

POLICY REVIEW AND PERFORMANCE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

16 JANUARY 2013

Present: County Councillor Clark (Chairperson)
County Councillors Bale, Hunt, Keith Jones, Knight, Lloyd,
Robson and Walker

Apologies: Councillor Russell Goodway

37: MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of the Policy Review and Performance Committee held on 28 November 2012 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairperson.

38: DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chairperson reminded Members of their responsibility under Part III of the Members' Code of Conduct to declare any interest in general terms and to complete personal interest forms at the start of the meeting and then, prior to the commencement of the discussion of the item in question, specify whether it is a personal or prejudicial interest. If the interest is prejudicial Members would be asked to leave the meeting and if the interest is personal, Members would be invited to stay, speak and vote.

39: DELIVERY & PERFORMANCE REPORT QUARTER 2 OF 2012/13

The Chairperson welcomed Councillor Heather Joyce, Leader of the Council, Mike Davies, Head of Service, Scrutiny Performance & Improvement and Jon House, Chief Executive to the meeting.

The Chairperson reminded Members that during work programme discussions, the Committee agreed to receive the performance report for quarter 1 for information but to consider Quarter 2's report in more depth. The Quarter 2 Delivery and Performance report followed a new format which had been developed to provide information on delivery of the revised Corporate Plan, and the priorities contained in the Administration's year one 'Leading Cardiff, Building Communities' document.

The Chairperson advised Members that the Committee had a specific remit to consider service area-specific performance, as detailed in paragraph 3 of the covering report, and also to scrutinise overall corporate performance management arrangements.

The Chairperson invited Councillor Joyce to make a statement.

Councillor Joyce explained to the Committee that the main objective was to ensure that the service provided was effective and efficient, with high priority being placed on effective resources. A new approach to service delivery was being implemented with a new style of quarterly Cabinet performance reporting. One of the main concerns was communities, with development and inclusion being encouraged. Individual Cabinet Member were driving forward improvement and delivery in their specific portfolio areas. This would maintain accountability in the service areas and challenge the process as and when required, in order to resolve issues being faced.

The Committee invited Mike Davies to make a presentation on the Delivery and Performance Report: Quarter 2 which outlined the following:

Performance Planning Framework

- *What Matters*
- *Corporate Plan – 3-5yr focus reviewed annually*
- *Service Business Plans – 1yr-3yr focus. Produced annually*
- *Team Plans – 1yr focus. Produced annually*
- *Staff Objectives & Development Plans – 1yr focus. Reviewed 6 monthly*
- *Improvement Plan - linked to Corporate Plan and Service Business Plans – past year focus. Produced annually*

Definitions of Performance Management

- *“A process linking strategy with the behaviour that enacts it to deliver intended results.”*
- *Effective Performance Management – “Taking action in response to actual performance to make outcomes for users and the public better than they would otherwise be.” IDeA.*

Measuring performance

- *Performance should not be measured purely on the basis of statistics, however much the local media suggest otherwise. It was also about perception, culture and governance.*
- *Critically, it must also be about the effective delivery of services to citizens and communities.*
- *However, we must raise our aspirations and seek to compare against best class, not just our Welsh peers.*

Scale of Performance Management in Cardiff

- *150+ Statutory Performance Indicators (PIs):*
 - *25 National Strategic Indicators*
 - *130 Public Accountability Measures/ Service Improvement Data Set*
 - *300 Local PIs*
 - *193 Corporate Plan Objectives*
 - *42 “Year One” Commitments.*

Self Evaluation

- *Levels of challenge:*
 - *Improvement Team – Service Area*
 - *Peer to Peer (Senior Leadership Team)*
 - *Cabinet Member – Chief Officer/ Head of Service*
 - *Scrutiny Committee consideration*
- *Key principles:*
 - *Ownership*
 - *Accountability*
 - *Responsibility*
 - *Delivery*

What’s different?

- *The report was structured around a Corporate Overview and individual Cabinet Portfolios*
- *Progress was reported on the key commitments and priorities*
- *Progress was reported on a basket of performance indicators selected by Cabinet Members –will enable trend analysis over time.*

What are the headlines?

- *Corporately sickness absence levels were forecast to be higher than same quarter last year*
- *Reduction in the number of corporate complaints and improvement in response times*
- *The direction of 'Efficiencies Programme' was being reviewed in order to deliver £55m in the medium term*
- *There was a projected overspend as at end of quarter 2 of £944,000.*

What were the headlines?

- *The rate of Cardiff residents aged between 16 and 64 claiming Job Seekers Allowances was higher than both the Wales and UK levels*
- *Crime levels fell during quarter 2 in all except the category of 'Other offences'*
- *Work to deliver 5 Corporate Plan priorities falling within the scope of this committee have been assessed as green.*

Performance Management

What could Scrutiny do next?

- *Develop its role in evaluating delivery and performance of the Council – ask the 'so what?' questions*
- *Review the use of performance information within the total work of the Committee e.g. in inquiries and task and finish groups*
- *Develop a range of performance information which the Committee will receive to support evaluation of key areas of work falling within its remit*
- *Receive further Member development opportunities around performance information.*

The Chairperson thanked Officers for the informative presentation and invited the Committee to ask questions.

Members of the Committee referred to the significant corporate risks, (e.g. Welfare Reform, Social Services and Change) and asked why these were not reflected in the individual Cabinet Member sections of the report. Officers assured the Committee Members that this was a new way of reporting performance information including progress against the Year

One commitments and actions contained in the revised Corporate Plan. The Corporate Risk Register was considered by the Senior Leadership Team quarterly and by the Cabinet six-monthly. The Cabinet Member for Sport, Leisure and Culture had taken on the role of Member Risk Champion to ensure that risks are highlighted at a Member-level. This was all part of the performance management reporting mechanism of the Authority being driven by the current Administration.

The Committee was advised that following the changes being put in place as a result of the Performance and Information Management project, it was expected there be a more consistent approach to performance management across the Council in twelve months.

The Committee asked why no red-rated objectives had been highlighted in the performance report, and if this meant that the objectives set were not sufficiently challenging. In response Officers explained that as objectives had been set, delivery milestones were also set. Traffic light ratings of Green, Amber, Red are given depending on the likelihood the delivery milestones will be met.

Members of the Committee asked for further information on the following:

- What comparator cities had been identified as they were not referred to in the report
- Sickness absence broken down by service area
- 0.2% reduction in Council Tax collection
- Undisputed invoices challenged
- Percentage of regular payments made by BACS

Officers explained that identifying comparator cities for Cardiff was proving difficult. Comparison with Welsh local authorities against Statutory Indicators was possible, but not necessarily useful given Cardiff's unique status. English or Scottish comparator authorities needed to be identified to move forward. However, Members of the Committee were still concerned with the fact that there was still no data to permit comparison of the Council's performance against similar suitable English local authorities, as this point had been raised in previous scrutiny of performance. Members of the Committee asked if external verification of performance took place. In response Officers explained that regular meetings took place with the Wales Audit Office to address these issues. Wales Audit Office had recognised that Cardiff was unique and acknowledged that comparisons had to be made against similar English local authorities.

Sickness Absence was being addressed by the Cabinet and a further report could be brought forward for consideration. Council Tax collection reduction was as a result of the current economic climate and improvements were being made to deal with the undisputed invoices.

Members of the Committee emphasised that performance management should not be measured on the basics of statistics but that of quality and delivery of public service. Performance targets set in the report needed adequate explanation on the process of setting and amending these targets.

The Committee asked for further information on Cardiff Bus Station. In response, Officers advised that Cardiff Bus Station would be factored into the wider part of the proposed Enterprise Zone. This was a decision for Welsh Government and the Council had no control over timescales. Works had progressed around the current Bus Station and improvements could be seen.

Members of the Committee asked about the selection of performance indicators for inclusion in the report. No information on service areas coming under the Committee's remit, including ICT, Legal Services and HR People Services, was available in the report. ICT was a concern for this Committee and further information was needed for this area as it was previously highlighted as a red corporate risk. Officers informed the Committee that the indicators included in the Delivery and Performance report were likely to remain the same for the lifetime of the Administration, although there was scope for them to develop depending on feedback from Scrutiny Committees, Cabinet members and service areas. This would allow improved trend analysis. A bespoke performance report could be developed for the Committee using the full range of indicators collected by the Council, however. The Committee welcomed the opportunity to receive a bespoke performance report. This could provide the Committee with a more rounded view of Council performance, as well as more specific information regarding those service areas which came under the Committee's remit

The Committee was advised that the CIS system was a valuable resource for both Members and staff in terms of performance information. Officers offered the Committee training in how to use the system.

The Committee was advised of meetings taking place with the Vale of Glamorgan Council around collaboration.

Members were offered clarification on how many indicators included in the whole report were national as opposed to local.

The Committee emphasised the importance of overall back office support especially in records management in order to maintain the Council's Corporate Memory.

The Committee noted that work was being carried out in the area of electronic records management and asked that further information regarding Freedom of Information be included in the performance report.

The Chairperson thanked Councillor Joyce, Jon House, Chief Executive and Mike Davies for attending the Committee.

AGREED – That a letter be sent by the Chairperson on behalf of the Committee to Councillor Heather Joyce, Leader of Cardiff Council, thanking her and her Officers for attending the Policy Review and Performance Scrutiny Committee on 16 January 2013 and to convey the following observations of the Committee:-

- The Committee had previously commented that it did not feel there was sufficient data within quarterly performance reports to allow satisfactory trend analysis. Members welcomed officers' comments that the performance indicators contained in the Delivery and Performance report would remain largely static permitting trend analysis over the lifetime of the Administration. However, where more than one year of historic performance results were already available, Members believed that these should be included in the report.
- Having considered the Corporate Risk Register during the same meeting the Committee was concerned that areas highlighted in red in the Risk Register were not mentioned in the performance monitoring report. Members believed there should be a greater synergy between the two reports, particularly in terms of monitoring delivery of the mitigating actions highlighted in the Register.
- The Committee welcomed officers' offer to clarify how many indicators included in the whole report were national as opposed to local.

- The Committee noted that, following the changes being put in place as a result of the Performance and Information Management project, officers expected that there would be a more consistent approach to performance management across the Council in twelve months.
- Members of the Committee welcomed the Chief Executive's offer of further information regarding the Performance and Information project and the structures and process which it would put in place in the near future.
- The Committee emphasised that whilst it is recognised that the Delivery and Performance report was structured around Cabinet portfolios, rather than service areas, Members believed the report should include a full service area breakdown of sickness absence data.
- The Committee was concerned that there was still no adequate data to permit comparison of the Council's performance against similar suitable English local authorities. The Committee asked for appropriate comparisons to be provided to the Committee with the Performance outturn report for 2012/13.
- With regards to the performance targets detailed throughout the report, the Committee was still not satisfied that adequate explanation was included about the process of setting and amending targets and hoped to see this improved in future reports.
- The Committee requested further information regarding performance against indicator CFH/007, where it was noted that council tax collection was slightly down in comparison to the same period last year.
- The Committee requested further information about CFH/006, payment of undisputed invoices and questioned whether the target set down in this area was sufficiently challenging.
- The Committee was pleased that the Head of Service, Scrutiny Performance and Improvement had offered to provide a bespoke performance report using those indicators which the Council already collects. This would permit the Committee a more rounded view

of Council performance as well as more specific information regarding those service areas which came under the Committee's remit. Members had agreed that the Committee and the Scrutiny Officer would work with the Improvement and Information team to develop a bespoke performance report in time to come to the Committee with quarter 3 information.

- The Committee noted comments that work was being undertaken in the area of electronic records management and would schedule further consideration of information management at an appropriate juncture.

40: CORPORATE RISK REGISTER

The Chairperson welcomed Councillor Huw Thomas, Cabinet Member for Sports Leisure and Culture and Member Risk Management Champion, Christine Salter, Corporate Chief Officer – Corporate Services and Derek King, Audit and Risk Manager to the meeting.

The Chairperson informed the Committee that this item gave Members the opportunity to consider the Corporate Risk Register which had been presented to Cabinet in December. It would also serve as a brief introduction to the Council's Risk Management methodology. The item may allow Members the opportunity to identify areas of interest for this or next year's work programme.

The Committee received a presentation on Risk Management which outlined the following:

What is Risk Management?

- *Risk management is the process of identifying significant risks to the achievement of the authority's strategic and operational objectives, evaluating the potential consequences and implementing the most effective way of responding to, controlling and monitoring them*
- *Risk can be thought of as arising in two ways:*
 - *Direct threats (damaging events) which could lead to failure to achieve objectives*
 - *Opportunities (constructive events) which if exploited could offer an improved way of achieving objectives, but which are surrounded by threats.*

Why is Risk Management Important?

- *All organisations exist to achieve their objectives*
- *The purpose of risk management is to manage the barriers to achieving these objectives*

Who is involved with Risk Management?

- *Members & Corporate Management Board*
 - *Service Partners*
 - *Dedicated Member & Officers*
- *Chief Officers & Service Area Management Teams*
 - *Risk Management Steering Group*
 - *Service Area Risk Champions*
- *Operational Staff*
 - *Internal Audit*
 - *External Audit*

How do we manage Risk at Cardiff?

- *Risk Identification*
 - *Interviews, workshops and analysis of data*
- *Risk Analysis*
 - *Risk scenarios and the risk matrix: Consequence & Likelihood*
- *Risk Control*
 - *Action planning, controls, training and procedures*
- *Risk Monitoring*
 - *Reviewing actions, planning, reporting, review strategy*

Risk Analysis

- *Once risks have been identified they need to be assessed in terms of Likelihood and Consequence*
- *Traffic light system – a consistent approach to the assessment of risk*

Corporate Risk Register

- *Background*
- *Format & Size of Register*
- *Currently: 8 Event Driven Risks*

15 Ongoing Risks

- *Risk assessment*
- *Monitoring*

The Chairperson thanked Officers for the informative presentation and invited the Committee to ask questions.

Members of the Committee drew attention to the issues being faced by ICT, highlighted as a corporate risk. The Committee was advised that ICT had been listed on the Risk Register last year. Additional funding had been built into the 2012/13 budget to commence a three-year ICT refresh programme, in order to mitigate the corporate risk. The Cabinet and Council will take a view as to how this can be taken forward as part of the 2013/14 budget proposals

The Committee was advised that plans were in place for exploring renewable options for energy procurement, however, the process was complex.

Members of the Committee were concerned with the risk of flooding in certain parts of the city and suggested the Council look to develop storm drains in low lying areas. In response, it was stressed to the Committee that Flood Risk Management was already in place, with constant monitoring of high risk areas. Drainage repair works was on-going, however, budgetary restraints were in place.

The Committee made reference to the potential lack of read across between the Delivery and Performance report and the Corporate Risk Register. In terms of Equal Pay Awards, the Committee expressed concern that risk management and performance management should be better linked. In response, Members were advised that all risks were identified at operational level and were then fed through to the Cabinet Member with that specific responsibility. Cabinet Members are also taking an active role in challenging performance in their portfolios.

Members asked for further information regarding an 'Opportunity Register' to which Councillor Thomas had referred. Members were informed that this was in its conceptual stages, but was hoped to sit alongside the Risk Register to capture opportunities available to the Authority.

The Committee drew attention to the imminent financial pressures taking place following the introduction of Welfare Reform. This would have an

impact on local councillors as they would be called upon by their constituents to give advice on matters such as housing benefit and social fund reform. Therefore, Members asked for consideration of additional mitigating actions, further training and exploration of other measures to be considered to support Members in this area.

Members of the Committee requested a copy of the final report produced by the Council's risk partner, Marsh Risk Consulting, into the risks associated with Welfare Reform as soon as it became available.

The Committee were advised that Information Governance was considered to be a high priority risk and that a review of the Council's Records Management policy was mentioned as a proposed improvement action.

The Chairperson thanked Councillor Thomas, Christine Salter and Derek King for attending the meeting.

AGREED – That a letter be sent by the Chairperson on behalf of the Committee to Councillor Huw Thomas, Cabinet Member, Sport, Leisure and Culture thanking him and his Officers for attending the Policy Review and Performance Scrutiny Committee on 16 January 2013 and to convey the following observations of the Committee:-

- The Committee welcomed the potential impact of Welfare Reform being highlighted in the Register. Members were concerned that this entry did not fully reflect the impact which this area may have on Elected Members and asked that consideration of additional mitigating actions be considered.
- Members of the Committee requested a copy of the final report produced by the Council's partner Marsh Risk Consulting, into the risks associated with Welfare Reform as soon as they became available.
- Members noted that the Council's ICT platforms being unsuitable or outdated continued to pose a high risk. Further, Members noted that funding had been built into the 2012/13 budget as part of an intended three year programme to refresh the Council's systems. The Committee would bear this in mind when scrutinising the 2013/14 draft budget proposals.

- The Committee would take into account whether the other corporate risks were reflected within the 2013/14 budget proposals.
- The Committee noted that Information Governance was considered to be a high priority risk and that a review of the Council’s Record Management policy was mentioned as a proposed improvement action. The Committee would seek to receive a briefing paper on information management at its April meeting, with a view to possibly developing this into a deeper task and finish inquiry.

41: 2012/13 BUDGET MONTH 6

The Chairperson welcomed Allan Evans, Operational Manager Service Accountancy to the meeting and Christine Salter, Corporate Chief Officer – Corporate Services.

The Chairperson reminded Members that as part of their work programme discussions, they agreed to consider the 2012/13 Month 6 budget monitoring information in detail.

The Committee received a presentation which outlined the following:

Budget Monitoring Month 6 – Revenue

- £0.9 million ‘Potential’ overspend
- Broadly in line with month 3

Key Variances

	£000
<i>Children’s Services</i>	1,490
<i>City Services</i>	916
<i>Education</i>	954
<i>Corporate Management</i>	(868)
<i>Shared Services</i>	(341)
<i>NDR Refunds</i>	(400)
<i>Council Tax Collection</i>	(1,100)

Service areas – key variances

Adult Services + £100,000

- *Projected overspend on externally provided services*
- *Projected savings in Direct Services, Assessment & Care Management and Management & Support.*

Children's Services + £1,490,000

- *Projected overspends on external fostering, external residential care, 16+ Leaving Care and Child Health & Disability*
- *Projected underspend on employee costs.*

City development + £68,000

- *Projected shortfall on planning fee income and non fee earning Building Control*
- *Projected savings in Major Projects and Business & Investment.*

City Management + £183,000

- *Projected overspends in Culture, Tourism & Events, Network Management and Harbour Managed Activities*
- *Partly offset by projected savings in Parks and Management & Support.*

City Services + £916,000

- *Projected overspends include the Materials Recycling Facility and deficits in the Trade Waste and Household Waste Collection Services*
- *Projected saving on Landfill Operations.*

Communities (£125,000)

- *Projected savings in Housing & Neighbourhood Renewal, Community Facilities, Partnerships & Citizen Focus and Supporting People*
- *Projected overspend on Regulatory Services.*

Corporate Management (£868,000)

- *Includes projected saving of on Efficiency Programme expenditure budgets.*

Corporate Services (£96,000)

- *Additional court cost income and property rental income together with savings on vacancies across the service area*
- *Partly offset by projected overspends on the Office Accommodation Account and the Cardiff Market together with a shortfall in savings on the Performance and Information Management Project.*

Education + £954,000

- *Mainly due to pressures and resolution of issues at Danescourt, St Albans and Glyn Derw / Michaelston College federation. There was also a projected deficit on the School Catering Service.*

Shared Services (£341,000)

- *Projected saving in HR People Services, reflecting the surplus on Cardiff Works. Savings also projected in Facilities Management ICT and Customer Services*
- *Projected overspends in the Centralised Transport Service and in Media & Communications.*

Efficiency Programme

	<i>£m</i>
<i>Budgeted Savings</i>	<i>10.2</i>
<i>B/f from 2011/12</i>	<i>0.7</i>
<i>Reflected in service area budgets</i>	<i>10.9</i>
<i>Projected savings at month 6</i>	<i>(8.6)</i>
<i>Projected Shortfall</i>	<i>2.3</i>

Projected saving of £953,000 on expenditure budgets

Other issues

- *Prior year amounts recovered via appeals process supported by PricewaterhouseCoopers*

- Recovery of VAT on trade waste collections £2.168m
- Recovery of payments made on Landfill Tax £1.515m
- Available to support specific in-year initiatives or transfer to reserves at year end
- Cost of funding the Living Wage in 2012/13 c.£584,000 funded from reserves.

Capital Programme 2012/13 – Month 6 Budget Monitoring

<u>General Fund</u>	£000
Budget	122,899
Projected Outturn	<u>103,596</u>
Variance	(19,303)

(General Fund Expenditure at Month 6 - £32.6M
Percentage of Projected Outturn 31.5%)

<u>Public Housing</u>	£000
Budget	17,487
Projected Outturn	<u>17,487</u>
Variance	0

General Fund Capital Programme Variance

Variance Represented by:	£000
Net Overspend	431
Net Slippage	<u>(19,734)</u>
Variance	(19,303)

Capital Programme Variance can be due to:

- Overspends or underspends against Capital Programme schemes
- Variances mainly due to slippage of schemes against their anticipated spend profile – usually carried forward into the next financial year
- Some slippage unavoidable but officers reminded of importance of minimising and reporting slippage.

Capital Programme – Key Variances

Education and Lifelong Learning

School Organisation Plan Schemes slippage of £8.69M

- *Slippage due to delays, some linked to 21st Century Funding proposals and technical movement of contingency sums to the end of each scheme.*

Parks

Bute Park Restoration slippage of £1.200M

- *Heritage Lottery Fund Grant funded scheme – slippage due to extensive preparatory works required, including the various listed consents, together with ongoing discussions with the Environment agency*

Section 106 Schemes – slippage of £1.116M

- *In order to increase capacity additional landscape gardeners have been recruited on fixed term contracts.*

Housing and Neighbourhood Renewal

Citizen Hub Friary – slippage of £0.750M

- *Location of this hub is being reviewed which has led to slippage.*

Corporate

Enterprise Architecture – slippage of £1,000M

- *Spend in year on SAP software licenses*
- *Slippage over number of areas including project to deploy new mobile and scheduling solution which was procured in October.*

Our Space – Office Accommodation – slippage of £2.903M

- *Options in respect of office accommodation being considered*
- *Slippage mainly in respect of County Hall.*

The Chairperson thanked Christine Salter and Allan Evans for attending the meeting.

Members of the Committee were advised that the Council had worked alongside PricewaterhouseCoopers to take forward VAT appeals . It was almost the end of the Appeal Process to which they were involved in, there was some additional appeals coming forward but the ‘interest tail’ for these will have less of an impact.

The Committee was advised that Adult Services was currently projecting an overspend of £100,000 an increase compared to the balanced position reported at month three. The main areas of concern as a result of on-going vacancies was Learning Disability supported Accommodation and Day Care and in the Home Care Service. Assessment & Care Management was also a concern due to vacancies.

Members of the Committee noted the slippage in Section 106 Schemes and asked if this was due to fewer projects going forward this year or due to under-recovery. In response Officers explained that the projected overspend of £68,000 was in line with the position reported at month three and reflected shortfalls in planning and Section 106 income together with additional costs in relation to non fee-earning Building Control.

The Committee was informed of shortfall in income recovery relating to car parking arrangements at Sophia Gardens. This was a result of the reduction in demand in that area and may need to be considered in the budget.

Members of the Committee were concerned to learn that the Johnston building in Callaghan Square was to be demolished. In response, Officers explained that this building was part of the proposed wider Central Enterprise Zone and talks were on-going with land owners. The Council owned building was in a state of disrepair and was attracting further damage.

The Committee requested additional breakdown of income generated across service areas.

The Committee noted the comments that the funds received by the Council in relation to overpayment of VAT on trade waste had not yet been allocated and Members asked for further information regarding this and landfill tax in order to allow a comparison with last year's position.

The Committee received information regarding Major Projects' projected saving of £70,000 with staff savings as a result of vacancies and recharges to capital schemes. This included a projected overspend of £45,000 in respect of support provided to the Dr Who Experience.

Members of the Committee were of the view that information contained in the report was out of date and should have been provided to the Committee in November 2012 for comment. Members recognised that it could be a challenge to effectively scrutinise budget monitoring reports

due to the time-lags in the reporting cycle. Officers explained to the Committee that the financial reporting mechanism was part of timing the committee cycle. Cabinet received the information in December 2012 which then progressed to Scrutiny for comment in January 2013.

Members commented that the overspends outlined in the report should have been were predictable when the budget had been set. The Committee emphasised that action should be taken to ensure that service areas plan budgets effectively to avoid variances as far as possible.

Members of the Committee were concerned with the overspend in Children's Services and asked that a reassurance be given to parents to assure that provision could be delivered to these respective service users. This budget was slowly decreasing and provisions needed to be found in order to meet the demands placed on parents. In response Officers explained that a significant growth in demand for Children Services was apparent and the pressures being faced in 2012/13 were substantial. Budget realignment would have to be applied in order to meet these needs due to an increase in costs with more service users accessing the provision. Month 8 would be higher than Month 6 especially in key areas such as fostering/residential, domiciliary care packages and providing support overall for children and young adults. There was an ongoing trend in this area as a result of the lack of recruitment of foster carers, along with recruitment and retention of staff. One of main issues was out of county placement with costs, which needed to be addressed.

The Chairperson thanked Christine Salter and Allen Evans for attending the meeting.

AGREED – That a letter be sent by the Chairperson on behalf of the Committee to Christine Salter, Corporate Chief Officer, Corporate Services, thanking her and her Officers for attending the Policy Review and Performance Scrutiny Committee on 16 January 2013 and to convey the following observations of the Committee:-

- The Committee requested an additional breakdown of income generated across service areas.
- The Committee noted the comments provided on the allocation of overpayments of VAT on trade waste and asked for further information regarding this and landfill tax in order to allow a comparison with last year's position.

- Members of the Committee noted that the anticipated projected overspend of £0.9m may improve before the next monitoring report was published and also noted that officers had been asked to cut back on 'non essential' spend in order to ameliorate the situation.

42: WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE:

The Committee received a report which provided progress in delivering the Committee's work programme for 212/13 and to update on forthcoming items in order to seek agreement on the next task and finish inquiry.

RESOLVED: The Committee AGREED to:

- (i) note the contents of the updated 2012/13 work programme
- (ii) Schedule a briefing regarding Information Management in place of the planned Lord Mayoralty item;
- (iii) not to hold a further task and finish inquiry as part of the 2012/13 work programme, apart from the continuation of the Local Development Plan inquiry;
- (iv) Consider an update on ICT as part of the Committee's 2013/14 work programme.

43: CORRESPONDENCE

The Committee received a report that outlined the letter sent by the Chair on behalf of the Committee summing up the Committee's comments, concerns and recommendations regarding the issues previously considered. Responses received to date were also attached to the report.

RESOLVED: The Committee AGREED to:

- (i) Note the content of the letters attached to the report

44: AUDIT PANEL & AUDIT COMMITTEE MINUTES

The Committee were presented with the Audit Panel minutes of 19 March 2012 and the Audit Committee meeting of the 17 September 2012 for information. As further minutes became available these would be

presented to the Committee at appropriate points in the Committee's Work Programme.

RESOLVED: The Committee AGREED to:

- (i) Note the minutes of the Audit Panel and Audit Committee.

CHAIRPERSON.....DATED.....