

### BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

#### AUDIT COMMITTEE

4.00pm 15 DECEMBER 2009

COMMITTEE ROOM 3, HOVE TOWN HALL

#### MINUTES

**Present:** Councillors Hamilton (Chairman), Watkins (Deputy Chairman), Kitcat, Oxley, Phillips, Simpson, Smith and C Theobald

#### PART ONE

#### 37. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

##### 37a Declarations of Substitutes

37.1 Councillor Phillips declared that she was substituting for Councillor Taylor.

37.2 Councillor Mrs Theobald declared that she was substituting for Councillor Theobald.

##### 37b Declarations of Interests

37.3 Councillor Simpson declared a personal but not prejudicial interest in Item 53: Corporate Risk and Opportunity Register Update and Item 55: Corporate Risk Management Action Plan Focus, for the reason that she sat on the Board for the Local Delivery Vehicle.

##### 37c Exclusion of the Press and Public

37.4 In accordance with section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 ('the Act'), the Audit Committee considered whether the press and public should be excluded from the meeting during an item of business on the grounds that it was likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the press or public were present during that item, there would be disclosure to them of confidential information (as defined in section 100A(3) of the Act) or exempt information (as defined in section 100I of the Act).

37.5 **RESOLVED** - That the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of item 54, Non-Public Minutes of the Previous Meeting, and item 55, Corporate Risk Management Action Plans Focus as these items were exempt under Paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of the 1972 Act (information relating to the financial or business affairs of the authority).

**38. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

- 38.1 **RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 29 September 2009 are approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

**39. CHAIRMAN'S COMMUNICATIONS**

- 39.1 The Chairman addressed the Committee and noted that the Health Impact Assessment report had been referred to the Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee for consideration.

The Chairman had recently visited the National Fraud Initiative and had asked for an Officer to attend an Audit Committee meeting at a later date.

The Chairman thanked Mr Brown from the Audit Commission for his work with Brighton & Hove City Council, and welcomed Mr Mathers into the post.

**40. PETITIONS**

- 40.1 There were none.

**41. PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

- 41.1 There were none.

**42. DEPUTATIONS**

- 42.1 There were none.

**43. WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS**

- 43.1 There were none.

**44. LETTERS FROM COUNCILLORS**

- 44.1 There were none.

**45. TREASURY MANAGEMENT POLICY STATEMENT 2009/10 (INCLUDING ANNUAL INVESTMENT STRATEGY 2009/10) - MID YEAR REVIEW**

- 45.1 The Committee considered a report from the Director of Finance & Resources regarding the Treasury Management Policy Statement 2009/10 (for a copy see minute book).
- 45.2 The Head of Strategic Finance and Procurement, Mark Ireland, introduced the report and stated that following the collapse of the Icelandic banks local authority reporting processes on treasury management had been examined, and it was recommended that treasury management activities be reported more frequently to elected members through council audit committees.

Mr Ireland highlighted that the financial crisis was not over and it was still possible that some smaller financial institutions may run into difficulty as the new year progressed. Brighton & Hove remained cautious in terms of investments and the department was closely monitoring the position in respect of decisions on where to lend money. The policy of repayment of debt was continuing as this reduced investment risk and was financially beneficial to the council overall. The set borrowing limits had not been exceeded and returns on investments were significantly higher than both internal and external benchmarks. The capital financing budget was currently £400,000 underspent, but this was now likely to remain static for the remainder of the year. He noted that the Council would need to begin borrowing in the near future, and would need to decide at what point to start this to take the best advantage of the current situation. Finally he added that a Members seminar on treasury management was being held on 19 January 2010.

- 45.3 The Chairman asked if there were any questions and Councillor Smith asked why the Council was not borrowing money now to take advantage of the low interest rates. Mr Ireland stated that all of the Council's borrowing and investment requirements were considered regularly by officers. He added that the Council needed a reason to borrow money before advantage could be taken of any low rates, but the markets were examined every day to assess the situation accurately.
- 45.4 Councillor Mrs Theobald asked what involvement members had with treasury management at the Council and Mr Ireland replied that the key annual reports went to Full Council and Cabinet and Audit Committee Members would also receive regular reports.
- 45.5 Councillor Simpson asked questions around the repayment of debt on the Housing account and Councillor Oxley responded that this was a very technical and complex area of treasury management. He stated that officers were able to give Councillors excellent individual explanations of the management of this account. Essentially, the HRA subsidy is based on 'notional' assumptions about HRA debt rather than actual debt and interest levels. Changes in actual debt can therefore cause increases or decreases in the subsidy payable.
- 45.6 Councillor Watkins believed the report showed the Council was doing well in terms of treasury management and asked how the authority compared with other Councils. Mr Ireland replied that it was difficult to make accurate comparisons as each Council had individual factors affecting it. He added that the only area that could be reliably compared was performance on investments and the Council was in the top quartile for this.
- 45.7 **RESOLVED** – That the report is noted.

#### **46. AUDIT COMMISSION UPDATE AND AUDIT & INSPECTION PLAN**

- 46.1 The Committee considered an update from the Audit Commission and an oral report on the Audit & Inspection Plan.
- 46.2 The District Auditor, Ms Helen Thompson, addressed the Committee and stated that work for the 2008/09 period was completed and work on the 2009/10 year was

beginning. The Pre-Audit Statement was in progress and currently running to timetable, and discussions with officers were taking place with regarding to timings of work. The Audit Progress report would be updated and brought back to a subsequent Audit Committee meeting.

Ms Thompson recognised that a commitment had been made by the Audit Commission for the CAA Lead for Sussex, Ms Prail, to address the Committee, but she stated that due to other commitments across the area Ms Prail had been unable to make this meeting. She would attend at the earliest available opportunity in the new year. The results of the CAA had been published on the One Place website, but as the process was ongoing rather than annual, it would be updated on a more informal but regular basis.

46.3 The Chairman asked if Ms Prail would be able to attend the March 2010 Audit Committee meeting and Ms Thompson replied that she would look into this.

46.4 **RESOLVED** – That the update and the Audit and Inspection Plan work is noted.

#### **47. AUDIT COMMISSION: GOOD GOVERNANCE REPORT**

47.1 The Committee considered a report from the Director of Strategy & Governance regarding the Good Governance Review and report from the Audit Commission (for a copy see minute book).

47.2 Ms Thompson briefly introduced the Audit Commission's report on Good Governance and noted that the fieldwork for evidence for this report had been conducted at the end of 2008 and beginning of 2009. The draft report had been produced early in 2009, but for various reasons had taken time to finalise. She added however that there were very few differences between the draft report and the final report.

The main findings of the report were that the Constitutional and governance arrangements at Brighton & Hove City Council were robust and strong. There was recognition that there had been a major change in the way the Council conducted its governance arrangements resulting from the introduction of the new constitution and that this had a noticeable effect on the culture and operation of the authority. The District Auditor, Ms Thompson, believed the report reflected this inevitable settling in period, but highlighted that the organisation could not be complacent with regard to its own arrangements and suggested areas where improvements might be made in the form of an action plan (appended to the Audit Commission's report). She added that the Audit Commission was not criticising the Council, but felt that it was important to regularly review and monitor arrangements to ensure they were strong and transparent.

47.3 The Head of Law introduced the officer's review of the Good Governance report and felt that the work of the Audit Commission was useful and overall complimentary of the Council's arrangements. A number of strengths in the Council's current arrangements were identified in the report including the constitutional arrangements, partnership working, community engagement, Member development and Member conduct. The report identifies areas for improvement, but the Head of Law reiterated that these have to be seen in the proper context. The fieldwork had been conducted between October 2008 and March 2009 shortly after a new Constitution had been introduced with a

relatively new administration. This was therefore a period of adjustment and it is not surprising that Members and Officers felt unsure about aspects of the new arrangements. The action plan records improvements that have already taken place and others to be implemented in the coming months. The Head of Law thanked the Audit Commission for the work they had done in identifying these areas.

- 47.4 The Chairman asked if there were any questions and Councillor Kitcat asked whether the Council had contracted this report from the Audit Commission or whether it was part of the regular programme of work the Audit Commission performed.

Ms Thompson replied that examination of governance arrangements was part of the Code of Practice for authorities, but it was also something the Audit Commission had identified as necessary for Brighton & Hove City Council as a result of issues that had emerged from the 2007 Comprehensive Performance Assessment, which had highlighted governance as an area that needed reviewing. This work was delayed until the new arrangements were introduced, and could act as a compliment to the work of the Council on the six month review of the new Constitution.

- 47.5 Councillor Kitcat was concerned there had been significant changes between the draft report and the final report and asked who had been responsible for negotiating these changes with the Audit Commission. Ms Thompson stated that the draft report had been written in the Audit Commission's "house style", which formulated a judgement, gave reasons for the judgement and assessed why this judgement was important. She recognised that this could often come across as austere and direct. There was a need to factor in the special circumstances of the Council at the time the evidence was gathered, and to make the report more encompassing of the situation the authority faced than was expressed in the original. This process had taken some time to achieve, but Ms Thompson recognised that the length of time between the draft report and the final report was unacceptable and assured Councillors that this would not happen in the future.
- 47.6 The Head of Law stated that the essence of the final report was the same as the original draft and the recommendations from the Commission were essentially the same. There had been no Member involvement in between the draft and final stage, and the first Members to see the report had been the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of Audit Committee. He added that all of the changes made to the report had either been factual or contextual and were necessary for a complete report.
- 47.7 Councillor Kitcat believed that the way in which the Council ran Cabinet Member Meetings was unusual when compared with other Councils and asked why this was not referred to in the report.

The Head of Law stated that this area of work was identified in the report, as originally there had been the perception that many of the reports going to Cabinet Member Meetings were simply for 'noting' and this was not an efficient use of time for the authority. However, following the six month review of the Constitution, the reporting processes and delegations had changed to reflect a more streamlined approach. This is also an area that has been considered as part of the 12 month Constitution review of the constitution and there will be proposals to change some of the CMMs.

The Head of Law understood that most other authorities did not hold Cabinet Member Meetings in public and decisions in these authorities were taken in private. However, when the new system had originally been designed at Brighton & Hove City Council, there was a commitment by members and officers to ensure the new system was as transparent and open as possible. He added that officers remained up-to-date with what other authorities were doing in this area, but he believed Brighton & Hove had formulated the most open and inclusive system as possible.

- 47.8 The Chairman agreed that Brighton & Hove City Council had worked very hard to achieve the best system possible and thanked Councillor Oxley, who had led on the project, for his commitment to developing such a transparent system. Councillor Watkins agreed with this statement.
- 47.9 Councillor Oxley felt that the current situation in Brighton & Hove was quite different from when the fieldwork was undertaken for the report, and this was not reflected in the final version. He stated that the 12 month Constitution review would be much more in-depth and contain many more suggestions that further developed the recommendations in the Good Governance report. The Overview & Scrutiny function had been looked at, and further work would be undertaken on Cabinet Member Meetings, although when the system had originally been introduced, there was concern across the Council that it would be a very closed system, and a conscious effort was made to give open access to both Council Members and members of the public and press. He felt the report was valuable and important, but it was important to recognise how far the Council had developed from the point when the evidence base had been gathered.
- 47.10 Councillor Mrs Theobald asked about the recommendations regarding raising the profile of the Standards Committee and the Head of Law stated that the Independent Chairman had already visited with Group Leaders and Groups, there was ongoing discussion and consultation around standards issues at the Council, and the Annual Report of the Standards Committee would be coming to Full Council in the new year, and would reflect the work that had been done, and was being done, to develop standards further. Councillor Oxley added that the Chairman of Standards Committee had been invited to the Governance Committee to discuss the recommendations from this report.
- 47.11 Councillor Mrs Theobald expressed concern that the report stated that the Cabinet structure did not support efficient and effective decision making, but Councillor Oxley felt this was no longer a concern as effective measures had been put in place after the six month Constitution review to help streamline the Cabinet portfolios and make meetings more effective. Ms Thompson added that at the time of assessment between December 2008 and February 2009 the Cabinet structure had not been working effectively. The Commission had not conducted follow-up work to assess the current situation however, but felt this could be assessed as part of the Commission's Use of Resources work for 2009/10.
- 47.12 Councillor Mrs Theobald expressed concern that the report highlighted problems with the Council developing a more user-friendly approach to performance reporting information and Councillor Oxley stated that this had been recognised and work was in progress in this area. Ms Thompson added that she had met with the current Chief Executive and this was a clear area he was focussing on for improvement. The Assistant Director, Improvement & Organisational Development agreed that this was an

area under review and was aware there was a high density of information produced by the authority that was complex for both members and members of the public.

**47.13 RESOLVED –**

1. That the report of the Audit Commission is noted; and
2. That the proposed action in response to the recommendations of the Commission as set out in the action plan, listed at appendix 1 to the Commission's report, is noted.

**48. AUDIT COMMISSION: REVIEW OF INTERNAL AUDIT**

- 48.1 The Committee considered a report from the Audit Commission regarding the Review of Internal Audit (for a copy see minute book).
- 48.2 The Audit Manager for Sussex, Mr Grahame Brown, addressed the Committee and stated that the Internal Audit department had been fully co-operative with the review process and the service was found to be overall compliant and effective in all elements of the CIPFA code of practice.
- 48.3 Councillor Kitcat asked if more audit work was being undertaken by the Council's internal audit function, and what impact this would have on the service. Mr Brown stated that there had been a programme of managed audits developed by the Commission, and at times where there was a heavy workload, they had relied upon Internal Audit to help with some of the programme. This was an ongoing process and wherever possible, the Commission would seek for Internal Audit to conduct work as this option was less expensive for the Council. He added that the housing benefits audit had been a particular success as Internal Audit had a good working relationship with the housing department, which had helped to ease the process.
- 48.4 Councillor Kitcat was concerned that this extra work would adversely affect the outcomes for Internal Audit and Ms Thompson replied that any extra work was negotiated with the service, and many of the reviews had to be externally assessed for quality assurance. She recognised that there was an element of re-performance in this practice, but cost-effectiveness was continually assessed and the programme developed according to this.
- 48.5 **RESOLVED** – That the report is noted.

**49. AUDIT COMMISSION: ANNUAL AUDIT LETTER 2008/09**

- 49.1 The Committee considered a report from the Audit Commission regarding the Annual Audit Letter (for a copy see minute book).
- 49.2 Ms Thompson addressed the Committee and stated that this report was a summary of the Annual Governance report and Annual Audit Letter, which had been given an unqualified audit opinion at the end of September 2009. Some concerns had been noted, a small additional fee charged and these were summarised in the report. The overall score for Value for Money and Use of Resources was 3 and Ms Thompson

thanked the officers of Brighton & Hove City Council for their help throughout the year on the audit process.

- 49.3 The Chairman raised concern that the same comments regarding internal controls of the payroll system had been made by the Commission for the second year in a row. Mr Brown agreed that extensive discussions had taken place last year regarding this area and certain arrangements had been put in place to rectify the issues. Whilst there was no longer a 'material' problem and no major failings had been found, it was felt that the controls needed to be tightened as there was an opportunity for failure inherent in the current system. The Head of Audit & Business Risk added that the department was moving in the right direction and would be introducing a new system in May 2010 to help with this.
- 49.4 Councillor Kitcat felt that the proposed Members IT Working Group would have helped to progress this situation further, and Councillor Oxley replied that the IT Working Group was currently being set up, but had unfortunately been delayed due to the departure of the current Head of ICT.
- 49.5 Councillor Oxley asked if the scores achieved by the Council for this year's audit were harder to achieve than last year's scores and Ms Thompson agreed that this was the case. She stated that the biggest difference had come in the way Use of Resources was achieved as there was now a need to demonstrate good outcomes as well as processes. There were now fewer authorities with a high level of scoring because of this new focus. Governance of the business was also much more difficult to evidence for outcomes. There was expected to be more development around outcomes in asset management, and in 2009/10 asset management and workforce planning would be the focus rather than natural resources. Ms Thompson believed this would help to reduce the burden on councils.
- 49.6 **RESOLVED** – That the report is noted.

## **50. AUDIT & BUSINESS RISK PROGRESS REPORT**

- 50.1 The Committee considered a report from the Director of Finance & Resources regarding the Audit & Business Risk Progress Report (for a copy see minute book).
- 50.2 The Head of Audit & Business Risk, Mr Ian Withers, addressed the Committee and stated that this was a normal periodic report and the service was constantly assessing risks and developing the plan according to this. He added that resourcing in the Internal Audit Team was still an issue and there was currently one vacancy in the team. Recent final audits had produced three audits with limited assurance and action plans had been implemented to address these weaknesses. The counter fraud audit would form a separate report for the March 2010 committee and the counter fraud risk analysis and loss measurement details were currently with Deloitte. There was quality assurance work being conducted around equal pay and the team were generally meeting their targets and were on course to meet the plan for the year.
- 50.3 The Chairman asked if the team were aiming to achieve completion of 91 per cent of programmed audits and Mr Withers confirmed this.



- 50.4 The Chairman noted the limited assurance given on seafront services and asked if the relevant Cabinet Member had been made aware of the situation, and whether the issues were being addressed. Mr Withers confirmed that the Cabinet Member should have been informed and an action plan had been put in place.
- 50.5 Councillor Mrs Theobald noted the requested audit on the Mayoral Charities and asked for more details. Mr Withers confirmed that the audit would be assessing how the accounts for the charities were internally audited and managed and how money transactions were being recorded.
- 50.6 Councillor Oxley asked who made the request for the charities to be audited and Mr Withers replied that the request had come from an officer in the relevant department. He added that he would risk assess any requested audits to ensure they were appropriate. Councillor Oxley asked for more details on requested audits to be included in future reports and Mr Withers agreed to this.
- 50.7 **RESOLVED** – That the contents of the report are noted.

#### **51. ANNUAL GOVERNANCE STATEMENT 2008/09 - ACTION PLAN PROGRESS UPDATE**

- 51.1 The Committee considered a report from the Director of Finance & Resources regarding the Annual Governance Statement 2008/09 – Action Plan Progress Update (for a copy see minute book).
- 51.2 Mr Withers introduced the report and stated that it was good practice for the Audit Committee to remain updated on the Annual Governance Statement as it was the Committee's responsibility to ensure the action plan was implemented.
- 51.3 The Chairman asked if there was a specific timeframe related to actions in the plan and Ms Thompson replied that the Audit Commission would look at the Statement to see if it was consistent with the Commission's knowledge of the Council. If a risk emerged the Commission would expect it to be reflected accordingly and that if there is a plan, it is being addressed properly. She stated that the Commission was satisfied providing there were good processes in place.
- 51.4 Councillor Kitcat felt there was a lack of rigour shown in development of the scrutiny process and asked if any more actions would be forthcoming in this area. Ms Thompson replied that the process was showing better outcomes and there was now a new Head of Overview & Scrutiny in place. She added that it was an ongoing process, but the Commission was satisfied with the progress so far. Councillor Oxley added that there had recently been a review of scrutiny, with a number of recommendations accepted by the Overview and Scrutiny Commission. Many previous concerns had been addressed and a need for collaborative working had been recognised.
- 51.5 **RESOLVED** – That the progress on the actions agreed in the Annual Governance Statement for 2008/09 are noted.

**52. TARGETED BUDGET MANAGEMENT (TBM) MONTH 6**

- 52.1 The Committee considered a report from the Director of Finance and Resources regarding the Targeted Budget Management (TBM) month six report (for a copy see minute book).
- 52.2 **RESOLVED** – That the decision made by Cabinet on 12 November 2009 in respect of Targeted Budget Management month six are noted.

**53. CORPORATE RISK AND OPPORTUNITY REGISTER UPDATE**

- 53.1 The Committee considered a report from the Director of Finance & Resources regarding the Corporate Risk and Opportunity Register Update (for a copy see minute book).
- 53.2 The Risk and Opportunity Manager, Ms Jackie Algar, addressed the Committee and stated that the register had been refreshed following the six month update of strategic risks. The Management Team approved the new register and this was submitted to Cabinet on 18 November 2009 for information and was available to the Audit Committee for comment.

Ms Algar explained that a new software system had been introduced and the information contained in the Risk Maps had slightly changed to include a new column to indicate “potential” risks. Other elements to the Risk Maps had remained the same, such as the likelihood scores and the direction of travel arrows.

The main changes to the Corporate Risk Register were that CR2: Financial Outlook for the Council, had been moved to the top of the register, CR13: Waste Reduction and Disposal had moved down the register because of the ongoing work with the waste PFI contract to mitigate this risk, CR1: Council Housing Stock Condition had moved down the register due to ongoing work and a new Corporate Risk had been added: CR18: Protection of Vulnerable Children. This Risk had been introduced because of national legislative changes, and the cost implications of these to the Council.

Ms Algar added that prioritising risks, refreshing the register and ensuring those risks that were successfully managed were removed from the registered formed good practice in risk and opportunity management. As such, three risks had been removed from the register because they were now mainstreamed into Council functions and there were measures in place to ameliorate the risks.

- 53.3 Councillor Hamilton asked if individual Risk Maps were still available for review by the Committee and Ms Algar replied that they would be and she would be demonstrating the software for this later on in the meeting.
- 53.4 Councillor Watkins raised concerns about the removal of CR6: Civil Resilience as he felt this was a very critical area and noted that the impact on the Council was unknown. Ms Algar stated that the “risk scenario” was the position recorded six months ago, but the last column demonstrated why this risk could now be removed. Councillor Watkins remained concerned that these risks were no longer on the register.

- 53.5 The Chairman agreed with Councillor Watkins but understood the process of reviewing the Risk Register and the need to remove risks once they had been dealt with effectively.
- 53.6 Councillor Kitcat concurred with the Chairman and stated that risks needed to be managed and removed when it was felt that the Council was effectively coping with the risk.
- 53.7 Councillor Watkins remained concerned that once a risk was removed from the register there was no Members' forum where it could be reviewed to ensure it continued to be effectively managed. Councillor Kitcat stated that the Risk Register was a tool for managing risks and took a snapshot of the main risks at the point it was produced. He added that if Members were concerned that there was a lack of Member involvement in managing the risks, then this should be raised with the relevant Cabinet Member for the risk. Ms Algar stated that the ROM Strategy was approved by Cabinet, but the risks were identified and are managed by officers who were more involved in the technical details of the risks. The Cabinet/TMT forum agreed the updated risk register and it was now for the Audit Committee to ensure that those risks that were agreed on the register were being managed appropriately.
- 53.8 Councillor Oxley noted that officers briefed Cabinet Members on the Risk Register and took views on the risks presented, but it was ultimately down to officer judgement as to which risks were included or removed. He added however that there was now a greater emphasis for Cabinet Members on the Risk Register.
- 53.9 Councillor Smith stated that as a Cabinet Member he always asked lots of questions around the risks within his portfolio. He recognised that some of the risks were major but there was continual improvements made by officers to ensure these risks were managed effectively. He added that the Risk Registers helped to manage risks appropriately.
- 53.10 Ms Thompson stated that the Audit Committee were entitled to take an independent view on the Risk Register, and if it was the belief of the Committee that an important risk had been removed, this was the opportunity to add to the Risk Register.
- 53.11 Councillor Watkins stated that he would feel more comfortable with the process if he was assured that the risks to be removed had been taken to the relevant Cabinet Member, and that Member had agreed the removal of the risk. Ms Algar stated that TMT set the Risk Register and Cabinet Members were briefed on this by the Directors, although she was unsure how often this process took place or what effectiveness it had.
- 53.12 Councillor Kitcat agreed with Councillor Watkins and felt Cabinet Members should be approving removal of risks that were a top priority for the Council.
- 53.13 Mr Brown noted in the Good Governance Report that risk management arrangements involving other partners was recognised by the Council as an area for improvement. He asked what arrangements had been put in place to develop this. Ms Algar replied that the Council recognised that more assurance reporting and standardisation and sharing of risk registers needed to take place. In light of this, the Children and Young People's Trust (CYPT) Risk Registers would be added to the risk management system from

January 2010 and the sharing of these registers and the Council's Corporate Risk Register would take place between the Council, the CYPT and Southdowns in April 2010. The sharing of Risk Registers for Audit Services would be led by the Risk Manager for Southdowns, and the sharing of registers with other partners such as the LAA partners would be via a rescheduled ROM workshop for February/March 2010 where joint registers would be formulated.

53.14 The Chairman noted that when the Risk Register altered it was reported to Cabinet for information. He requested that the Cabinet Member agreed the removal of any risks beforehand. Councillor Oxley stated that he and Councillor Smith would progress this issue with Cabinet Members and Councillor Smith added that Members needed to be aware of the entire risk picture. The Chairman asked that confirmation be given to the Audit Committee that a risk had been agreed for removal by the relevant Cabinet Member when the updated registers became available for information to the Audit Committee.

53.15 **RESOLVED** – That the Corporate Risk Register 2009-10 is noted.

**54. NON-PUBLIC MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING - EXEMPT CATEGORY 3**

54.1 The Chairman was requested to approve and sign the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 29 September 2009.

**55. CORPORATE RISK MANAGEMENT ACTION PLAN FOCUS - EXEMPT CATEGORY 3**

55.1 The Committee considered a presentation and software demonstration from the Risk and Opportunity Manager regarding the Corporate Risk Management Action Plan Focus.

55.2 The Members discussed the contents of the presentation and felt that a way forward would be for the relevant Cabinet Member to be consulted and to give final agreement before corporate risks were removed from the register.

The meeting concluded at 6.30pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of