



CHEL TENHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Notice of a meeting of Audit Committee

Wednesday, 24 September 2014
6.00 pm
Pittville Room, Municipal Offices

Membership	
Councillors:	Colin Hay (Chair), Chris Nelson (Vice-Chair), Matt Babbage, Flo Clucas, Dan Murch, David Prince and Pat Thornton

The Council has a substitution process and any substitutions will be announced at the meeting

Agenda

1.	APOLOGIES	
2.	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	
3.	MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING 18 June 2014	(Pages 1 - 12)
4.	PUBLIC QUESTIONS These must be received no later than 12 noon on the fourth working day before the date of the meeting	
5.	ANNUAL STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTS 2013-14 Presentation by the GO Shared Services Finance Team (Statement of accounts are available electronically on the website http://www.cheltenham.gov.uk/site/scripts/download_info.php?fileID=3775 and a hard copy is in the Members' room)	
6.	AUDIT HIGHLIGHTS MEMORANDUM - ISA 260 Report of Grant Thornton	
7.	REVIEW OF IMPLICATIONS OF COUNCIL ACTION PLAN (KPMG) Report of the Borough Solicitor and Monitoring Officer	(Pages 13 - 48)
8.	APPOINTMENT OF CO-OPTED MEMBERS TO THE AUDIT COMMITTEE Report of the Director of Resources	(Pages 49 - 62)
9.	INTERNAL AUDIT MONITORING REPORT	(Pages

		Report of the Head of Audit Cotswolds	63 - 76)
10.		COUNTER FRAUD UNIT UPDATE Presentation by the Head of Audit Cotswolds	
11.		WORK PROGRAMME	(Pages 77 - 80)
12.		ANY OTHER ITEM THE CHAIRMAN DETERMINES TO BE URGENT AND REQUIRES A DECISION	
13.		DATE OF NEXT MEETING 14 January 2015	

Contact Officer: Saira Malin, Democracy Officer, 01242 775153
Email: democratic.services@cheltenham.gov.uk

Audit Committee

**Wednesday, 18th June, 2014
6.05 - 8.40 pm**

Attendees	
Councillors:	Colin Hay, Matt Babbage, Chris Nelson (Vice-Chair), Dan Murch, Pat Thornton and David Prince
Also in attendance:	Ken Dale, Ruth Jones, Rachel McKinnon, Gary Nejrup, Bryan Parsons, Robin Pritchard, Mark Sheldon and Gary Spencer

Minutes

1. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

Councillor Nelson, Vice Chair, explained that a Chairman had not been elected at Selection Council. He was aware that there had been ongoing discussions regarding the election of an independent Chair and as such, proposed that the committee consider this item after agenda item 6 (Appointment of Independent Members to the Audit Committee).

Given that the committee was not in a position, at this time, to appoint an independent member, it was agreed that the issue of chairmanship would be concluded at a later date. In the meantime the Vice Chair would assume the role of Chairman and noted that at such a time as the committee was ready to consider this matter again, he would appreciate consideration for the role. He confirmed his intention to attend the Grant Thornton summer workshop scheduled for the 4 July.

2. APOLOGIES

Councillor Clucas had given her apologies.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Hay declared an interest in agenda item 9 (Governance Arrangements for the Leisure and Culture Trust) as a trustee.

4. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

The minutes of the last meeting had been circulated with the agenda.

Peter Barber, Principal Auditor from Grant Thornton, requested an amendment to the first sentence of Agenda Item 12 (Audit Plan for the year ending 2014). He asked that the text be amended to read; there were 3 main challenge areas set out in the plan covering, financial pressures...

Upon a vote it was unanimously (by those members that had been present at the meeting in March)

RESOLVED that the minutes, as amended, of the meeting held on the 26 March 2014 be agreed and signed as an accurate record.

5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No public questions had been received.

6. APPOINTMENT OF INDEPENDENT MEMBERS TO THE AUDIT COMMITTEE

The Director of Resources explained that the committee had been discussing, for some time, the benefits of independent representation, which was increasingly considered as good practice. There was however, no provision within the current terms of reference to allow the committee to appoint independent members. If members were minded to appoint independent members it would need to make onward recommendations to Council, as set out in the report. He acknowledged that no chairman had been elected at Selection Council and felt that it was necessary for the committee to first decide whether it accepted the benefits of independent representation and then make a decision regarding chairmanship separately.

Members accepted that independent representation on the Audit Committee was widely deemed as good practice. There was consensus that benefits would include additional and specific skills and expertise and that this would assist the public perception of the committees independence.

There was some debate regarding the definition of an independent member. Members agreed that existing officers or Members of Cheltenham Borough Council, or close friends or relatives of those persons, should not be considered eligible to apply.

A member felt strongly that in the interest of independence and the perception of independence, this should include those persons that had been an Officer or Member in the last five years. He was aware that the former Chair of the committee who had not stood in the recent elections, had indicated that he would be interested in co-option onto the committee and Chairman. The member felt strongly that any co-opted member should not be a member of a political party, especially one that held the position of chair. In his opinion the chair, by the very nature of the role, would be able to influence the direction discussion and that this could undermine the committee. Other members of the committee felt that it would be difficult enough to find interested representatives with the relevant skills and expertise without limiting eligibility any further than existing officers and Councillors or their friends and family.

The committee were reminded that at this stage they were simply being asked to agree, in principle, for the provision of independent representation on the committee. Council would decide the selection and appointment procedure and the Monitoring Officer, having been authorised to make the relevant changes, could well invite the constitution working group to take a view on this.

The Vice Chair was happy that the comments from this discussion would be included within the report that was taken to Council.

Upon a vote it was unanimously

RESOLVED that the committee recommends to Council that

- i. **The terms of reference of the Audit Committee be amended to allow it to appoint up to 3 co-optees as non-voting members;**
- ii. **It authorises the Borough Solicitor and Monitoring Officer to make any necessary changes to the constitution;**
- iii. **It agrees a selection/appointment procedure for appointment of the co-optees.**

7. ANNUAL GOVERNANCE STATEMENT

The Governance, Risk and Compliance Officer introduced the Annual Governance Statement (AGS). He explained that the Council had a statutory duty to prepare the AGS as part of the annual statement of accounts. The committee needed to be satisfied that the AGS fairly reflected the arrangements within the council and that the action plan would address any significant governance issues identified by the review.

This was a lengthy report and covered the previous twelve months of business at the council, including issues and management of risks. The action plan at the back of the report was populated by internal and external audit and progress was monitored throughout the year.

The Governance, Risk and Compliance Officer gave the following answers to questions from members of the committee;

- The audit committee was responsible for reviewing and approving some of the council's policies. The Counter Corruption and Fraud policy was currently being reviewed by officers in order that it could be aligned with the procurement policy. Once complete this would be reported for approval by the committee.
- Unlike the Joint Waste Committee, there was no reference to the Joint Economic Committee. The Governance, Risk and Compliance Officer would speak to the relevant officer regarding what reference was required as he had not been involved in any discussions up to this point.
- The typos that were highlighted would be amended.
- The final report and recommendations into the Wilson (Art Gallery and Museum) had not yet been received and as such this had not been included. Once it had been received and the issues were, the level of associated risk would be assessed and items added as necessary. Until then the specific issues were not evident.
- The council had a robust business continuity plan but as a result of the ICT shared service with the Forest of Dean and the alignment of ICT infrastructure both plans were being challenged and redefined. The council had committed to a 5 year capital investment of 1.3million in to ICT infrastructure. Members were assured that the existing business continuity plan was still in place should an issue arise with the infrastructure and the March 2015 deadline was for the alignment of this plan into a joint plan with the Forest of Dean.
- The action relating to 'safeguarding children and vulnerable adults' was not complete as a lot of training had been delivered by GCC and the training records were still being sourced and pulled together.

The council had purchased a new central system which would automatically identify relevant training, send out policies (requiring the officer to register receipt and carry out a short test to measure understanding).

- UBICO use the council safeguarding policy and their staff were welcome to attend council training. CBH had their own policies and training, given that by their very nature they were more likely to come into contact with children and vulnerable adults. There was a legal requirement for all organisations to have these policies and as part of the AGS process they were required to give assurances to the council regarding compliance with such policies. Audit would report any non-compliance to the council.
- The interim Head of Audit Services confirmed that the significant issue relating to the investigation into weaknesses in the control framework in ICT was being managed by the ICTSS and could be closed. It was felt that March 2015 was somewhat of a default date. Whilst it was likely that a mid-year update would likely report that some actions had been concluded, officers were mindful of resource issues.
- The car parking item was ongoing as this was now subject to an enhanced piece of work to that originally undertaken. Originally the review was focussed on an issue at Regents Arcade car park which had now been expanded to consider the wider enforcement issue. Officers were currently working towards having a report ready for Cabinet in July.

Upon a vote it was unanimously

RESOLVED that;

- 1. the Annual Governance Statement be approved and included within the statement of accounts**
- 2. the Leader and Chief Executive be advised to sign the Annual Governance Statement.**

8. AUDITING STANDARDS - COMMUNICATING WITH THE AUDIT COMMITTEE

Peter Barber, from Grant Thornton, introduced the item and explained that this formed part of an annual process whereby Grant Thornton sought a formal response from management and 'those charged with governance' regarding actual, suspected or alleged fraud and views on key areas affecting the financial statements. The responses from management had been circulated with the agenda and he noted that Grant Thornton had been very satisfied with the level of detail that had been provided.

Peter Barber offered the following answers to questions from members of the committee;

- The management response to the question regarding 'key events and issues that will have significant impact on the financial statements for 2013/14' would be amended to include the Wilson (Art Gallery and Museum).

- The issues at the cemetery and crematorium were to do with internal controls rather than having any impact on the financial statements and as such this would not be included.

The management response would be used to inform the Audit Committee/Chair response but there was agreement by all that Paul Massey, as Chair for the period in question, 2013/14, would be best placed to formulate this response, if he were happy to do so. Officers agreed to contact Paul Massey and circulate the draft response for comment, by email, between now and the next meeting (September 24).

9. GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS FOR LEISURE AND CULTURE TRUST

Ken Dale, the Business Development Manager, introduced a PowerPoint presentation (Appendix 1) which set out the proposed governance arrangements for the Leisure and Culture Trust. He and the other officers that were in attendance talked through each of the slides.

Officers provided the following answers to questions from members of the committee;

- Potentially, money was the biggest risk, however, the agreed fee would run for five years which was aimed at providing a level of certainty and confidence. From the perspective of the Trust, the council had clearly set out where is expected savings to be achieved as a result of the formation of the Trust and as such, the business plan had had been built around the budget.
- The Trust would have audit arrangements and an audit committee of its own but this committee would need to feel comfortable with the arrangements that were in place and any associated risks. It was important to note that this committee did not receive regular updates on other shared services as the necessary assurances were included in the Annual Governance Statement and annual assurances. As was the case with GOSS, it would be possible to review governance for the Trust at the twelve month stage.
- Performance issues would be picked up by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
- Any risks of the trust that escalated to a level whereby they became corporate risks of the council would be reported immediately to this audit committee.

There were no resolutions resulting from this paper.

10. AUDIT COMMITTEE UPDATE

Grant Thornton, External Auditors, introduced the Audit Committee Update. Given the timing, after having finished the interim accounts audit and before the 2013-14 final accounts audit, there had not been a large amount of progress since the last update in March. Page 55/56 set out progress to date and beyond that, the paper aimed to highlight any emerging issues or developments. The challenge questions were a new addition to the update and Grant Thornton thanked management for their responses.

Grant Thornton provided the following responses to member questions;

- The challenge questions were a new concept, generally, feedback had been positive but if members preferred the position statement then Grant Thornton were happy to revert back to that. It was not envisaged that the management response would necessarily address each question comprehensively, nor were the questions posed to create a raft of work for officers. The Council produced performance data and the suggestion was that the committee could ask Overview and Scrutiny to look at a particular issue if these questions highlighted a particular issue or even pass them all of the challenge questions on an annual basis.

There were no resolutions resulting from this paper.

11. AUDIT FEE LETTER 2014/15

Grant Thornton referred members to the letter as circulated with the agenda, which set out the proposed work programme and associated fees for the ensuing year. They explained that the fee, of just under £65k, had been set by the Audit Commission and had remained at the same level as the previous year.

In response to a member question, Peter Barber advised that the Wilson (Art Gallery and Museum) review had been undertaken outside of Grant Thornton's regular work stream, for which there would be an additional fee. He was aware that there had been a number of issues which had delayed the timescale for this review, which had in turn, delayed the final report. The report would soon be submitted to the Chief Executive and considered by this committee at the meeting in September. Having not been personally involved in the review, the representatives from Grant Thornton were to provide any further advice in relation to the outcome of this review.

There were no resolutions resulting from this paper.

12. INTERNAL AUDIT OPINION - 2013/14

Robin Pritchard introduced himself to the committee; he was supporting the Head of Audit Cotswolds in his role for a short period. The report summarised the audit activity for the last year and an overall assurance level, which for 2013-14 was satisfactory.

In response to a member question, Robin Pritchard explained that items listed on Appendix 1 of the report (Table of internal audit work in 2013/14) as draft, had not been concluded within the financial year but would be finalised and reported to Audit in September.

There were no resolutions resulting from this paper.

13. COUNTER FRAUD REPORT 2013-14

Ruth Jones, Senior Benefits Investigation Officer, introduced the Counter Fraud Report 2013-14, inviting members of the committee to make comments as necessary. The report set out the counter-fraud and anti-corruption arrangements and activity for the previous year, with three areas of focus; acknowledge, prevent and pursue.

There were two elements, awareness of the risk of fraud and external fraud, mostly in relation to benefit fraud. Internal Audit had reported that there had

been no internal issues in the last twelve months and as such the focus had been on external (benefit) fraud.

Whilst there were only a small number of issues arise through the course of a year, owing to the proactive anti-fraud culture, it was useful to produce summary and in future this would be sorted by order of importance.

Councillor Hay commended officers for a well produced report.

There were no resolutions resulting from this paper.

14. WORK PROGRAMME

The Director of Resources introduced the committee work plan which set out the agenda items for each meeting. He noted that a large proportion of items considered by this committee were cyclical but from time to time there were ad-hoc items for consideration. He acknowledged that the committee often had very full agendas.

The work programme was noted.

The Vice Chair took the opportunity to thank officers for some well written and highly informative reports.

15. ANY OTHER ITEM THE CHAIRMAN DETERMINES TO BE URGENT AND REQUIRES A DECISION

No urgent business was raised.

16. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting was scheduled for 24 September 2014.

Vice – Chairman
Councillor Nelson

This page is intentionally left blank
Page 8

Cheltenham Leisure and Culture Trust – Governance Arrangements

Audit Committee

18 June 2014

Ken Dale – Commissioning Division
Gary Nejrup – Wellbeing and Culture Division
Rachel McKinnon – Commissioning Division
Gary Spencer – One Legal

CHEL TENHAM
Leisure & Culture Trust

This evening's presentation ...

- Cheltenham LCT (CLCT) will be responsible for the operational management and service delivery of Leisure@, Prince of Wales Stadium, Cheltenham Town Hall, Wilson Art Gallery and Museum, Pittville Pump Room, Tourism and Tourist Information Centre, Sport Play and Healthy Lifestyles from October 1st.
- CLCT is in the process of developing its corporate governance framework
- CLCT and the Council are agreeing the governance arrangements for the management of the contractual relationships
- We will give you an update on the information shared last year, briefly covering:
 - Trust legal structure
 - Contractual relationship between the Trust, Council and support services providers
 - Trust corporate governance
 - Specification and Proposal
 - Council's Due Diligence
 - Contract governance arrangements
 - Client side management
 - Members' roles
 - Key programme risks

CHEL TENHAM
Leisure & Culture Trust

Trust legal structure

- Charitable company limited by guarantee (CCLG)
- Incorporated 1st May 2014
 - Commonly legal form – “trusted brand”
 - Creates a separate legal entity
 - Flexible structure – able to create subsidiary companies, one currently being formed
 - Protection for trustees – company enters into contracts not individual trustees
 - Advantageous structure
 - Trust will be regulated by the Charity Commission and Companies House – highest standards of good governance demanded
- Directors of a charitable company are both directors and trustees and have duties and responsibilities under the Companies Act and Charities Act

CHEL TENHAM
Leisure & Culture Trust

Contractual relationships

- Including contract / lease relationships between trust and council; between trust and its support providers
- Contract will specify what Trust has to do and standards
- Leases will deal with individual properties e.g. Town Hall

CHEL TENHAM
Leisure & Culture Trust

Trust corporate governance

- Memorandum & Association of articles
- Trustee code of conduct
- Policies & Procedures
- Charity Commission

CHEL TENHAM
Leisure & Culture Trust

Specification

- Outcomes based specification
- 3 areas - principles, outcomes, operating standards
- Developed in partnership
- Designed to give trust freedom to deliver the outcomes by being innovative and using its skills, knowledge and expertise

CHEL TENHAM
Leisure & Culture Trust

Proposal

- Key Activities required by CBC
- How the Trust will deliver
- Target Indicators
- Monitoring



Due Diligence

- Advice from GOSS regarding due diligence process
- Important to remember this has not been a procurement exercise
- Using the experts across the council
- Evaluation of each of the following
 - HR, Finance, Legal, Insurance, Licencing, Property, governance, H&S, ICT, Audit, Strategy and Engagement



Contact Governance Framework

- Partnership Board
 - Quarterly
 - Cabinet portfolio holder, Authorised officer, Chair of trustee's , Chief Executive
- Performance meetings
 - Monthly
 - Authorised officer, Client officer, Chief Executive, Relationship officer



Client-side management

- Formal relationship management between the trust and the council via contract and specification
- Client side monitoring will sit within the Commissioning Team
- Customer complaint monitoring will form key performance measure within the contract
- Suite of performance measurements will be agreed between the trust and the council – currently in development
- More complex outcome-focused indicators will need to be developed over time
- Regular officer meetings – monthly, quarterly and annually
- Seeking a partnership approach



Members' roles

- **Cabinet**
 - approves the strategic direction for leisure and culture services and approves the outcomes
 - agrees and approves contractual arrangements (including performance standards and governance)
 - receives performance reports via the performance management process
- **Cabinet Lead**
 - defines the strategic and policy direction for leisure and culture services
 - works with the commissioners to develop the contractual arrangements including advising on key elements of the contract and specification
 - will be a member of the formal Partnership Board and will take part in the informal contract governance
- **Overview and scrutiny**
 - will receive the quarterly and annual reports of the Trust's performance (NB it may be determined this should go to Full Council)
 - call the trust to account if required
 - may decide, for example, to undertake a review of how the trust is performing say after the first 12 months of operation.
- **Individual members**
 - will have access to how the trust is performing via reports submitted to O&S
 - will have access to the Trust's annual performance report
 - will, as ward councillors, be asked to direct complaints with service standards or performance to the Trust. The Trust will have a published complaints process. The council will monitor the level of customer complaints as part of the contract monitoring with the trust



Risks

- **Approach**
 - Programme risks reviewed and managed monthly by programme board
- **Key Risks**
 - Insufficient capacity / lengthening timescales. Agreed budget for executive support and backfill. Ongoing management through programme board and corporate resourcing process
 - Set-up costs exceed budget. Clear accountability for costs at programme board level supported by monitoring and control. Clear justification for additional spend required.
 - Service teams' concerns during transition impact service delivery. Ensure teams fully briefed and consulted. Ensure dialogue between board and service teams.
 - Trust fails to deliver contract. Carry out due diligence. Design and implement robust contract management.
 - Approach to support services. Agree an approach which allows the trust sufficient freedom in sourcing its support services whilst allocating the business / financial risks of moving away from council / partner provision
 - Lack of engagement of members and other key stakeholders. Continue to engage through discussion and presentations



Comments/Questions



Outcomes

- **People in Cheltenham lead healthier, fulfilling and active lives**
 - People take regular exercise
 - People make lifestyle choices to improve their own health and wellbeing
 - People can participate in activities regardless of age or ability
- **People in Cheltenham are inspired to take part and gain valuable skills and experience**
 - People of all ages learn new skills and develop their knowledge
 - People of all abilities and backgrounds participate in learning activities
 - People contribute to the health and wellbeing of their communities
- **Cheltenham is seen as a world class place to live, work, study and visit**
 - Cheltenham is recognised as an inspiring cultural and tourist destination
 - Cheltenham's heritage & cultural assets and environment are protected, enhanced and enjoyed
 - Cheltenham is open and accessible to all



This page is intentionally left blank
Page 12

**Cheltenham Borough Council
Audit Committee – 24 September 2014
Review of Implementation of Council
Action Plan (KPMG)**

Accountable member	Councillor Jordan, Leader of the Council
Accountable officer	Andrew North, Chief Executive
Ward(s) affected	None directly
Key Decision	No
Executive summary	
<p>On 22 March 2010, the Council approved Action Plans in response to recommendations made by the Council’s Auditors, KPMG in a report in the Public Interest relating to the Council’s decision making processes and to recommendations made by a Member Working Group set up to review employment and dispute resolution processes.</p> <p>The Council delegated responsibility to the Audit Committee to monitor implementation of the Action Plans. Monitoring reports were considered by the Committee between June 2010 and September 2011. On the 21 September 2011, the Audit Committee concluded that it was satisfied that all specified actions had been fully addressed.</p> <p>In response to a question at the Council meeting on the 21 July 2014, the Leader of the Council confirmed the Audit Committee decision in relation to the recommendations from the KPMG public interest report. The Leader also confirmed that given the passage of time he had asked officers to prepare a report to enable the Audit Committee to review the current situation.</p> <p>Appendix 2 to this report sets out the current position with regard to implementation of the Action Plans approved by the Council by updating a version of the template used by the Audit Committee in 2010 /11 to monitor implementation of the Action Plans. This will enable the committee to review the position as requested.</p>	
Recommendations	
<p>That the Committee consider the information set out in Appendix 2 and determine whether any further action is required in respect of any of the recommendations set out in parts A and B of the Action Plan</p>	

Financial implications	<p>There are no financial implications arising directly from this report.</p> <p>Contact officer: Mark Sheldon, mark.sheldon@cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 264123</p>
Legal implications	<p>None directly arising from the report.</p> <p>Contact officer: Sara Freckleton, sara.freckleton@teWKesbury.gov.uk, 01684 272011</p>
HR implications (including learning and organisational development)	<p>There are no HR implications arising directly from this report.</p> <p>Contact officer: Amanda Attfield, amanda.attfield@cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 264186</p>
Key risks	<p>See attached Risk Template</p>
Corporate and community plan Implications	<p>None</p>
Environmental and climate change implications	<p>None</p>

1. Background

- 1.1 On 22 March 2010, the Council considered a report in the Public Interest (PIR). The report had been issued by KPMG regarding the Council's decision making processes arising from a review of the Council's decision making processes for the High Court litigation against its former Managing Director. At the same meeting, the Council received a report from a Member Working Group which was set up to review the KPMG report, recruitment and appointment processes and the internal processes for dispute resolution.
- 1.2 The Council accepted the recommendations made by KPMG in the PIR and by the Working group and approved Action Plans in response to each. The recommendations forming the approved Action Plans are set out in Appendix 2, Part A being those required to address the KPMG report and Part B being those required to address the report of the Member Working Group.
- 1.3 Responsibility was delegated to the Audit Committee to monitor the implementation of the approved Action Plans. The Committee reviewed progress between June 2010 and September 2011 and, at its meeting on the 24 September 2011, resolved "That it was satisfied that all specified actions had been fully addressed".

2. Current Position and Review of Action Plans

- 2.1 On the 21 July 2014 the Leader of the Council was asked to confirm that all of the recommendations arising from the KPMG Public Interest Report were implemented and are still in place today. The Leaders response was "As you will recall the council considered the 26 recommendations at an Extraordinary Meeting of Council on 23 March 2010, and approved a list of 39 actions to be taken forward. Monitoring the implementation of the recommendations was given to the Audit Committee and they considered progress reports at their meetings in June 2010, September 2010, January 2011 and March 2011. At their meeting on 21 September 2011 they concluded that they were satisfied that all specified actions had been fully addressed. It is inevitable that four years later, processes put in place at the time will have been updated and amended, as governance and risk arrangements have been improved. I think it would be appropriate for the Audit Committee to review the current situation and I have asked officers to prepare a report for consideration by the committee".
- 2.2 The table at Appendix 2 sets out the recommended actions, the position as approved by the Audit Committee in September 2011 and then a further column indicating the current position. The Committee will note that action was taken as required in respect of all 39 action points. There was one action which was not, following detailed consideration and for the reasons set out, capable of implementation (Part B- R9). On this basis, the Audit Committee was able to confirm, in September 2011, that all specified actions had been fully addressed.
- 2.3 In accordance with the request of the Leader of the Council, the Committee is being asked to review the current position and consider whether, in the light of the updated position and current circumstances, there is any further action which needs to be taken in respect of any parts of the Action Plan.

3. Alternative options considered

- 3.1 None

4. Consultation and feedback

- 4.1 None

5. Performance management –monitoring and review

5.1 The Committee will determine whether any further monitoring/review is required.

Report author	Contact officer: Sara Freckleton, sara.freckleton@teWKesbury.gov.uk, 01684 272011
Appendices	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Risk Assessment 2. Action Plan Progress Table
Background information	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reports to and Minutes of Extraordinary Council Meeting held on the 22 March 2010 2. Reports to and Minutes of Audit Committee Meetings held on 23 June 2010, 29 September 2010, 9 January 2011, 23 March 2011 and 21 September 2011

The risk				Original risk score (impact x likelihood)			Managing risk				
Risk ref.	Risk description	Risk Owner	Date raised	Impact 1-5	Likelihood 1-6	Score	Control	Action	Deadline	Responsible officer	Transferred to risk register
	If the Council fails to continue to monitor, review and update its Corporate Governance and Risk arrangements then there would be a risk that the Councils decision making processes would become flawed putting at risk its reputation, finances and assets	Chief Executive Andrew North	12/09/2014	4	2	8	Review	Ensure that the Councils corporate governance and risk management arrangements are maintained and reviewed by the Corporate Governance Group, monitored by the Senior Leadership Team and approved by the Audit Committee.	Annual re-assessment	Director of Corporate resources	
<p>Explanatory notes</p> <p>Impact – an assessment of the impact if the risk occurs on a scale of 1-5 (1 being least impact and 5 being major or critical)</p> <p>Likelihood – how likely is it that the risk will occur on a scale of 1-6 (1 being almost impossible, 2 is very low, 3 is low, 4 significant, 5 high and 6 a very high probability)</p> <p>Control - Either: Reduce / Accept / Transfer to 3rd party / Close</p>											

This page is intentionally left blank

Action Plan to implement KPMG and Review Working Group Recommendations

**As agreed at
Council 22 March 2010
and
Reviewed at Audit committee;**

23rd June 2010
29th September 2010
12th January 2011
23rd March 2011
21st September 2011
24th September 2014

Part A - Action Plan in response to KPMG RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATIONS		
The Role of the Borough Solicitor		
R1. Review the constitution to make clear what the Borough Solicitor can and cannot do regarding decisions to instigate and continue legal action, whether financial limits should apply to the Borough Solicitor's delegated authority, and when and from whom further sanction is required for financial expenditure above that limit.		
Recommended Action	Position as at 21 st September 2011	Lead Officer and Current Position
<p>1. That the powers delegated to the Borough Solicitor will be considered as part of the review of the Constitution (including the Employee Delegation Scheme). Specific consideration will be given to the scope of delegation of decisions to instigate and continue legal action and to any financial limits which should apply and, how and from whom authority to exceed that limit is obtained.</p> <p>2. That the Borough Solicitor is tasked to undertake a comprehensive review of the Constitution and to produce a report by the 30th September 2010 for consideration by the Staff and Support Services Committee.</p>	<p>Completed.</p> <p>1. On the 13th December 2010, the Council approved revisions to the Council's Constitution which include amendments to the Employee delegation scheme and which address this recommendation.</p> <p>2. On the 11th October 2010, the Council approved a revised timetable for the comprehensive review of the Constitution and it is now intended that this be completed in time for the next municipal year in May 2011.</p>	<p>Borough Solicitor</p> <p>Implemented.</p> <p>The Constitution was reviewed as required and approved by the Council on the 13th December 2010.</p> <p>Further amendments to the Constitution, including a comprehensive-review of Part 3 of the Constitution-Responsibility for Functions (Scheme of Delegation), were approved by the Council in March 2012.</p>

R2. Review the constitution for other potential instances where authority is delegated to individuals without clarity over the extent of their financial authority.

Recommended Action	Position as at 21 st September 2011	Lead Officer and Current Position
<p>1. That the Employee Delegation Scheme to be reviewed by the Borough Solicitor as part of the review of the Constitution. The review will consider whether there is sufficient clarity as to the financial restrictions which should appropriately apply and how and from whom authority to exceed any limits is obtained.</p> <p>2. That the Borough Solicitor is tasked to undertake a comprehensive review of the Constitution and to produce a report by the 30th September 2010 for consideration by the Staff and Support Services Committee.</p>	<p>1. Completed see R1 above.</p> <p>2. See R1 above.</p>	<p>Borough Solicitor</p> <p>Implemented</p> <p>The Constitution was reviewed as required and approved by the Council on the 13th December 2010.</p> <p>Further amendments to the Constitution, including a comprehensive review of Part 3 of the Constitution-Responsibility for Functions (Scheme of Delegation), were approved by the Council in March 2012.</p>

RECOMMENDATIONS		
The Role of the Borough Solicitor		
R3. Ensure that where there are alternative people or bodies who could take a lead decision making role, that all options are evaluated and the conclusion is documented clearly.		
Recommended Action	Position as at 21st September 2011	Lead Officer and Current Position
That a process, to be implemented corporately, be devised whereby, in circumstances where there are alternative officers or committees who could make a particular decision, the options for the decision making are evaluated and the conclusion clearly documented. The process is to be explained within the guidance note being prepared by the Assistant Chief Executive for the Senior Leadership Team (SLT) and Service Managers.	Completed. A guidance note has been issued and training has been undertaken with report authors so that they are aware of the process for the evaluation of decision-making options.	Chief Executive Implemented The Guidance Note remains in place and relevant. Training is currently being refreshed and further sessions for officers on processes and decision making are taking place on 23 rd and 30 th September 2014.

Page 2

The Role of Members		
<p>R4. Review the need for, and remit of, the S&SSC and other committees. In a Cabinet/Scrutiny model, a Council may only need regulatory committees (Licensing, Audit, Planning). Mixing decisions between Cabinet and S&SSC can be confusing. It may be possible for many operational matters to be delegated to the officers and the Chief Executive as head of paid service, perhaps supported by ad hoc Member Panels or other for a for advisory purposes.</p>		
Recommended Action	Position as at 21st September 2011	Lead Officer and Current Position
<p>1. That the need for and remit of the Staff and Support Services Committee and other Committees should be reviewed as recommended as part of the comprehensive review of the Constitution.</p> <p>2. That a Member Working Group be established to undertake the review of the remit of Committees and any other aspect of the Constitution as is deemed appropriate by the Staff and Support Services Committee.</p> <p>3. That the Borough Solicitor is tasked to undertake a comprehensive review of the Constitution and to produce a report by the 30th September 2010 for consideration by the Staff and Support Services Committee.</p>	<p>1 & 2 Completed. On 13th December 2010, the Council, having considered the Constitution Working Group's report reviewing the remit of the Staff & Support Services Committee, resolved that the S&SSC should be discontinued.</p> <p>3. On the 11th October 2010, the Council approved a revised timetable for the comprehensive review of the Constitution and it is now intended that this be completed in time for the next municipal year in May 2011.</p>	<p>Borough Solicitor and GOSS HR</p> <p>Implemented</p> <p>The Constitution was reviewed as required and approved by the Council on the 13th December 2010.</p> <p>Further amendments to the Constitution, including a comprehensive review of Part 3 of the Constitution-Responsibility for Functions (Scheme of Delegation), were approved by the Council in March 2012.</p>

R5. Review constitutionally whether 'key decisions' made by committees should be subject to similar procedural and notification requirements as those made by Cabinet.		
Recommended Action	Position as at 21 st September 2011	Lead Officer and Current Position
<p>1. That consideration as to whether there should be procedural and notification requirements for decisions made by Committees which are similar to the procedures for "key decisions" to be included as part of the comprehensive review of the Council's Constitution.</p> <p>2. That the Borough Solicitor is tasked to undertake a comprehensive review of the Constitution and to produce a report by the 30th September 2010 for consideration by the Staff and Support Services Committee.</p>	<p>1. Completed. On 13th December 2010, the Council considered the report of the Constitution Working Group which included recommendation for changes to Article 13 (Decision Making) of the Council's Constitution. The Council approved the introduction of a definition of "Significant Decisions". In the light of the decision to discontinue the S&SSC, it was not considered it to be necessary to introduce a procedure for notification of Significant Decisions.</p> <p>2. On the 11th October 2010, the Council approved a revised timetable for the comprehensive review of the Constitution and it is now intended that this be completed in time for the next municipal year in May 2011.</p>	<p>Borough Solicitor</p> <p>Implemented</p> <p>The position remains as set out in 2011.</p>

RECOMMENDATIONS		
The Role of Members		
R6. When important constitutional questions are raised, then the Council should take care to answer the precise question and also to look further at the underlying implications.		
Recommended Action	Position as at 21st September 2011	Lead Officer and Current Position
<p>1. That the requirement to identify, answer and consider underlying implications of important constitutional questions should be included within the guidance note being prepared by the Assistant Chief Executive for the Senior Leadership Team (SLT) and Service Managers.</p> <p>2. That the Corporate Governance Group recommends a process / procedure to ensure that constitutional questions are identified and dealt with.</p>	<p>1 & 2 Completed. A guidance note has been issued and training has been undertaken with report authors so that they are aware of the process.</p>	<p>Chief Executive Implemented.</p> <p>The report writing process guide is in place to support report authors. The Borough Solicitor is a member of the Statutory Officers Group and the Corporate Governance group where legislative changes and / constitutional issues are dealt with and then cascaded as required.</p>

Page 25

R7. Where decisions are made by committees or officers, ensure there is sufficient briefing of, and involvement from, the relevant Cabinet leads at appropriate stages.		
Recommended Action	Position as at 21st September 2011	Lead Officer and Current Position
<p>1. This has been implemented.</p> <p>2. That the need for timely and sufficient briefing of Cabinet Leads (and Shadow Leads as appropriate), be included within the guidance note which is being prepared for the Senior Leadership Team and Service Managers.</p>	<p>1. Implemented</p> <p>2. Completed. A guidance note has been issued and training has been undertaken with report authors so that they are aware of the need for timely and sufficient briefing of Members as appropriate.</p>	<p>Chief Executive Implemented.</p> <p>The guidance note remains in place and relevant. Cabinet leads are briefed on officer decisions as well as on reports presented to committees.</p>

RECOMMENDATIONS		
Objectives and Option Appraisal		
R8. Review the process for taking forward, and reporting back on, decisions made by committees to ensure agreed actions are delivered (or explanations provided as to why they are not).		
Recommended Action	Position as at 21st September 2011	Lead Officer and Current Position
<p>1. Implement a centralised log of decisions taken with mechanisms for recording and monitoring actions taken in accordance with those decisions.</p> <p>2. Devise a mechanism whereby Committees review progress of implementation of decisions which they have made.</p>	<p>1. Modern.Gov has now been implemented and within the system decisions can be reviewed by date, decision maker and decision status, and the system also enables the decision to be linked to issues so that anyone can see associated decisions. There is a facility to update a decision status of Modern.gov but this is not widely used by other councils and not cost-effective in terms of the Democratic Services resource that would be needed to monitor decisions. The 'decision' on the budget for example could contain as many as 20 separate recommendations. Instead implementation of decisions is the responsibility of Directors and these will be reviewed with members via 1-1s and where appropriate a review can be scheduled in a committee's work plan. Where the decisions support actions in the Corporate Strategy these will be monitored by the Performance Management system. As such this action is now complete.</p> <p>2. Completed.</p>	<p>Chief Executive</p> <p>A new report template has been devised which includes a section on how the recommendations will be monitored and reviewed. Training has been undertaken with report authors and the new template is to be used for the meetings in September onwards.</p>

RECOMMENDATIONS		
Objectives and Option Appraisal		
R9. Ensure that all relevant options are assessed when considering crucial decisions.		
Recommended Action	Position as at 21st September 2011	Lead Officer and Current Position
<p>1. The assessment of all relevant options should be included within the reports placed before Committees and the corporate Committee report template should be revised to incorporate options evaluation.</p> <p>2. A process whereby the evaluation of options in respect of decisions taken under delegated powers should be devised and implemented.</p> <p>3. The requirements in respect of the drafting of reports and decisions made within delegated authority should be included within the guidance note which is being prepared for the Senior Leadership Team (SLT) and Service Managers.</p>	<p>1. Completed. A new report template has been devised which includes a specific section on the evaluation of all relevant options. Training has been undertaken with report authors and the new template is to be used for the meetings in September onwards</p> <p>2 & 3. Completed. A guidance note has been issued and training has been undertaken with report authors so that they are aware of the process for the evaluation of options, drafting of reports and decisions to be made in respect of decisions taken under delegated powers.</p>	<p>Chief Executive</p> <p>Implemented.</p> <p>The corporate report template currently in use includes reasons for recommendations and the alternative options which have been considered.</p> <p>Decisions made by officers under delegated authority follow the same report process and are published!</p>

RECOMMENDATIONS		
Objectives and Option Appraisal		
<p>R10. Options should be reassessed throughout decision processes. This includes revisiting the overall objective and ensuring that the strategy being followed remains appropriate for delivering the objective. The council needs to remain flexible, and be prepared to change objectives, options and decisions on a timely basis if information changes.</p>		
Recommended Action	Position as at 21st September 2011	Lead Officer and Current Position
<p>That the need to apply project management principles and to reassess risks during throughout a decision process should be included within the guidance note which is being prepared for the Senior Leadership Team (SLT) and Service Managers. The Project Management Principles should include defining at the outset, the period for reviewing the project, its purpose and objectives.</p>	<p>Completed. SLT has received a presentation on projects and risks and criteria for managing projects is being developed. The risk assessment template has been updated and identifies the need to consider risks which may impact on the delivery of the strategic outcomes. The revised report template also includes a section on how decisions will be monitored and reviewed.</p>	<p>Chief Executive Implemented. Criteria for managing programmes and projects are in place. Any significant risks which are identified at programme/project level are reported to SLT for inclusion on the corporate risk register. SLT monitor projects of corporate significance</p>

Page 28

RECOMMENDATIONS		
Professional Advice		
R11. The Council should, in all instances, take decisions based on a balanced range of success factors including service needs, legal issues, financial implications and risk. Decisions should be informed by appropriate risk scenarios or possible outcomes.		
Recommended Action	Position as at 21st September 2011	Lead Officer and Current Position
<p>1. Revise the Council's standard report template to ensure that a balanced range of success factors, legal and financial implications and risks are required to be fully considered within each report to the Council and its Committees.</p> <p>2. Devise a procedure to ensure that the same range of factors as set out above are demonstrably considered in respect of crucial decisions taken under authority delegated to officers and implement the procedure.</p>	<p>1. Completed. A new report template has been devised which requires report owners to ensure that a balanced range of success factors, legal and financial implications and risks are fully considered within each report. Training has been undertaken with report authors and the new template is to be used for the meetings in September onwards</p> <p>2. Completed. The guidance note includes reminders to involve the appropriate officers when drafting reports, and covers delegated decisions. Training has been undertaken with report authors.</p>	<p>Chief Executive</p> <p>Implemented.</p> <p>The corporate report template requires disclosure of the financial, HR, legal, property and environmental implications. There is a risk template attached to every report.</p>
R12. Before starting legal proceedings that are likely to incur significant costs, estimate the potential risks and costs and revisit this analysis throughout the process, and certainly whenever there is a sea change in the case.		
Recommended Action	Position as at 21st September 2011	Lead Officer and Current Position
The action recommended is as set out above in R10 and R11.	Completed. See R10 and R11.	<p>Chief Executive</p> <p>Implemented.</p> <p>See R10 and R11 above</p>

RECOMMENDATIONS		
Crucial Decision Points		
R13. The Council should recognise that not taking an explicit decision (e.g. use of “The Committee notes”) can amount to a positive decision to continue with the existing course of action. In sensitive or important issues, officers should carefully draft recommendations so that it is clear what will happen as a result.		
Recommended Action	Position as at 21st September 2011	Lead Officer and Current Position
Include guidance to report authors to ensure careful drafting of recommendations to Committee and what Officers should seek from Members in considering those recommendations will be included in a guidance note to the Senior Leadership Team (SLT) and Service Managers.	Completed. The guidance note has been issued and includes the need for clarity as to the recommendations and decisions required. Training has been undertaken with report authors	Chief Executive Implemented. The guidance note remains in place and relevant and refresher training is being undertaken as referred to in R3 above.

RECOMMENDATIONS		
Crucial Decision Points		
R14. The Council should apply its usual governance processes to all decisions brought to Members, in whatever committee or forum, and explain the reason for any deviation from the processes.		
Recommended Action	Position as at 21st September 2011	Lead Officer and Current Position
<p>1. Devise a process to ensure, through the Democratic Services, that all matters brought to members for a decision follows the usual governance processes, and to include specific provisions for the recording of any deviations from the standard process.</p> <p>2. That the process be incorporated within the guidance note which is being prepared for the Senior Leadership Team (SLT) and Service Managers.</p>	<p>1 & 2 Completed. The guidance note has been issued and makes it clear that the normal governance process must be followed when decisions are taken and any deviations documented. Training has been undertaken with report authors</p>	<p>Chief Executive Implemented. The guidance note remains in place and relevant and refresher training is being undertaken as referred to in R3 above.</p>

Involvement of Officers Corporately		
R15. The Strategic Directors, Assistant Directors and Service Managers should immediately review all major service and corporate issues that they are individually dealing with, and check whether they are being managed properly and reported through the appropriate channels . There should be an on-going process to ensure that significant issues are escalated to the right people. (See also risk management below).		
Recommended Action	Position as at 21st September 2011	Lead Officer and Current Position
Action has already been instigated by the Chief Executive for an immediate review of all major services and corporate issues being dealt with by Strategic Directors, Assistant Directors and Service Managers to ensure the proper management and reporting. The ongoing process will be reviewed regularly through both the internal audit as part of its audit plan and the corporate governance group. The Chief Executive has issued an email to Strategic Directors, Assistant Directors and Service Managers asking them to undertake the review.	<p>Completed.</p> <p>This has been implemented. SLT have received a presentation on projects and risks and criteria for managing projects is being developed. All ADs are producing service plans for their areas and as part of this process are looking at the way in which projects and programmes are being managed.</p> <p>SLT discuss risks on a regular basis and now have a section on their agenda which enables concerns to be raised.</p> <p>The project and programme guidance has been updated to ensure that it is clear how project risks can be escalated to either programme or corporate level.</p>	<p>Chief Executive</p> <p>Implemented.</p> <p>Key projects forming the corporate strategy action plan are monitored through SLT acting as the operational programme board.</p> <p>The Corporate Governance Group chaired by the CEO meets on a regular basis to consider the key internal controls in respect of risk and governance. The group also considers progress in respect of recommendations arising from internal and external Audit reports</p>

RECOMMENDATIONS		
Risk Management		
R16. Undertake mandatory risk management training to appropriate officers and Members. This should include Directors, Assistant Directors and Service Managers. The training should be specific to Cheltenham's own risk management process.		
Recommended Action	Position as at 21 st September 2011	Lead Officer and Current Position
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consider the needs of Members and Officers for risk management training. 2. Develop a training programme for Members and Officers. 3. Implement the training programme. 4. That risk management training be a pre-requisite for Members who serve on the Audit Committee and the Treasury Management Panel. 	<p>1 and 2 are completed: Induction for new members for 2010 has taken place, with the six new member's allocated specific senior manager "buddies" to work with them over the next 6 months regarding orientation into the council and development needs. Needs are to be recorded by individuals on the learning gateway. From this, a learning plan will be developed. Similarly, those members of specific committees will need to log their learning needs and achievements on the learning gateway. A list has been drawn up of the training each member of each committee will be expected to undertake, reminders will be issued, and information checked. Risk management training approach for relevant officers has not yet been finalised as appraisals are currently underway that will determine training needs. E-learning modules will be developed for roll-out. Recruitment is underway to help delivery capacity in the team.</p> <p>Analysis of risk training requirements from appraisals is taking place, and the support to create e-learning modules is now in place and training in the module creation process is underway.</p> <p>3. The risk management e-learning module has been completed and is loaded on the Learning Gateway. Directors and Services Managers have been notified and asked to refresh their own and employees knowledge via the suggested module.</p> <p>4. Completed.</p>	<p>GOSS HR</p> <p>Implemented.</p> <p>The Audit Committee owns and approves the Risk Management Policy on an annual basis (last revised March 2014). All Members were asked to consider the policy and to make suggestions as to any training needs.</p> <p>The learning gateway, used by all staff, has an on-line risk awareness training tool which was updated in April 2014. SSS Staff are aware of this training and of the availability of an officer who can provide additional advice and assistance. The facilities on Learning Gateway are also available to Members. Following the recent elections Audit Committee Members were provided with an overview of governance and risk management. A risk management seminar will be offered to all members shortly.</p>

	All members will be automatically added to risk training via the cbc learning gateway.	
--	--	--

RECOMMENDATIONS		
Risk Management		
<p>R17. Immediately review all risks on the corporate and service risk registers to ensure that they are complete, appropriate and that the descriptions and risk assessments continue to reflect the current state. Any high scoring service risks should be transferred to the corporate risk register where appropriate. The updated corporate risk register should be presented to Members for consideration.</p>		
Recommended Action	Position as at 21st September 2011	Lead Officer and Current Position
<p>1. The Corporate and Service Risk Registers have recently been reviewed by the Senior Leadership Team, Service Managers and the Corporate Governance Group.</p> <p>2. That the Corporate Risk Register is in future to be presented to the Audit Committee on a quarterly basis, commencing in June 2010.</p>	<p>Completed. SLT have reviewed the corporate risk register which was considered by Cabinet on 1 June. The Corporate Risk Register is now a standing item on the SLT agenda. The new service plan template includes a Divisional Risk Register and there is clarity that risks scoring more than 16 need to be brought to SLT for discussion and inclusion on the Corporate Risk Register. The register was considered by the Audit Committee on 23 June.</p>	<p>Chief Executive</p> <p>Implemented.</p> <p>SLT continue to monitor the Corporate Risk Register on a monthly basis and Cabinet Members are immediately briefed as necessary. The Corporate Governance Group also monitors risk and notifies SLT of any concerns.</p> <p>Service and Project team managers are responsible for identifying risks which are monitored by the relevant Director. Any project or service risk scoring 16 or more must be escalated for consideration by SLT</p> <p>As Cabinet members are kept up to date on a monthly basis the Corporate Risk Register is reported to Audit Committee on an annual basis together with a report of activity of risk in the previous year</p>

Page 35

RECOMMENDATIONS		
Project Management		
R18. All legal case work should have a formally appointed Instructing Officer and a written scoping document. In practice, the Borough Solicitor or other members of the legal team should only be the Instructing Officer in rare circumstances. All legal actions and defences should continue to be channelled through the legal team.		
Recommended Action	Position as at 21st September 2011	Lead Officer and Current Position
To be Included in revised case management procedures.	Implemented.	Borough Solicitor The procedure remains in place as implemented.

R19. On any occasion where the Borough Solicitor is the Instructing Officer rather than acting on behalf of other service departments, the Council should consider the controls in place to ensure an appropriate corporate oversight is maintained.		
Recommended Action	Position as at 21st September 2011	Lead Officer and Current Position
That the Chief Executive provide a corporate oversight should the circumstances arise in which the Borough Solicitor is the Instructing Officer.	Implemented.	Borough Solicitor The procedure remains in place as implemented.

P
 1
 0
 0
 5

RECOMMENDATIONS		
<p>R20. The Council should review its scheme of delegation to consider at what level formal project management techniques should be employed. This does not necessarily apply only to capital programmes, IT development or major change projects – but could apply (as in this legal case) to revenue activities.</p>		
Recommended Action	Position as at 21st September 2011	Lead Officer and Current Position
<p>Directors and Assistant Directors to</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. review which Officers within the organisation are responsible for implementation of projects requiring project management skills. 2. identify whether those Officers require either project management training or dedicated project management support in order to effectively implement the project. 	<p>This is being achieved alongside the development of service plans for 2010-11, where specific “projects” are being identified, with the responsible senior officer for each project (or programme) clearly identified. Guidance as to what level of project needs what degree of formal project management input, based on an assessment of risk and opportunity, is being developed to better enable an informed match of project management skills to size of project. A survey of Officers with current project management training and qualifications is also underway.</p> <p>Analysis of existing training records has been completed, However, project management training is not corporately funded, so the work is underway to create a more comprehensive list from service specific training records. A proposal for addressing skills gaps is being drafted. This will take into consideration the lack of funding available for externally provided training.</p> <p>1&2 A framework for categorisation of projects and the level of project management support has been agreed by SLT. In line with budget cuts, skills gaps for managers will be addressed by completion of the project management e-learning module and use of experienced project managers as coaches. The project management group will continue to assist all those involved in managing projects, ensuring that project management is pitched at the right level for the complexity of each project. A summary report has been prepared for Senior Leadership Team.</p>	<p>Deputy Chief Executive</p> <p>Implemented.</p> <p>The corporate plan and / or project initiation document identifies who has responsibility for all projects undertaken.</p> <p>The council’s project management guidelines set out the required expertise and qualification for project managers for all projects relative to their size and complexity. In July 2014, these guidelines were reinforced with all directors and service managers.</p> <p>The Learning Gateway exists as a repository for all project management training or development undertaken by staff members. GO Shared Services Learning and Development team provide guidance for all staff members seeking project management training or development. Alternatives to formal accreditation, e.g. e-learning modules and mentoring, are used depending on need and budget</p>

Page 17

		<p>constraints.</p> <p>The council's corporate project and programme management team provides support for all project managers within the council and advice on procuring project managers from external sources for specific assignments</p>
--	--	---

R21. The Council should review the project management skills base within its workforce, and seek to train more people if necessary, or to find ways of sharing the resource among different projects.

Recommended Action	Position as at 21st September 2011	Lead Officer and Current Position
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Draw up a list of those officers with project management qualifications. 2. Prepare a report on the project management resource available to specifically include details of external spend. 3. Prepare a forward plan as to how the project management skills will be utilised. 4. Identify whether there are any deficiencies in project management resource. 5. Report on proposals as to how any deficiencies may be addressed. 	<p>1. Completed.</p> <p>2 & 3 Completed – survey of project management resource has been completed including the external support. All future requests are to be considered in line with “nil recruitment” position and budget restraints on business case basis. Project management capacity is now being reviewed on a continuing basis as part of the “resource management” at Commissioning Programme Board.</p> <p>4 & 5 completed. In line with budget cuts, skills gaps for managers will be addressed by completion of the project management e-learning module and use of experienced project managers as coaches, plus using project training (Prince) where needed and securing the high ££ investment in skills through requiring payback if the employee should leave the council.</p> <p>The project management group will continue to assist all those involved in managing projects, ensuring that project management is pitched at the right level for the complexity of each project. A summary report was prepared for the Senior Leadership Team in February 2011 recommending how project management skills will be developed and deployed.</p>	<p>Deputy Chief Executive</p> <p>Implemented.</p> <p>The Learning Gateway exists as a repository for all project management training or development undertaken by staff members.</p> <p>The council's quarterly resource management process identifies the demand for project managers over the next 12 months. Any deficiencies are then dealt with by the manager of the corporate project and programme management team working with project sponsors and / or the Senior Leadership Team. Options taken have included re-prioritisation and / or re-scheduling of projects; growth of the corporate team; and recruitment of temporary additional project managers.</p>

RECOMMENDATIONS		
R22. Significant legal casework should be supported by a budget and monitored accordingly. If further budget provision then becomes necessary, this should be considered through established virement processes.		
Recommended Action	Position as at 21st September 2011	Lead Officer and Current Position
<p>1. Implementation of recommended actions specified in recommendations 10, 11 and 12 above.</p> <p>2. That a requirement that the financial implications of any significant legal casework which is proposed to be commenced should be fully assessed, that any financial restrictions on the exercise of authority complied with and that the necessary budget is available to be included in the guidance note which is being prepared for the Senior Leadership Team (SLT) and Service Managers.</p> <p>3. Implementation of recommendations 11 & 12 will ensure that the financial implications are reviewed in accordance with sound project and risk management principles.</p>	<p>1, 2 and 3 Completed.</p> <p>Recommendations 10, 11 and 12 have been implemented and therefore have addressed the actions required. The guidance note has been issued and together with the revisions to the standard report template, ensures that the financial and budgetary implications are fully assessed when decisions are taken.</p>	<p>Deputy Chief Executive</p> <p>Implemented.</p> <p>Significant legal work is identified as “extraordinary work” and the budgetary requirements are specified.</p> <p>Reports include legal, financial and HR implications and identify any resources required.</p>

RECOMMENDATIONS		
Pre-Meeting Briefings		
R23. Ensure Chairs and Vice Chairs of committee meetings are always briefed sufficiently on crucial matters such as those concerning significant legal cases, to allow them to manage the debate at committee and facilitate appropriate challenge by Members.		
Recommended Action	Position as at 21st September 2011	Lead Officer and Current Position
1. Already implemented. 2. Procedures for ensuring that Chairs and Vice-Chairs of Committee meetings are sufficiently briefed on crucial matters to be set out in the guidance note which is being prepared for the Senior Leadership Team (SLT) and Service Managers.	1. Implemented. 2. Completed - chair's briefings do take place and democratic services are present. The guidance note includes reference to the need to ensure that chairs are fully briefed and training has been undertaken with report authors	Chief Executive Implemented. The procedure implemented in 2010/11 is now embedded.
Format of Member Reporting		
R24. Ensure that written reports to committee meetings are clear on what decision is required of Members. Noting update briefings may often be appropriate but where decisions are required, or officers are seeking endorsement or support for decisions, specific recommendations should be made.		
Recommended Action	Position as at 21st September 2011	Lead Officer and Current Position
That the requirement for clarity as to the decision being sought from a Committee or Council be included within the guidance note being prepared for the Senior Leadership Team (SLT) and Service Managers.	Completed. SLT is already ensuring that there is clarity on recommendations and the guidance note reinforces this requirement for clarity.	Chief Executive Implemented. The guidance note remains in place and relevant.

RECOMMENDATIONS		
R25. Exempt minutes must record the names of those attending the meeting and include sufficient detail to record discussions and decisions fully.		
Recommended Action	Position as at 21st September 2011	Lead Officer and Current Position
Ensure that all exempt minutes record the names of those attending the meeting and include sufficient discussion to enable full understanding of the decision and the reason for it.	Implemented.	Chief Executive This practice has continued since implementation
R26. Develop guidance on the circumstances when it may be appropriate to record the number of people voting for, against and abstaining. This might apply in sensitive matters, and exempt proceedings might be expected to be sensitive.		
Recommended Action	Position as at 21st September 2011	Lead Officer and Current Position
As part of the review of the Constitution, develop guidance on the circumstances in which it might be appropriate to record the names of those Members voting for, against or abstaining from the decision on any item of business.	Completed. On 13 th December 2010, the Council approved revisions to its Constitution which include amendments to the Rules of Procedure to require that, except where decisions are taken by affirmation, the numbers of votes for, against or abstaining, shall be recorded in the minutes of the meeting.	Chief Executive Implemented. The arrangements remain in place as implemented in 2011.

Part B - ACTION PLAN - IMPLEMENTATION OF REVIEW WORKING GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATIONS		
A. Recommended changes to Council's pre-appointment processes		
<p><u>Recommendation 1</u> That the Council adopts a Recruitment Protocol for Chief Officers to include the Council's intentions as to how it will:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage the recruitment process for Chief Officer / Statutory Officers and in particular <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Whether external agencies will be engaged to manage the recruitment process ○ How advertising for the vacancy will take place ○ How the feedback to successful and unsuccessful candidates (both internal and external) will take place ○ Guidelines for making conditional offers of employment ○ Timescale for making written offer of employment ○ Timescale for issue of contract of employment • Include in the final selection process significant Councillor involvement as well as involvement from partners and employees • The process which will be undertaken to obtain medical clearance for the employment of the successful candidate • Induction processes as appropriate to a senior position 		
Recommended Action	Position as at 21 st September 2011	Lead Officer and Current Position
Introduce a Cheltenham Borough Council Recruitment Protocol.	Completed. Best practice in recruitment research has been introduced, including recommended process, stakeholder engagement, timing, competency basis. A report with the findings and recommendations was presented to and agreed by Staff and Support Services Committee on 29 th July 2010.	GOSS HR Implemented. The protocol is reviewed as necessary and remains fit for purpose.

<u>Recommendation 2</u> The Council includes, as part of the recruitment process for Chief Officers / Statutory Officers / Assistant Directors, a requirement for the candidates for the post to undertake relevant job related competency based person profiling (e.g. leadership / personality profiling)		
Recommended Action	Position as at 21st September 2011	Lead Officer and Current Position
Devise a competency based recruitment process for the Council's senior appointments.	Completed. As 1 above.	GOSS HR Implemented and embedded.
<u>Recommendation 3</u> When commencing a recruitment process for a Chief Officer / Statutory Officer, careful consideration should be given to the timing of the process and the date for the Council meeting to make the appointment to avoid dates where there are likely to be significant member absences due to holiday (e.g. avoid Christmas / New Year period).		
Recommended Action	Position as at 21st September 2011	Lead Officer and Current Position
Ensure that the timing of any recruitment process for posts which require to be appointed by the Council take into account statutory holiday periods.	Completed.	GOSS HR Implemented
B. Recommended changes to Council's appointment processes		
<u>Recommendation 4</u> That the Council sets up an Appointments Committee to make recommendations to the Council on appointments to posts which are required to be made by the Council with Terms of Reference which include recommending a preferred candidate to Council for approval following a full interview and assessment process being carried out by the Appointments Committee.		
Recommended Action	Position as at 21st September 2011	Lead Officer and Current Position
Report on this recommendation to be prepared for consideration by the Staff and Support Services Committee	Completed. On 13 th December 2010, the Council approved revisions to its Constitution which include the establishment of an Appointments Committee.	GOSS HR Implemented. The Council has established an Appointments and Remuneration Committee to discharge this function.

<u>Recommendation 5</u> That the Council amends the Council Rules of Procedure to require that the appointment of any Statutory Officer (Head of Paid Service, Section 151 Officer and Monitoring Officer) should be approved by 2/3rds of the Members who are present at the meeting and voting.		
Recommended Action	Position as at 21st September 2011	Lead Officer and Current Position
Report on this recommendation to be prepared for consideration by the Staff and Support Services Committee	Completed. On 13 th December 2010, the Council approved revisions to its Constitution which include amendments to the Rules of Procedure on voting to reflect this recommendation.	Borough Solicitor and GOSS HR Implemented.
<u>Recommendation 6</u> That the Council sets a target of 28 days, from the date of the acceptance by the employee of the offer of employment, for the issue of an employee's Statement of Particulars of Employment.		
Recommended Action	Position as at 21st September 2011	Lead Officer and Current Position
Issue Statements of Particulars of Employment to new employees within a target of 28 days from acceptance by the employee of the Council's offer of employment.	Completed.	GOSS HR Implemented
<u>Recommendation 7</u> That the Council's appointment / recruitment / absence management and dispute resolutions policies be reviewed regularly to ensure that they continue to be up to date, robust and fit for purpose.		
Recommended Action	Position as at 21st September 2011	Lead Officer and Current Position
Include within the Human Resources Policy Review Timetable the regular review of the Council's appointment, recruitment, absence management and dispute resolution policies to ensure that they continue to be up to date, robust and fit for purpose.	Completed. The timetable for review of key policies has been reviewed and key policies due for review included in Corporate Governance arrangements with timescale for review (e.g. Whistleblowing, Code of Conduct due for review 2010-11).	GOSS HR Implemented. The policies are regularly reviewed and refreshed. The absence management policy is currently being reviewed.

C. Recommended changes to Council's procedures to ensure that disputes are resolved efficiently and effectively		
<u>Recommendation 8</u> That the Council reviews the membership and functions of the JNC Disciplinary Committee to ensure that they are consistent with the guidance in the 2009 version of the JNC for Local Authority Chief Executives (National Salary Framework and Conditions of Service).		
Recommended Action	Position as at 21st September 2011	Lead Officer and Current Position
Include, within the report of the review of the Council's Constitution, recommended revisions to the membership and functions of the JNC Disciplinary Committee to reflect the 2009 version of the JNC for Local Authority Chief Executives (National Salary Framework and Conditions of Service).	Completed. On 13 th December 2010, the Council approved revisions to its Constitution which include amendments to the JNC Disciplinary Committee and the introduction of a JNC Appeals Committee which address this recommendation.	Borough Solicitor Implemented
<u>Recommendation 9</u> That the Council explores the possibility and appropriateness of incorporating within the conditions of contract of Officers, an ongoing requirement for the Council (by instructing an occupational health practitioner) to have access to medical records, subject to safeguards and clarity as to what event would trigger that consent being used and subject also to legislation relating to disclosure of medical records.		
Recommended Action	Position as at 21st September 2011	Lead Officer and Current Position
Consider whether the Council is permitted, within the relevant employment and access to medical records legislation, to seek ongoing access to medical records from employees and, if this is permissible, to implement the necessary changes.	Completed. Advice has been received from IMASS, the new Occupational Health provider, that such a requirement would be contrary to medical practitioner guidance and data protection legislation.	GOSS HR The position has not changed from that reported in September 2011.

Recommendation 10		
That the Council introduces a procedure whereby nominated Officers deputise for Chief Officers / Statutory Officers during any extended absence e.g. sickness, and are given full authority to act in that capacity.		
Recommended Action	Position as at 21st September 2011	Lead Officer and Current Position
Introduce a formal procedure for the nomination of deputies to act for Chief and Statutory Officers during any extended absence and measures to ensure that the deputies are provided with the necessary authority to act in that capacity.	Nominated deputies are in place for the Chief Executive, s151 Officer and the Monitoring Officer. Regarding the necessary authority to act in the event of extended absence, this will be picked up as part of the comprehensive review of the Constitution (see R1 above).	Borough Solicitor and GOSS HR Implemented
Recommendation 11		
That the Council amends its guidance on managing sickness absence, to ensure that:		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. employees who are certified as being unfit for work are clear about the circumstances and purposes for which they can attend the workplace 2. guidance is in place to ensure that employees who are certified as being unfit for work do not issue inappropriate instructions or requests to other employees and the guidance should be such that employees who receive inappropriate instructions or requests are clear that they are able to refer these to their manager 3. the Council include in its guidance on managing absence, nominated post(s) with responsibility for managing any absence of the Chief Executive/Head of paid Service. 		
Recommended Action	Position as at 21st September 2011	Lead Officer and Current Position
Introduce amendments to the Council's guidance on managing sickness to satisfy items 1-3 of the recommendation.	Completed.	GOSS HR Implemented

Recommendation 12		
That the Council makes an appropriate amendment to the Employees Code of Conduct to ensure that Officers who have an interest in any matter which would, in the case of any Member of the Council, amount to a “prejudicial interest”, should not participate in or seek to influence the outcome of that matter.		
Recommended Action	Position as at 21st September 2011	Lead Officer and Current Position
Prepare a report for the Standards Committee/Council to suggest revisions to the Employees Code of Conduct to clarify the requirements regarding personal interests, as identified in the recommendation.,	The Standards Committee has included the review of the Employees Code of Conduct within its current workplan. A revised draft of the Employee Code of Conduct has been drawn up and will now be the subject of consultation for approval by the Council in 2011.	Borough Solicitor and GOSS HR Implemented
Recommendation 13		
That the Standards Committee be asked to undertake a review of the Protocol for Member / Officer Relations to ensure that it reflects best practice.		
Recommended Action	Position as at 21st September 2011	Lead Officer and Current Position
Request the Standards Committee to review the Protocol for Member / Officer relations as specified in the recommendation.	Completed. A revised protocol for Member/Officer Relations was approved by the Council on 13 th December 2010.	Borough Solicitor Implemented. The Protocol for Member Officer Relations approved in 2010 remains in place and is included within the Protocol review programme of the Standards Committee.

This page is intentionally left blank

Cheltenham Borough Council

Audit Committee

24 September 2014

Appointment of Co-opted Members to the Audit Committee

Accountable member	Cabinet Member Corporate Services, Councillor Jon Walklett
Accountable officer	Mark Sheldon, Director of Resources
Ward(s) affected	N/A
Significant Decision	No
Executive summary	<p>The Audit Committee has 7 elected members and is politically balanced.</p> <p>A report was considered by Council on 21 July 2014 and members supported the proposal to appoint non-voting co-opted members to the Audit Committee. Council resolved that the appointment of co-optees should be delegated to the Audit Committee.</p> <p>Officers, in consultation with the Council's External Auditors (Grant Thornton), have drafted an advert, job description, person specification and application form, which include details of any restrictions.</p> <p>The Audit Committee are asked to consider the draft documents, comment as necessary and approve them for use as part of the recruitment process.</p>
Recommendations	<p>The Audit Committee are recommended to approve;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the opportunity to apply for the position of independent member of the Audit Committee be advertised on the Council's website. 2. The advert, job description, person specification and application form, as attached at Appendix 3, 4, 5 and 6 be used as part of the recruitment process. 3. That an Interviewing Panel, comprising the Director of Resources and Democratic Services Manager (or their nominated representatives), nominate up to three Co-optees and make recommendations to the Audit Committee for their appointment.
Financial implications	<p>If the co-optee was elected at Chair they would receive the Chair's SRA; currently set at £454 per annum. There would be no cost implications if the level of the SRA remained unchanged. Co-optees on other committees are currently paid travelling expenses but no allowances.</p> <p>Contact officer: Mark Sheldon, Director of Resources, mark.sheldon@cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 26 4123</p>

Legal implications	Co-optees are not entitled to vote nor do they have a right to attend Council meetings (save in their capacity as a member of the public). In theory, a co-optee could be elected as chairman but they would not have a second or casting vote. They are bound by the Committee Procedure Rules and also the Code of Members' Conduct. Contact officer: peter.lewis@tewkesbury.gov.uk, 01684 272012
HR implications (including learning and organisational development)	None. Contact officer: Julie McCarthy, GO Shared Service Human Resources Manager (West), julie.mccarthy@cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 264355
Key risks	As set out in the report
Corporate and community plan Implications	Strengthening our communities by involving local residents in the democratic process
Environmental and climate change implications	None.
Property/Asset Implications	None. Contact officer: David Roberts@cheltenham.gov.uk

1. Background

- 1.1 It has been suggested that Audit Committee may benefit from having some independent members as co-optees.
- 1.2 There is still a prevalent view nationally that there is value in having independent members on the Audit Committee and the Head of Audit Cotswolds, along with the Council's external auditors, Grant Thornton, are supportive of this approach.
- 1.3 The issue was considered by the Audit Committee on 18 June 2014. They supported the appointment of co-opted members in principle but wished for guidance from Council on the criteria for defining an 'independent' member.
- 1.4 Council considered the matter on 21 July 2014 and the extract of those minutes is attached at Appendix 2.
- 1.5 Council approved the recommendation that the terms of reference for the Audit Committee be amended to allow it to appoint up to 3 non-voting independent members.
- 1.6 The decision of whom to co-opt was delegated to the Audit Committee by Council.
- 1.7 Selection criteria pertaining to the appointment of independent members, including any restrictions; was also delegated to the Audit Committee, in consultation with the Borough Solicitor and the Council's external auditors, Grant Thornton.

2. Recruitment and Selection of Co-optees

- 2.1 An application form, together with an advert, job description and person specification was produced by officers.

Page 51

- 2.2** It would be the intention for an advertisement for the co-optees to be placed on the Council's website and supported by media releases. It would also be circulated to Elected Members so that they may pass it on to anyone who might be interested.
- 2.3** It is for the Audit Committee to decide what criteria to set regarding eligibility. The person specification produced by officer's sets out the proposed selection criteria, including any restrictions and has been based on criteria used across other councils for the purpose of recruiting independent members to the Audit Committee.
- 2.4** There is no legislation associated to the appointment of independent members to the Audit Committee and as such, eligibility criteria, is to be determined locally. It is suggested that the minimum criterion be:
- i) the applicant shall not currently be an Officer or Member of Cheltenham Borough Council
 - ii) the applicant shall not have any criminal convictions
 - iii) the applicant shall not be an undischarged bankrupt
 - iv) the applicant shall not have any significant business dealings with the Council
- 2.5** It is for the Audit Committee to consider whether it wishes to apply further criteria, which could include that the applicant shall not be:
- v) a member of a political party, and/or
 - vi) an Officer or Member of another local authority, and/or
 - vii) an Officer or Member of Cheltenham Borough Council (or another local authority) within the last x years, and/or
 - viii) a close friend or relative of a current Cheltenham Borough Council Member or officer.
- 2.6** Co-opted members would be eligible to receive travel expenses.
- 2.7** A co-optee would be eligible for election as chair or vice-chairman. Other authorities have adopted the approach that a co-optee should not be elected to both posts.
- 2.8** If a co-optee was elected as Chair they would receive the Chair's allowance; currently set at £454 per annum.
- 2.9** In terms of arrangements for selecting applicants for consideration by the Audit Committee, it is proposed to set up a small Panel which would make recommendations to the Committee. It is suggested that the Panel comprise the Director Resources and the Democratic Services Manager or their representative(s).
- 2.10** Given the nature of a report by the Panel and the personal details it would include, any such report would have to be considered by the Audit Committee in closed session.
- 2.11** The appointment would be made for a period of 4 years (unless earlier terminated by Committee), after which time the co-optee would be eligible for re-appointment for a further term.
- 2.12** It had been suggested that any appointments made by the Committee, would be subject to review by the Committee after one year of operation.

3. Reasons for recommendations

- 3.1** The report has been brought to the Audit Committee at the request of Council.

4. Alternative options considered

- 4.1** Decide against recruiting and/or appointing any independent members and continue with the current make up of the committee.

5. Consultation and feedback

- 5.1 The Chief Executive has consulted with Group Leaders as part of this process and they felt it was a matter that should be considered by the committee. The importance of a co-opted chair being independent was highlighted and the need for an open appointment process.
- 5.2 The feedback from Council is set out in Appendix 2.
- 5.3 Feedback from Legal regarding eligibility and restrictions was that there is no legislation associated with the appointment of independent members of the Audit Committee and as such, eligibility criteria, is to be determined locally.

6. Performance management –monitoring and review

- 6.1 Not applicable

Report author	Contact officer: Saira Malin, Democracy Officer Saira.Malin@cheltenham.gov.uk , 01242 77 5153
Appendices	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Risk Assessment 2. Extract of the minutes of Council 21 July 2014 3. DRAFT application form 4. DRAFT advert 5. DRAFT job description 6. DRAFT person specification
Background information	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Minutes of Audit Committee 18 June 2014

The risk				Original risk score (impact x likelihood)			Managing risk				
Risk ref.	Risk description	Risk Owner	Date raised	Impact 1-5	Likelihood 1-6	Score	Control	Action	Deadline	Responsible officer	Transferred to risk register
	If no applicants come forward for the position of co-optee then the Audit Committee will remain without independent members	Director of Resources	06//07/2014	2	4	8	Reduce	Issue press release and Local Advertisement (website). Ensure that job description and person specification are as comprehensive as possible.	30/10/2014	Director of Resources	

EXTRACT OF COUNCIL (21 JULY 2014) MINUTES

The Cabinet Member Corporate Services, Councillor Jon Walklett introduced the report, as circulated with the agenda and referred members to an email that had been sent to all members on Friday (18 July) which contained revised recommendations. He indicated that Councillor Colin Hay was now being proposed as Chairman of the Audit Committee. He highlighted an amendment to the recommendations that had been circulated in his e-mail and iv) now proposed that the selection criteria be delegated to the Audit Committee in consultation with the Borough Solicitor and the External Auditor.

A member questioned a reference in the e-mail that the Audit Committee required a chairman with knowledge and experience of the governance arrangements. He queried whether that related to knowledge of the governance of this council in particular or whether it related to more general knowledge of governance in local government.

The Cabinet Member replied that his understanding that it was specifically related to the local governance arrangements of this council but that somebody with knowledge of governance at the county council for example could be considered

Upon a vote it was unanimously

RESOLVED that;

- i. Councillor Colin Hay be appointed as Chair of the Audit Committee.**
- ii. The terms of reference of the Audit Committee be amended to allow it to appoint up to 3 co-optees as non-voting members.**
- iii. The decision to co-opt be delegated to the Audit Committee.**
- iv. Selection criteria pertaining to the appointment of independent co-optees on the Audit Committee, including any restrictions, be delegated to the Audit Committee in consultation with the Borough Solicitor and External Auditors.**
- v. The Borough Solicitor and Monitoring Officer be authorised to make the necessary changes to the Constitution, to reflect the above.**

CHELTENHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL

**DRAFT APPLICATION FOR THE POSITION OF
CO-OPTED MEMBER ON THE AUDIT COMMITTEE**

Individuals who wish to be considered for the appointment as an Independent Member of the Audit Committee for Cheltenham Borough Council are requested to provide the following information to support their application. All information provided will only be used for the purposes of selecting one or more co-opted independent member(s). Please feel free to use a separate continuation page if you wish to expand upon your answer to any question outlined below.

1. PERSONAL DETAILS:

Name:

Address:

Postcode:

Contact Details:

Daytime Telephone Number:

Mobile:

Email address:

2. QUALIFICATIONS

(Please give details of any of your qualifications which you think are relevant to the position of Independent Member)

3. SUMMARY OF EXPERIENCE

(Please give a brief account of your experience including career, public and voluntary work together with the nature of your current or most recent occupation).

4. RELEVANT EXPERIENCE/SKILLS

(Please outline briefly any knowledge or expertise which you believe would be particularly relevant to your role as co-optee of the Audit Committee having regard to the selection criteria for the position).

5. Why do you wish to be considered for the position of co-optee of the Audit Committee and what particular attributes do you believe you would bring to the work of the role?

6. Please provide any additional information you may wish to give in support of your application.

7. References will be taken up for all applicants who are invited for interview.

1. Name

Address:

Tel No:

2. Name

Address:

Tel No:

I wish to apply to be a co-opted member of the Audit Committee for Cheltenham Borough Council.

In submitting this application, I declare that I;

- (i) Am not an Officer or Member of Cheltenham Borough Council;
- (ii) Do not have any criminal convictions;
- (iii) Am not an undischarged bankrupt;
- (iv) Do not have any significant business dealings with Cheltenham Borough Council

Signed:

Date:

Please return this application form **by date tbc** to:

Title tbc
Name tbc
Cheltenham Borough Council
Municipal Offices
The Promenade
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 9SA

Interviews are likely to be held during the w/c date xxx. Please advise of any times that you are not available during that period.

NOTE: ELIGIBILITY FOR APPOINTMENT

1. A person is not an independent member if the person is currently
 - (i) a Member, Co-opted Member or Officer of Cheltenham Borough Council;

PERSONS WHO ARE NOT ELIGIBLE TO BE INDEPENDENT MEMBERS AS A RESULT OF ANY OF THE ABOVE NEED NOT APPLY.

DRAFT

DRAFT ADVERT

The Audit Committee of Cheltenham Borough Council has been operating since March 2007, and is a key component of the corporate governance arrangements for the Authority. The Audit Committee provides a source of assurance on the Council's arrangements for managing risk, maintaining an effective control environment, and reporting on financial and non-financial performance.

The Audit Committee comprises of 7 elected Councillors and is supported by the Director of Resources, as the Lead Officer.

The Council now wishes to appoint up to 3 'Independent Persons'. Independent Members will help increase public confidence and bring a wider perspective from outside the Council, as well as skills knowledge and experience.

Appointments are for a period of 4 years, subject to annual review.

You must be able to consider complex information and act impartially at all times. Financial awareness is essential, as is a broad understanding of financial, risk and control, and corporate governance issues facing local authorities generally and the Council specifically.

You will need to demonstrate an independent mind, analytical skills, possess tact and good interpersonal skills.

Applications cannot be considered from anyone who –

- Is currently an Officer or Member with Cheltenham Borough Council
- Has any criminal convictions
- Is an undischarged bankrupt
- Has any significant business dealings with the Council

No salary is payable, but the Council will reimburse reasonable travelling, childcare/care allowance, etc. for attending meetings. Meetings are held at the Municipal Offices, Cheltenham, usually at 6pm, four times per annum.

The work will provide a real opportunity to make an active contribution to governance standards in public life. If you feel you have the experience and personal qualities to undertake this role, please complete the application form and return it to –

Name
Address
Telephone number
Email address

If you would like to discuss the position further, please contact xx on xx.

Cheltenham Borough Council is an equal opportunity employer and welcomes applicants from all sections of the community.

*This draft is based on adverts used by Cheltenham Borough Council in the past and other authorities in relation to the appointment of independent members of the Audit Committee. It is for the committee to decide what it wants to include.

DRAFT JOB DESCRIPTION

Position: Independent Member/Co-optee

Accountable to: Audit Committee

To actively participate in the work of the Audit Committee which is responsible for –

1. Reviewing the internal and external reports and assessments in respect of corporate governance.
2. Considering the Head of Internal Audit's annual report and opinion and annual internal audit plan and the level of assurance it gives over the council's corporate governance arrangements.
3. Monitoring the operational Internal Audit plan and the audit planning process; ensuring that internal audit work is planned with due regard to risk, materially and supports the council's corporate aims and priorities.
4. Consulting with the Audit Commission on the appointment of the council's external auditor.
5. Consideration and review of the external audit annual report to those charged with governance (ISA 260) and all associated reports and other documents.
6. Review all matters relating to external audit, including audit and inspection planning, action points and reports.
7. Monitoring and review of actions required arising out of external and internal audit recommendations.
8. Ensuring effective liaison between external and internal audit and any other inspection agency.
9. Reviewing and signing approval of the audited annual statement of accounts and annual governance statement, including the statement of the system of internal financial control by 30th September of each year following the financial year end.

(N.B.) Co-opted members will be a non-voting member of the committee and would be eligible for election as chair or vice-chairman, but not both.

DRAFT PERSON SPECIFICATION

As well as being of good character, co-opted members of the Audit Committee must meet the minimum criteria set out in the essential column below;

ESSENTIAL	DESIRABLE
Not currently an employee or Councillor with Cheltenham Borough Council	Not currently an employee or Councillor with any other local authority and not previously an employee or Councillor with Cheltenham Borough Council. Not currently an employee with the Council's principle partner organisations.
Ability to remain independent in thinking and consider matters without political views	
Ability to analyse information, ask pertinent questions, reach rational conclusions and maintain confidentiality	Experience of dealing with Local Government or a similar public sector or voluntary organisation
Broad understanding of financial, risk and control, and corporate governance issues facing local authorities generally and the Council specifically	
Financial awareness and an understanding of governance	
Be committed to the term of office and able to attend the meetings of the Audit Committee on a regular basis (of which there are 4 per annum)	

*This draft is based on the person specifications used by other authorities in relation to the appointment of independent members of the Audit Committee and it is for the committee to decide what it wants to include.

Cheltenham Borough Council

Audit Committee – 24 September 2014

Internal Audit Monitoring Report

Accountable member	Cabinet Member Corporate Services, Councillor John Walklett
Accountable officer	Head of Audit Cotswolds – Robert Milford
Ward(s) affected	All
Significant Decision	No
Executive summary	<p>The Council must ensure that it has sound systems of internal control that facilitate the effective management of all the Council's functions. The work delivered by Audit Cotswolds, the Council's internal audit service, is one of the control assurance sources available to the Audit Committee, the Senior Leadership Team and supports the work of the external auditor.</p> <p>The Annual Internal Audit Opinion presented to Audit Committee provides an overall assurance opinion at the end of the financial year. This Internal Audit Monitoring Report, however, is designed to give the Audit Committee the opportunity to comment on the work completed by the partnership and provide 'through the year' comment and assurances on the control environment.</p>
Recommendations	The Audit Committee considers the report and makes comment on its content as necessary

Financial implications	<p>The report includes a summary of the findings from the audit of key areas of the council's activity. The assurance levels provide evidence that there are no significant areas of weakness. There are some recommendation for improvement highlighted that are addressed by action plans which, once implemented, will provide further strengthening of key controls designed to protect public funds.</p> <p>Contact officer: Mark Sheldon, Chief Finance Officer mark.sheldon@cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 264123</p>
Legal implications	<p>None specific arising from the recommendation</p> <p>Contact officer: Peter Lewis, Head of Legal Services, One Legal peter.lewis@tewkesbury.gov.uk, 01684 272012</p>
HR implications (including learning and organisational development)	<p>Nothing arising from this report.</p> <p>Contact officer: Amanda Attfield, Head of HR, GOSS Amanda.attfield@cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 264186</p>
Key risks	<p>That weaknesses in the control framework, identified by the audit activity, continue to threaten organisational objectives, if recommendations are not implemented.</p>

<p>Corporate and community plan implications</p>	<p><i>“Internal Auditing is an independent, objective assurance and consulting activity designed to add value and improve an organisation’s operations. It helps an organisation accomplish its objectives by bringing a systematic, disciplined approach to evaluate and improve the effectiveness of risk management, control and governance processes.” (Chartered Institute of Internal Auditing UK and Ireland).</i></p> <p>Therefore the internal audit activity impacts on corporate and community plans.</p>
<p>Environmental and climate change implications</p>	<p>Relevant to particular audit assignments and will be identified within individual reports.</p>

1. Background

- 1.1 The Annual Audit Plan 2014/15 was aligned with the corporate and service risks facing the Council as identified in the consultation with the Senior Leadership Team and supported by such systems as the risk registers. The role and responsibilities of internal audit reflect that it is there to help the organisation to achieve objectives, part of the plan has been aligned to elements of this strategy. However, to inform the audit plan we have also reviewed other key documents, such as the Medium Term Financial Strategy, change programme agendas and updates to the business plan, many of which contain risk assessments.
- 1.2 There is also a benefit to supporting the work of the External Auditor (Grant Thornton). This is in the form of financial and governance audits to support such activities as value for money.
- 1.3 The audit plan also considered risks that may evolve during the year. The consultation process has sought to identify these areas considering where internal audit could support and add value to the risk control process. This report identifies work we have completed in relation to the planned audit work.

2. Reasons for recommendations

- 2.1 The environment in which Cheltenham BC and other Local Authorities now operates has presented significant drivers for change. The continual effort to meet the organisational objectives within a constrained budget has resulted in core systems coming under review for change e.g. the GO Shared Services impacting on core financial systems and shared services generally impacting on core governance arrangements.
- 2.2 Therefore Internal Audit needs to be responding to the changing environment and the areas where the organisation now requires assurances. This prompts the requirement to keep to a more flexible and risk based plan.
- 2.3 It should also be recognised that the service is a partnership, so co-ordinating resources across multiple organisations is critical to the success of the partnership.
- 2.4 This report highlights the work completed by Internal Audit and provides comment on the assurances provided by this work.

3. Internal Audit Output

- 3.1 The internal audit service is continuing to review its operational procedures and processes to ensure they align with the Public Sector Internal Audit Standards (PSIAS). Furthermore, the service is reviewing its structure to ensure it is appropriately resourced and skilled for future work

expectations.

- 3.2** The appendices to the report are therefore intended to inform the Audit Committee of progress made regarding the approved work plan for 2014/15 and follow up action that has taken place.

Report author	Robert Milford, Head of Audit Cotswolds, 01242 775058 robert.milford@cheltenham.gov.uk
Appendices	<p>Appendix A of this report sets out the executive summaries of those reports that have been concluded since the last monitoring report.</p> <p>Appendix B to this report sets out the Assurance and Priority Methodology applied to Internal Audits.</p> <p>Appendix C to this report sets out the Internal Audit Plan for 2014/2015 updated for progress to date.</p> <p>Appendix D to this report sets out the key findings of the six month follow up reviews that have taken place.</p>
Background information	None

This page is intentionally left blank

National Non Domestic Rates 2013/14 Executive Summary

This review of National Non Domestic Rates (NNDR) or Business Rates, the national tax collected by local authorities on all non-domestic/commercial properties, was undertaken in February 2014, the objectives of the review were as follows:

- Determine the most significant risks across the whole service area and confirm that the related fundamental controls were operating effectively
- Take account of results from previous reviews across the whole service area to evaluate the complete risk and controls picture
- Follow up recommendations from the previous year

It can be seen from the first objectives that our intention was not to undertake one of the three modules covering the whole NNDR process, from the rateable valuations and billing through to arrears collection processes, but instead review the key risks and related control effectiveness, across the whole operation.

As at the beginning of April 2013, Cheltenham Borough Council (CBC) had approximately 4,000 commercial properties liable for Business Rates. The total amount billed for these properties was approximately £55m; the actual amount collected to January 14 was £53m. The arrears position at the end of November 13 was £705k.

Based on this year's objectives, we first determined whether there were any major changes to current systems or procedures or new legislative requirements. We involved management in this assessment. As a result, we have been able to confirm the effectiveness of the controls which are in place to mitigate the key risks identified. We also confirmed that these controls were operating as expected. There was however one exception.

The reconciliations of the NNDR IBS system to the General Ledger accounting system had not been undertaken for 2 months from January 14 to February 14, due to the absence of a key member of staff. We have confirmed that all outstanding reconciliations have now been completed and there are no brought forward problems. We held discussions with the Revenues Manager, who stated; the non-completion of the reconciliations was a managed risk and considered to be a low priority against the demands of the 2014-15 annual billing procedure deadlines. We have been advised that alternative additional staffing arrangements have been put in place by management, so that this situation does not happen again.

We have also taken into account previous years' modular based audit results in order to come to an overall conclusion this year.

Finally we confirmed that the recommendations made at the last audit have been properly implemented and are working effectively.

As a result of the overall findings we have given this review a 'Satisfactory' assurance opinion.

Assurance Level	Audit Assurance Opinion
Satisfactory	The system of expected control although sound, has elements of weakness thus increasing system objective risks

Page 68
Council Tax 2013/14
Executive summary

This review of Council Tax, the national tax collected by local authorities on all domestic dwellings, was undertaken between February and May 2014, the objectives of the review were as follows:

- Determine the most significant risks across the whole service area and confirm that the related fundamental controls were operating effectively.
- Take account of results from previous reviews across the whole service area to evaluate the complete risk and controls picture.
- Follow up recommendations from previous year.

It can be seen from the first objectives that our intention was not to undertake one of the three modules covering the whole Council Tax process, from the valuations and billing through to arrears collection processes, but instead review the key risks and related control effectiveness, across the whole operation.

Cheltenham Borough Council (CBC) is the Billing Authority and therefore responsible for setting, levy, collection and recovery of Council Tax. As at the beginning of April 2013, there were approximately 53,400 domestic properties liable for Council Tax. The total amount billed for these properties was approximately £58m; the actual amount collected to January 14 was £55m. The arrears position at the end of November 2013 was £1.1m.

Based on this year's objectives, we first determined whether there were any major changes to current systems or procedures or new legislative requirements. We involved management in this assessment. As a result, we have been able to confirm the effectiveness of the controls which are in place to mitigate the key risks identified. We also confirmed that these controls were operating as expected. There was however one exception.

The reconciliations of the Council Tax IBS system to the General Ledger accounting system had not been undertaken for 2 months from January 14 to February 14, due to the absence of a key member of staff. We have confirmed that all outstanding reconciliations have now been completed and there are no brought forward problems. We held discussions with the Revenues Manager, who stated the non-completion of the reconciliations was a managed risk and considered to be a low priority against the demands of the 2014-15 annual billing procedure deadlines. We have been advised that alternative additional staffing arrangements have been put in place by management, so that this situation does not happen again.

We have also taken into account previous years' modular based audit results in order to come to an overall conclusion this year.

Finally we confirmed that the recommendations made at the last audit have been properly implemented and are working effectively.

As a result of the overall findings we have given this review a 'Satisfactory' assurance opinion.

Assurance Level	Audit Assurance Opinion
Satisfactory	The system of expected control although sound, has elements of weakness thus increasing system objective risks

Page 69
Grants 2013/14
Executive summary

In 2013, the Council funded 36 community pride schemes costing the Council £46,000. The schemes consisted of a mixture of community pride and community “building” (i.e. spirit) type schemes. These are not classed as capital projects.

There were also three longer term regeneration projects funded by the Council under an SLA. These were the:

- Oakley Project
- Hesters Way scheme
- Cheltenham West End Partnership

Payments made under these schemes were reviewed; they are accurately recorded and controlled and in accordance with the service level agreements (SLA’s).

The community grant schemes are well advertised and the Councils policy and criteria are clearly documented on their website as guidance for applicants.

There is a grants protocol that ensures grants are awarded in accordance with the Councils aims and objectives. A panel sits and agrees the grants to fund, a process which is accurately recorded and robust.

Grant application and grant agreement forms are completed for all grants approved and payment is only made on a completed grant claim form validating expenditure.

The introduction of the new finance system, ABW (Agresso) has led to some challenges in the payment of grants. We recommend that the grant recording system is better integrated with finance to improve reporting and monitoring of grants.

The audit acknowledged that the spread sheet used by the Strategy and Engagement Manager provides useful management and monitoring information. This should be regularly reconciled however with the ledger to ensure integrity.

The audit conclusion from our testing is that award and payment of grants is generally well controlled and monitored.

Assurance Level	Audit Assurance Opinion
Satisfactory	The system of expected control although sound, there are opportunities for improvement to further reduce system objective risks.

Page 70
Housing Benefits 2013/14
Executive summary

This audit has been completed as part of the annual review of the core financial systems which are an important part of financial management for the Council. Appropriate control over the operation of this system is central to the financial management element of the Council's statement of internal control. Housing Benefits are a core financial system and as such are audited each year.

This review focused on fundamental key controls as required by the external auditor (Grant Thornton); Personnel and software changes; Subsidy claim procedure review; 3rd party data sharing; and the Discretionary Housing Payments (DHP) scheme.

The main objectives of the review have been to test the adequacy and effectiveness of internal controls in place; to ensure that current processes are meeting the requirements of internal policy, procedural standards and targets for each system reviewed; and to ensure the processes are meeting external codes of practice, and, as appropriate, statutory regulations.

Due to the depth of testing completed 2012-13, for 2013-14 we have performed a high level review of previous findings as well as emerging risk areas as instructed by the client. The work undertaken during the review has been sufficient to address these objectives and gain an opinion on the level of assurance that can be placed on the system of controls.

As part of the Localism Act (2012), Council Tax Benefit (CTB) was replaced with Council tax support (CTS) on 1st April 2013. The new scheme is set nationally for pension age customers and locally for working age customers. Cheltenham has currently adopted a similar scheme to the old council tax benefit for working age. A one-off central government transitional grant was made available to CBC in 2013/14 to help facilitate the CTS changeover due to a 10% reduction in government funding of the new scheme. The Benefits Manager has made prudent use of the transitional grant payment leaving CBC well placed to absorb any shortfall in support funding for 2014-15.

Sample testing was carried out on the monitoring of new claims and change in circumstances, housing benefit payment runs through creditors, reconciliations between systems and controls in place for Discretionary Housing payment awards. There were no significant issues arising from the testing or our review of existing controls.

All recommendations from the previous audit have been actioned; the majority have been completed with one action point still on-going, led by the shared ICT team.

CBC received additional funds through changes to the Council Tax discount and exemption schemes as well as a transitional grant for Council Tax support. Management of resources leaves the service well placed to absorb any further cuts in Government funding of the scheme.

The Housing benefit department is based in a secure area of the Municipal offices with access only available to Benefits, Revenues and Licensing staff. The offices are open plan with the 3 services mentioned sharing the floor albeit in separated areas. It is recommended that in order to provide full assurance on the security of data the Benefits service should implement a clear desk policy with a long term view to having their own secured offices in the future.

Based on testing and review completed, we can place a high level of assurance system of controls in place.

Assurance Level	Audit Assurance Opinion
High	The system of control is sound and designed to achieve system objectives.

Page 71
Core Financials
Executive summary

The review of the Core Financial systems was conducted as part of the audit programme for 2013/2014 as approved by Audit Committee in March 2013. This audit covered controls and processes in place in respect of:

- Budgetary Control and Capital Accounting
- Main Accounting and Treasury Management
- Payroll
- Accounts Payable
- Accounts Receivable

Audit testing has confirmed that the control framework within CBC in relation to the areas reviewed is generally sound and provides assurance that processes and procedures enable the delivery of business objectives.

Recommendations from the previous year have been reviewed and any outstanding items not yet actioned or implemented have been addressed within these audits.

To further improve the control environment, the following areas would benefit from development and improvement:

- **Budget Monitoring:** Consider the timeliness of budget monitoring reporting and liaise with the GO Shared Service to enhance the current suite of reports.
- **Payroll:** Ensure payments are made in accordance with policy.
- **Accounts Payable:** Increase/improve the use of purchase orders and authorisation processes to ensure suppliers are paid promptly.

Based on the work completed we have concluded that there are sound controls operating within CBC in respect of the Core Financial Systems. There are number of opportunities for further improvement and development as above and discussed in section 3 of this report.

System	Assurance Level
Budgetary Control and Capital Accounting	Satisfactory
Main Accounting (Including Bank Rec) and Treasury Management	High
Payroll	Satisfactory
Accounts Payable	Satisfactory
Accounts Receivable	Satisfactory

Page 72
PSN Submission 2013/14
Executive summary

In 2013, the Audit Cotswolds brief focused on the evaluation of the evidence available to substantiate the “Supporting Evidence” statements made on CBC’s PSN Code of Connection (CoCo) submission.

A subsequent follow-up was done in March 2014 and was based on a review of the amber items. This review involved revisiting the amber items as well as a brief review of CBC’s 2014 submission responses.

This report provided further follow up in the run up to the submission to provide assurance that the PSN submission could be effectively evidenced. The audit concluded that if strategies were in position to tackle a number of on-going issues, leading to mitigating controls being in place, then Internal Audit could give a satisfactory assurance opinion over the 2014 PSN submission.

This position was confirmed by management.

Transparency
Executive summary

This audit was carried out as part of the risk based audit programme planned for 2013/14 as approved by Audit Committee in March 2013. The purpose of the audit is to provide Members and senior officers with sufficient levels of assurance that the transparency process in place at Cheltenham Borough Council is effective.

The Council has a responsibility to protect public funds and such, must make certain information available allowing the public to scrutinise the use of Council finances and resources.

In 2011 the Government published the categories of information that would increase local authority transparency in the *Code of Recommended Practice for Local Authorities on Data Transparency (2011)*. From May 2014 the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) issued a new *Local Government Transparency Code (2014)*. This updated code contains additional data sets which have now become mandatory for local authorities to publish (the 2011 code was voluntary).

The current transparency code of practice (2011) recommends a varied scope of data to be published. CBC voluntarily publishes the majority of this data with few exceptions (e.g. the property register of CBC owned land, property and assets). There are plans in place to publish the remaining information as part of compliance with the revised 2014 code.

It was noted from informal discussions with service areas that it is not widely understood what information they will be required to produce, or the deadlines for the implementation of the 2014 transparency standards. Existing engagement with service areas should continue – greater coordination in preparing for the requirements of the new code will ensure mandatory data is published, with the relevant service areas responsible for managing the process.

The current arrangements and practices in place at Cheltenham Borough Council support the effective publication of data for the public, in line with the Government’s Transparency Agenda (2011).

Assurance Level	Audit Assurance Opinion
High	The system of control is sound and designed to achieve system objectives.

[Note: See Appendix A for Assurance Level definitions]

Appendix B

Assurance and Priority Methodology

Assurance and Priority levels for all audits follow a standard methodology to ensure reliability and validity of Internal Audit opinion. The tables below set out the rationale for the opinion and suggested management action timescales.

Assurance Level	IA Opinion – Controls		IA Opinion - Compliance
High	The system of control is sound and designed to achieve system objectives	&	Controls are complete, consistently applied and compliance is good.
Satisfactory	The system of expected control although sound, has elements of weakness thus increasing system objective risks.	& / or	Compliance is generally good but there is evidence of non-compliance with some of the controls.
Limited	The system of controls falls below expectation as weaknesses are increasing system objective risks.	& / or	There is sufficient evidence of non-compliance which puts the system objectives at risk.
Low	The system of control is weak thus significantly increasing system objective risk.	& / or	There is significant non-compliance with controls leaving the system vulnerable to abuse or fraud and significantly increases the system objective risks.

Priority Level	
1	A significant and serious control weakness in the system of internal control – Action is essential
2	A weakness that could undermine the system of internal control and compromise its operation - Action is required as soon as possible.
3	An improvement to the system of internal control in order to comply with best practice, or which offers efficiency savings - Action date to be agreed within a maximum of 12 months

Internal Audit Progress summary

Audit Work completed or in progress 2013/14 plan	
National Non Domestic Rates 13/14	Completed
Housing and Council Tax Benefits 13/14	In Draft
Council Tax 13/14	In Progress
GO Shared Services (GO Module Audits and Client Testing) 13/14 Budgetary Control and Capital Accounting - Main Accounting - Payroll - Accounts Payable - Accounts Receivable	On-going Advice and Support Provision
ICT Review 13/14 – PSN submission	
Grants	
Transparency Agenda	
Annual Governance Statement 2013/14	
Audit Work completed or in progress 2014/15 plan	
Core Audit Areas	
Annual Governance Statement 14/15	
Performance Management 14/15	
Risk Management 14/15	
Governance Compliance 14/15	
ICT Review 14/15	
Housing and Council Tax Benefits 14/15	
Council Tax 14/15	
National Non Domestic Rates 14/15	
GO Shared Services (GO Module Audits and Client Testing) 14/15 - Budgetary Control and Capital Accounting - Main Accounting - Payroll - Accounts Payable - Accounts Receivable	
Other new work planned 2014/15	
Change Management – Cheltenham Trust	
Payment Channels and Income Streams	
Environmental Audit	
Data Protection and Control of Data	

Third Party Schemes and Grants
Transparency Agenda (follow up)
Social Networking
Change Management – Public Protection
Housing – Disabled Facilities Grants
Car Parking

Follow-up on recommendations

Car Parking Regents Arcade

Based on the work completed, IA can confirm that some system improvements have been made, however some of the issues relating to the Regent Arcade are still outstanding in relation to:

- Parking enforcement,
- Establishment of the most appropriate system for the future collection of car parking revenue at Regent Arcade, within the wider car parking strategy of the Council, and
- Choice of future contractor through use of an appropriate tender process.

These matters do however relate to the wider management of car parking within the Borough given the changes to both available parking and reductions/reorganisation of staffing following loss of the on-street GCC parking agency. As a result it is recommended that a full review of the provision and management of car parking is appropriate in order to ensure that the Council achieves its objectives in this area.

Audit Committee 2014-2015 work plan

Item	Officer	Decision / Discussion / Information
24 September 2014		
Briefing: 8 September 2014 (later than usual)		Complete reports by: 12 September 2014
Audit highlights memorandum - ISA 260 (for the previous year)	Grant Thornton	Discussion
Internal audit monitoring report	Rob Milford	Discussion
Annual statement of accounts 2013-14	Finance Team	Discussion
Review of implications of council action plan (KPMG)	Sara Freckleton	Discussion
Counter Fraud Unit update	Rob Milford	Discussion
Appointment of Co-opted members to the Audit Committee	Mark Sheldon	Decision
Special meeting to be arranged		
Art Gallery and Museum refurbishment project review	Grant Thornton	Decision
14 January 2015		
Briefing (to agree agenda): w/c 24 November 2014		Complete reports by: 2 January 2015
Audit update report	Grant Thornton	Discussion
Annual audit letter (for the previous year)	Grant Thornton	Discussion
Certification of grants and returns (for the previous year)	Grant Thornton	Discussion
Internal audit monitoring report	Rob Milford	Tbc
Annual governance statement – significant issues action plan	Bryan Parsons	Decision
Revenue and benefits commissioning review (governance arrangements)	Mark Sheldon	Tbc
25 March 2015		
Briefing (to agree agenda): w/c 9 February 2015		Complete reports by: 13 March 2015
Audit update report	Grant Thornton	Discussion
Audit plan (for the current year)	Grant Thornton	Discussion
Auditing Standards – communicating with the Audit Committee	Grant Thornton	Decision
Annual plan (for the upcoming year)	Rob Milford	Tbc
Internal audit monitoring report	Rob Milford	Tbc
Annual review of risk management policy	Bryan Parsons	Decision

Audit Committee 2014-2015 work plan

Item	Officer	Decision / Discussion / Information
Approval of the Code of Corporate Governance	Bryan Parsons	Decision
17 June 2015		
Briefing (to agree agenda): w/c 5 May 2015	Complete reports by: 5 June 2015	
Audit update report	Grant Thornton	Discussion
Internal audit opinion (for the previous year)	Rob Milford	Discussion
Internal audit monitoring report	Rob Milford	Tbc
Annual governance statement	Bryan Parsons	Decision
Annual Audit Fee Letter 2015/16	Grant Thornton	Discussion
Annual counter fraud report	Rob Milford	Tbc

Items to be added at a future date (future dates will not be agreed until March 2015)		
Corporate Strategy – consideration of governance issue	Rob Milford	Tbc
Joint training session with Cotswold, West Oxford and F.O.D councillors – governance of shared services (tbc)	Rob Milford / Mark Sheldon	n/a
Policy review timetable (briefing note)	Bryan Parsons	Information
Requirements of the Localism Act (re: local audit)	Rob Milford	Tbc
Corporate Governance arrangements for Glos Airport following further work by the JASWG and recs arising	Mark Sheldon	Tbc
Leisure and Culture Trust – 12 month review of governance arrangements	Tbc	October 2015

ANNUAL ITEMS (standing items to be added to the work plan each year)			
January	Audit update report	Grant Thornton	Discussion
	Annual audit letter (for the previous year)	Grant Thornton	Discussion
	Certification of grants and returns (for the previous year)	Grant Thornton	Discussion

Audit Committee 2014-2015 work plan

	Item	Officer	Decision / Discussion / Information
	Internal audit monitoring report	Rob Milford	Tbc
	Annual governance statement – significant issues action plan	Bryan Parsons	Decision
March	Audit update report	Grant Thornton	Discussion
	Audit plan (for the current year)	Grant Thornton	Discussion
	Auditing Standards – communicating with the Audit Committee	Grant Thornton	Decision
	Annual plan (for the upcoming year)	Rob Milford	Tbc
	Internal audit monitoring report	Rob Milford	Tbc
	Annual review of risk management policy	Bryan Parsons	Decision
	Approval of the Code of Corporate Governance	Bryan Parsons	Decision
June	Audit update report	Grant Thornton	Discussion
	Internal audit opinion (for the previous year)	Rob Milford	Discussion
	Internal audit monitoring report	Rob Milford	Tbc
	Annual governance statement	Bryan Parsons	Decision
	Annual Audit Fee letter for the coming year	Grant Thornton	Discussion
	Annual counter fraud report	Rob Milford	Tbc
September	Audit update report	Grant Thornton	Discussion
	Audit highlights memorandum - ISA 260 (for the previous year)	Grant Thornton	Discussion
	Financial Resilience report (for current year)	Grant Thornton	Discussion
	Internal audit monitoring report	Rob Milford	Tbc
	Review of annual statement of accounts	Finance Team	Tbc

This page is intentionally left blank