Members can do in practical terms, with case studies and examples of best practice.
6. A Member asked how the Council could ensure it monitored its improvement. The Executive Director replied that there was an annex in the report setting out how the implementation of actions would be measured. Quantitative measures were important in measuring the implementation, and the Council was ambitious with its aims for this and hoped to be held to account. Members should also inform officers whether the Council was doing well in meeting its aims. The Council should be taking accessibility, inclusion and the EIA into account for service design and transformation from the start. Other ways in which success could be measured was by measuring how representative the Council's workforce was across all levels, and by measuring staff satisfaction.
7. A Member questioned whether ensuring the workforce was representative was helpful – since the Council's workforce was a small proportion of the overall population of Surrey, this may not be particularly helpful. Instead, it could be more helpful to encourage a universal attitude shift towards equality and inclusion, rather than pushing specific ratios within the workforce. The Executive Director stated that, while the cultural aspect was indeed important, ensuring staff had equal opportunities by enabling staff progression within certain protected characteristics was important. Currently,

management within the Council was not proportionally diverse. The Director of HR&OD said that it was key for BAME staff in more junior positions to be able to see successful BAME people in senior management positions. Also, the Council had a low proportion of disabled staff, which it was keen to change. A workforce that reflected the Surrey population was essential for enabling the Council to represent the Surrey population accurately.

8. A Member asked whether there was scope for a Member reference group on EDI. Moreover, how were staff engaged in EDI? The Director of HR&OD responded that there were various routes for Member involvement. For example, there were seven Employee Resource Groups (ERGs) that had been set up by staff for certain affinity groups within the workforce, such as a women's network and LGBT+ network. Each of these groups had a Cabinet Member and Executive Director as sponsors and had recently put in place cross-network meetings with trade unions. These groups were key to staff engagement and helped to highlight areas of concern. The Executive Director echoed the importance of these groups and added that, as well as supporting colleagues, these groups helped shape the corporate EDI policy agenda. The Select Committee supported the notion of establishing a Member group to advise on EDI and inviting Members to informally attend ERG meetings where appropriate.
9. A Member enquired what new opportunities for EDI training there were and whether any of the training was mandatory. The Director of HR&OD replied that unconscious bias training for all staff had been introduced in 2020 and was mandatory for all staff. Training for staff about reverse mentoring, anti-racism training and bystander training were being explored. At the Select Committee's draft report meeting, Members suggested implementing mandatory EDI training for all Members, and with the Select Committee's support officers would look at implementing this.
10. A Member asked whether the Council was looking to the training offered at other local authorities for examples of best practice. The Executive Director said that the Council was looking at good practice and wanted to take inspiration from this where appropriate, but Surrey County Council was ambitious to be the best local authority in terms of EDI training. The Strategic Lead – Policy and Strategy added that a number of local authorities had been mentioned in the report and officers would meet tomorrow (22 January 2021) with the Greater London Authority to discuss an advisory panel that had been set up with the Mayor of London. The Local Government Authority excellency framework had guided the EDI action plan, as had best practice from companies in other industries, such as Sky and Bloomberg. On a more practical level, the Council was starting to have conversations with voluntary sector colleagues and Surrey Police, coming together as a system to develop shared priorities for EDI.
11. A Member suggested that EDI training should be conducted jointly for staff and Members, which would help build bonds. Also, she requested assurance that the Council would look to acquire an accreditation in EDI. The Executive Director expressed appreciation for Members' ambition in this field and took the Member's comments on board, while

stating that caution was needed when approaching accreditation as some accreditations varied in terms of value, and acknowledging the different challenges faced by Members and staff due to their different roles.

12. A Member requested that the mention in the report of 'minimising bias' be changed to 'eradicating bias'; to minimise bias was not ambitious enough. The Executive Director agreed to make this change.

Recommendations:

1. ED&I training for Members should take place after May 2021 and be made part of induction process for all Members; similar consideration to be given to such training for officers;
2. To help achieve the goal of a successful reassessment within the Local Government Association (LGA) Equality Framework in the first quarter of 2022, a survey of staff, residents and Members be carried out and results shared with this Select Committee;
3. Relevant key performance indicators be developed (enhanced in line with the action plan if already in place) and reported to this Select Committee as part of its existing regular performance monitoring report;
4. An update report be presented to this Select Committee as outlined under 'next steps' of the report;
5. On page 51, Appendix B of the report, under 'How we'll meet our commitment' – our commitment should be to 'eradicate bias', instead of merely minimising it;
6. To explore and remove any barriers to take part in the LGA Equality Framework as soon as possible;
7. There appear to be some anomalies in terms of the approach between officers and what the Minister for Women and Equalities is saying in her speech and these should be articulated and reconciled wherever possible;
8. All Members to be included in a Member level group to encourage collective leadership on ED&I. All Members to train on ED&I alongside officers and invited to participate in engagement activities.

Actions/further information to be provided:

1. Director of Insight, Analytics and Intelligence to provide locality profiles to Members of the Select Committee;
2. To receive a briefing paper by email about the Community Impact Assessment, including monitoring and review arrangements for the proposed action plan;
3. Executive Director of Environment, Transport and Infrastructure to look at the possibility of inviting Members to informally attend ERG groups.

9 TASK GROUP UPDATES [Item 9]

The Select Committee agreed the recommendations of the Customer Experience Task Group.

The Select Committee noted the notes of the recent County Hall Move and Agile Programme Task Group meeting.

10 FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME AND RECOMMENDATION TRACKER [Item 10]

The Select Committee agreed that it would consider the transformation deep dive reports (mentioned in paragraph 3 of item 7b) once it had seen the monthly reports informally.

11 DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING [Item 11]

The next meeting of the Resources and Performance Select Committee would be held on 18 March 2021.

Meeting ended at: 1.05 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank