

**CORPORATE RESOURCES OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**  
**17 MARCH 2016**

Minutes of the meeting of the Corporate Resources Overview & Scrutiny Committee of Flintshire County Council held in the Delyn Committee Room, County Hall, Mold on Thursday, 17 March 2016

**PRESENT: Councillor Clive Carver (Chair)**

Councillors: Marion Bateman, Paul Cunningham, Peter Curtis, Andy Dunbobbin, Robin Guest, Ron Hampson, Richard Jones, Brian Lloyd, Richard Lloyd, Vicky Perfect, David Roney, Nigel Steele-Mortimer and Arnold Woolley

**APOLOGIES:**

Councillor Billy Mullin – Cabinet Member for Corporate Management

**CONTRIBUTORS:**

Councillor Aaron Shotton – Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance, Chief Executive and Chief Officer (Governance)

For minute number 89

Superintendent Alex Goss from North Wales Police

For minute number 91

Finance Manager – Corporate Accounting and Systems and Technical Finance Manager

For minute number 93

Interim Human Resources and Organisational Change Manager

**IN ATTENDANCE:**

Member Engagement Manager and Committee Officer

**87. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (INCLUDING WHIPPING DECLARATIONS)**

No declarations of interest were made.

**88. MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 18<sup>th</sup> December 2015 (budget - am), 18<sup>th</sup> December 2015 (budget – pm), 29<sup>th</sup> January 2016 (budget) and 11<sup>th</sup> February 2016 had been circulated to Members with the agenda.

**ACCURACY**

18<sup>th</sup> December 2015 – pm meeting

Councillor Richard Lloyd requested that the name Brian Mullin be change to read Billy Mullin in the apologies section.

29<sup>th</sup> January 2016

Councillor Robin Guest asked for the heading of the minutes and the date of the meeting to be correctly reflected in the body of the minutes.

## MATTERS ARISING

11<sup>th</sup> February 2016

Councillor Richard Jones referred to page 22 and the clarification he had sought on the efficiency measure for minor adaptations. He felt that further explanation should be provided in reports where efficiencies had not been achieved but had been replaced. In response to a comment from the Chief Executive, Councillor Jones confirmed that he had received an explanation following the meeting but he felt that it was important that the information was provided in the report. The Chief Executive replied that this could be included in future reports.

### **RESOLVED:**

That subject to the suggested amendments, the minutes be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

## **89. 101 SERVICE PRESENTATION BY NORTH WALES POLICE**

The Member Engagement Manager introduced Superintendent Alex Goss from North Wales Police. He reminded the Committee that a discussion on the 101 phone service had taken place during the attendance at the meeting by the Police & Crime Commissioner, Mr. Winston Roddick, in December 2015. As a result of that meeting a presentation on the 101 service had been requested.

Superintendent Goss provided a detailed presentation which covered the following areas:-

- Operational Support Services (OSS)
- Calls and Incidents recorded in 2015
- Communications Operators
- Contact (Voice)
- Other Means of Contact
- Web Chat
- POD
- What happens with a call?
- Inappropriate 999 calls
- Tri-Service working

Superintendent Goss was aware of the frustrations expressed about the 101 Service which he felt were shared nationally. He explained that the Force Communications Centre at St. Asaph was the first point of contact for those dialling 999 or 101 and that all 999 calls were answered within 10 seconds. He added that a visit to the Centre could be facilitated for Members if required. Superintendent Goss commented on the use of social media, which was an extremely powerful form of contact, and Web Chat, which had been introduced in July 2015; both were available 24 hours a day.

The Centre was split into three areas which were Eastern for Wrexham and Flintshire, Central for Conwy and Denbighshire and Western for Gwynedd and Ynys Mon. A new telephony system was to be introduced in early 2017 which would allow calls from Flintshire to be directed to the Flintshire Pod where

operators who knew the area well would be situated. He provided details of the priority given to calls received at the Communications Centre and examples of inappropriate 999 calls which was a significant challenge as it blocked people who genuinely needed the Police from using the service. Close working was ongoing for the Police, Fire Authority and Ambulance Service to ensure that the public got the best possible service available to them at critical times.

A number of Councillors thanked Superintendent Goss for his presentation.

The Chairman sought clarification on the recorded message received when dialling 101 which asked the user to choose a language on two occasions; he queried whether this could be streamlined. Superintendent Goss advised that for 101 calls, callers heard a nationally determined bilingual greeting which lasted 53 seconds before the call was put through to the Control Centre where it would be answered. The greeting had been agreed for use in all Police Forces in Wales but a number of enquires had been received as to why it needed to be so long; work was ongoing to try and reduce the length of the message. There was a charge of 15 pence per minute for the 101 calls which was a national charge and was out of the control of the Police as it was set by the Home Office. In North Wales, the service had retained an 0300 number for the Control Room, which was free of charge.

Councillor Richard Lloyd referred to a problem experienced by residents in Saltney because they were close to the Cheshire border and were directed firstly to Cheshire Police when they rang 101 or 999 from a mobile phone. He also asked whether more officers were to be trained to be able to operate the laptop connected to the CCTV cameras in Saltney. In response Superintendent Goss provided a detailed explanation on how calls from mobiles were directed, based on three service provider masts to ensure the caller was passed to the Police Control Room through the quickest route. This meant that those living in the Saltney area could automatically be directed to Cheshire Police and would then need to choose option 4 for North Wales Police. He explained that where calls were directed to was in the control of the mobile service providers, not the Police. On the issue of training for officers, he advised that he would provide a response following the meeting.

Councillor Richard Jones asked why the Police were slow in responding to 999 'crime in action' calls. Superintendent Goss advised that for priority zero calls, the time allowed to respond was 20 minutes but in the majority of cases, officers responded in five minutes or less.

In referring to the decline in the number of incidents recorded by the Police, Councillor Robin Guest asked whether this was reflected in a reduction in the number of calls received. He sought clarification on whether reporting the issue of livestock on the road was an appropriate use of a 999 call and whether action was taken against those who used the service inappropriately. He queried whether there would be an impact on recruitment if calls from Flintshire were only answered by operators employed from the area and whether this was sustainable. In response, Superintendent Goss confirmed that it was appropriate to phone 999 if the livestock on the road constituted a danger and added that it would be the Crown Prosecution Service who would decide if action was to be

taken against individuals for inappropriate use of the 999 service. The reduction in the recording of incidents did coincide with the reduction in calls which had fallen by 120,000 in a three year period. He noted the comment about recruitment but explained that this had not been a challenge yet due to the high volume of applications for the role of operators.

Councillor Peter Curtis asked whether there were any communication barriers due to the large number of Polish residents in the area and queried whether officers were also trained in sign language. Superintendent Goss explained that some officers were fluent in languages other than English and Welsh and 'Language Line' which was a national facility for translation of other languages was also available to the Police. He added that some officers were also trained in sign language.

In response to a query from Councillor Andy Dunbobbin about the increased dominance of social media, Superintendent Goss explained that all operators were trained in the use of social media, emails, webchat as well as answering 999 and 101 calls.

Councillor Nigel Steele-Mortimer sought clarification on whether he had appropriately used the 999 service to report an incident and in response Superintendent Goss said that if life was at risk or a crime was in action then 999 was appropriate but if not, then the 101 service was the most appropriate number.

In referring to an experience of when she had needed to use the 101 service and the length of time it had taken for the call to be answered, Councillor Marion Bateman sought assurance that the amount of time taken to answer 101 calls had reduced in the past two years. Superintendent Goss advised that the average time taken to answer 101 calls was seven seconds from when the call went through to the Control Room, which was after the 53 seconds for the bilingual message. In response to a query from Councillor Lloyd on whether different operators dealt with 101 and 999 calls, Superintendent Goss explained that both types of calls were answered by operators but the telephony system ensured that there was always one operator available to answer a 999 call. He added that the current system was approximately five years old and that a new system was to be introduced early in 2017.

The Chairman thanked Superintendent Goss for his presentation and the offer of a visit to the Communications Centre.

**RESOLVED:**

That the presentation by Superintendent Alex Goss of North Wales Police be received and Superintendent Goss thanked for his attendance and contribution.

**90. USE OF CONSULTANTS**

The Chief Executive introduced a report to explain Council practice in the use of consultants and how value for money was obtained from commissioned consultancies.

The Chief Executive asked that the Committee review his report objectively and keep the issues in proportion. The report from the Audit Committee on 27 January 2016 was attached as an appendix; at that meeting it had been agreed that an update report on controls would be submitted to the July Audit Committee meeting. He commented on the use of consultants in the public sector for areas where specific expertise was not already available within those organisations, and gave details of the definition of a consultant compared with an agency worker or interim manager.

It was acknowledged that the issue of financial coding had been a concern and it was difficult to correctly ascertain the cost of properly defined consultants for previous years. The report to Audit Committee had reported a cumulative expenditure of £2.831m coded as consultancy spend in 2014/15. The report had also identified figures shown as consultancy under the procurement classification codes for business and management consultancy and project management services to only be £0.433m for 2014/15; the four known consultants over £25,000 contract value were detailed. The table in the report showed a current total of £431,906 for consultancy costs for 2015/16 along with details of the projects that the consultants were working on. The Chief Executive explained that all of these appointments were supported by written business cases.

The previously used definitions of consultants had been too general in their wording, leading to a range of expenditure, which should not have been recognised as consultancy, being allocated to the consultancy codes in the general ledger. A list of expenditure that had been incorrectly coded to consultancy codes in recent years was reported in paragraph 2.02. New controls had been put in place where Chief Officers could approve agency spend up to £25,000 but approval of a business case for any new consultancy work of a value of £25,000 or more would need to be given by the Chief Executive.

The Corporate Finance Manager had been invited to make a formal statement on cost control in his capacity as Section 151 Officer and this was reported in paragraph 2.04.

The two types of consultancy used were 'fee based' or 'risk and reward' and details of 'live' consultancies within Streetscene & Transportation, Social Services and Corporate Services were reported. The Chief Executive explained that consultancies were funded from one of three areas which were (i) core budget, (ii) through 'invest to save' options or (iii) through Welsh Government/other grant funding. There was strong evidence that skills and knowledge had been transferred from the consultants to the Council to make the organisation more self-sufficient for the future and examples of this were detailed in the report. The Council was not too over-reliant on consultants. He explained that whether 'value for money' was obtained from a consultant was a judgement best made by weighing up whether a competitive price for the work was obtained, whether the project was completed on time and budget and whether the Council had achieved its organisational objectives by engaging the consultant.

It had been difficult to obtain reliable comparable data from other councils but four had been able to supply a total figure for all expenditure coded as consultancy and this was reported with three having a higher spend than Flintshire. He commented on the 'risk and reward' basis that some councils used

to engage consultants and gave details of the equivalent level of employee that could be employed for a £50,000 or £25,000 consultancy cost. The Chief Executive advised the Committee that the Technical Finance Manager and her team were undertaking a significant amount of work to ensure the coding was correct and therefore there would not be any coding issues for 2016/17 onwards.

The Chief Officer (Governance) advised that he and the Chief Executive were working closely with the Internal Audit Manager to ensure appropriate systems were followed. He explained that the focus for this Committee was the issue of 'value for money' whilst Audit Committee would consider the process and whether it was working or not.

Councillor Aaron Shotton welcomed the opportunity for the report to be debated at this Committee and reiterated the earlier comments that Audit Committee would receive an update report in July 2016. He referred to the significant concern at the costs of consultants (£1.6m for 146 consultants) that had been reported to the Audit Committee in 2011 and indicated that the accuracy of the data had been questioned at that time. The current amount of 14 consultants at a cost of £0.433m was significantly lower than in 2010/11 but Councillor Shotton reminded the Committee that the two figures could not be compared as the £1.6m was for a six month period and the £0.433m was for a ten month period. He referred to recent reductions in senior and second tier management posts and felt that it was acceptable that the Council would need to seek expert advice for some of the significant projects it was undertaking such as the Strategic Housing and Regeneration Programme (SHARP). However, he added that it was important to ensure that the knowledge of the consultants was passed on to the staff in post. He said that there had been a reduction in consultancy costs but more work was required such as addressing the issue of incorrect coding.

The Chairman sought clarification on the definition of consultants and felt that 'other goods and services' for areas, which had been incorrectly coded as consultancy work, which could include legal fees contradicted the comment in paragraph 1.04 which indicated that consultants would normally be employed to give legal advice. He also referred to information that was provided as additional information to the statement of accounts following a request from him on posts paid more than £60,000 per year whether these were Council employees or posts covered by interim/temporary/contract arrangements and suggested that the figure of £0.490m provided for 14/15 was different to the £0.433m figure provided to Audit and this Committee. The Chief Executive advised that paragraph 1.04 related specifically to legal advice on the formation of Alternative Delivery Models. The difference between the spends correctly and incorrectly coded was whether they were time limited or routine work and the Chief Executive added that the list in 2.02 was not exhaustive. The Chief Officer (Governance) explained that an area of concern was because the organisation employed a number of senior officers to provide advice and information that officers needed and that consultants should therefore not be employed to duplicate advice that could be provided by the senior officers. The Chief Executive gave a more detailed explanation of the definition of consultants as reported in paragraph 2.03 and added that in future the costs of consultants would be correctly coded.

Councillor Nigel Steele-Mortimer referred to the difference between the figure of £2.8m originally reported for consultancy spend for 2014/15 and the amount of £0.433m now reported. He expressed his concern at how the balance of £2.398m had been spent and referred to areas which he felt should be reported as consultants such as work on the Local Development Plan (LDP) or the seeking of Counsel's opinion on legal issues and suggested that a breakdown should be provided. Councillor Richard Jones proposed the request for details of how the £2.398m had been spent and this was duly seconded. The Finance Manager advised that a list could be provided and the Chief Executive said that this would be carried out as quickly as possible. He advised that he would make enquires about the comments on the LDP but explained that each of the consultants costs for charges over £0.025m each had a business case which had been approved and added that the practice would continue in the future.

Councillor Robin Guest raised concern about the 'premium' costs for the use of agency workers to cover gaps that should be filled by permanent employees. He welcomed the information on the definitions provided, the areas that had incorrectly been coded to the area of consultancy in recent years and also the request for a breakdown of the remaining £2.398m. He also sought assurance that future coding would be correct and expressed his concern at the comments of Councillor Shotton when referring to the consultancy costs from 2011 which he felt could not be compared to the current figures. In response, the Chief Executive spoke of the ongoing work to ensure the codes for 2015/16 were correct and of the work that was being carried out to ensure that officers were aware of the appropriate area to code particular areas of spend to.

Councillor Jones sought clarification on whether interim managers were engaged through an agency and suggested that the definition provided may be incorrect. The Chief Executive explained that there were some areas where the MATRIX system was not the best system to use to engage the level of assistance required and advised that interim and agency staff could be engaged through the same route. He added that there was not a problem with the coding of agency workers and stated that this was a separate area of spend and was not coded as consultancy work. In response to a further query from Councillor Jones, the Chief Executive said that both agency workers and interim managers were temporary by definition. Councillor Jones referred to the level of consultancy spend for 2013/14 which was £2.1m and the costs for 14/15 of £2.8m and queried why there had been an increase. The Chief Executive reiterated his earlier comments about incorrect coding in previous years and said that it was difficult to compare the two years because of coding issues.

The Chairman referred to the information on agency workers referred to as part of the item on Workforce Information which was to be considered later in this meeting. The Chief Executive advised that further information could be provided when the particular item was discussed but said that the definition of agency workers had been included because of the confusion that the Council had a number of consultants working in senior management roles; he explained that there were none currently

Councillor Jones referred to the importance of ensuring that the use of contractors was value for money.

In response to a question from Councillor Marion Bateman about whether areas such as those shown as part of the £2.398m expenditure for types of fees, goods and services for 2014/15 would be individually coded in the future to allow the spends to be monitored, the Chief Executive confirmed that this would be the case.

Councillor Shotton referred to the comments of Councillor Guest about his reference to information on consultancy figures to the Audit Committee in 2011 and added that it has since been identified that the coding issues had been a problem in previous years. The Chief Executive said that it was extremely likely that the coding problems would have been repeated in previous years and therefore the figures referred to for 2011 had been artificially inflated. He provided assurance that the costs for 2015/16 would be correctly coded because of the work that was being carried out and that this would continue for future years.

Following earlier comments from Councillor Jones about the importance of ensuring 'value for money' and the request for a breakdown of the £2.398m, it was agreed that this could be submitted to the June meeting of the Committee. The Chief Executive also suggested that a report on the assurance of Value for Money be considered by the Committee on an annual basis.

**RESOLVED:**

- (a) That the Committee is assured by the explanations given over the purpose of using consultants, the control of total cost and how value for money is obtained from current Council commissioning and contract management practice;
- (b) That the officers provide the Committee with details of the expenditure between the £2.831m coded as consultancy spend in 2014/15 and the £0.433m figure from the procurement classification; and
- (c) That an analysis of the expenditure on consultants, to provide assurance on Value for Money, be submitted to the June meeting of the Committee and thereafter on an annual basis.

**91. REVENUE BUDGET MONITORING (MONTH 9) AND CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING (MONTH 9)**

Revenue Budget Monitoring (Month 9)

The Finance Manager – Corporate Accounting and Systems introduced a report to provide Members with the Revenue Budget Monitoring 2015/16 (Month 9) report for the Council Fund and Housing Revenue Account (HRA) which was to be submitted to Cabinet on 22 March 2016.

For the Council Fund, the projected net in-year expenditure was forecast to be £1.242m lower than budget which was a positive movement of £0.499m from Month 8. Appendix 1 detailed the movements from Month 8 which included an additional surplus from the Council Tax Collection Fund, an underspend on the Council Tax Reduction Scheme provision, additional funding from the



Department of Work and Pensions and a reduction in external audit fees and bank charges.

Appendix 3 provided details of the latest position of the programme of efficiencies and it was projected that £10.744m (83%) would be achieved resulting in a net underachievement of £2.130m. The Finance Manager had noted the earlier comments on efficiencies which had not been achieved but had been replaced. Taking into account the current underspend at Month 9 and previous allocations, the balance on the contingency reserve at 31 March 2016 was projected to be £4.878m. A summary of Earmarked Reserves as at 1 April 2015 was reported and the Month 9 estimate for the amount of reserves at 31 March 2016 was £17,261,681.

The Month 9 Monitoring Report for the HRA was projecting in-year expenditure to be £0.082m lower than budget and a projected closing balance as at 31 March 2016 of £1.319m which was 4.25% of total expenditure.

Councillor Richard Jones referred to the movement from Education & Youth to schools and sought an explanation of why this has occurred. He also felt that the 83% figure for the achievement of efficiencies was incorrect as the difference between the amount achieved from Month 8 to Month 9 was £0.170m which was a difference of 1.3%. In response, the Finance Manager explained that the movement from the Education & Youth budget related to the Additional Learning Needs delegated funding being moved from the Inclusion Service to Schools. On the issue of efficiencies, she agreed to check the figures.

#### Capital Programme Monitoring (Month 9)

The Technical Finance Manager introduced the report to provide Members with the Capital Programme Monitoring 2015/16 (Month 9) report which was also to be submitted to Cabinet on 22 March 2016.

Table 1 set out how the programme had changed during 2015/16 and appendix A provided detailed cumulative information relating to each portfolio. There had been a net decrease of £2.2885m in the programme with the main decrease being a reduction in the budgeted level for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Schools programme. Table 2 provided the summary of the changes and the overall decrease had been offset by grants and contributions which were reported in paragraphs 1.07 to 1.10. Table 3 showed the current projected outturn of £140.826 which was an overall underspend of £3.513m (£2.013m for Council Fund and £1.500m for the HRA). A total rollover to 2016/17 of £1.500m was being requested and two pressures totalling £0.088m had been identified within the Transport & Streetscene portfolio which had been offset against additional savings identified in the Flintshire Connects budget. The surplus from 2014/15 was £1.314m but due to in-year increases and decreases, the funding available for capital schemes was £2.986m as reported in table 6.

Councillor Richard Jones referred to the increase in Welsh Government Grant for Vibrant & Viable Places of £1.357m and queried whether this related to the Deeside cycle route. The Chief Executive suggested that the funding was for a number of schemes for the designated area and he agreed that a list of the projects could be circulated to Members.

In response to a comment from Councillor Robin Guest about requiring more details on the need for rollover in funding, the Finance Manager confirmed that additional information was included in appendix B. She asked Councillor Guest to let her know if there were any details that he felt were not included.

**RESOLVED:**

- (a) That the Revenue Budget Monitoring 2015/16 (Month 9) report be received;
- (b) That the Capital Programme Monitoring 2015/16 (Month 9) report be received; and
- (b) That the Committee confirms that it is not making any formal recommendations to Cabinet on this occasion.

**92. QUARTER 3 IMPROVEMENT PLAN MONITORING REPORT**

The Member Engagement Manager introduced a report to present the monitoring of progress for the third quarter of 2015/16 focussing on the areas of underperformance relevant to the Committee.

The Chief Executive advised that the efficiency targets were reported monthly and any variations would be absorbed into the year-end information. The risk relating to the scale of the financial challenge was recognised as a national risk due to the uncertainty about future national financial planning.

On the issue of alternative delivery models through community asset transfers, there had been 106 expressions of interest for 208 assets and if they were all achieved, then 49% of the assets would be transferred. A report which was to be considered by Cabinet on 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2016 included a list of community assets with approved business plans. The Chief Executive commented on the official handover of the Gwernymyndd Village Centre and the recent opening of the Mancot Community Library.

**RESOLVED:**

That having considered the Quarter 3 Improvement Plan Monitoring Report, the Committee is assured of progress and performance.

**93. WORKFORCE INFORMATION REPORT - QUARTER 3 2015/16**

The Interim Human Resources and Organisational Change Manager introduced the report to provide Members with an update for the third quarter for 2015/16 for the following:-

- Headcount and Full Time Equivalent (FTE)
- Organisational Age Profile
- Employee Turnover and Stability (including Redundancies and Early Retirements)
- Attendance (Including 100% Appraisal)

- Performance Appraisals and Development
- Resource Management (Agency Workers)
- Equality and Diversity

The headcount for the Council continued to decrease and the cumulative absence FTE days lost for quarter three was 7.34 which was a positive movement. The projected outturn for 2015/16 was currently 9.78 which was slightly above the annual target for the year of 9.60 days. The outturn figure had reduced when compared with 2014/15 but there was a need to continue to monitor the situation. On the issue of agency workers, the Interim Manager explained that the majority of spend was within Streetscene & Transportation which had 75 front line vacancies and Social Services which had used a number of agency workers to cover vacancies and to supplement some of the core workforce allocated to special/ad hoc projects.

Councillor Robin Guest sought clarification on whether the issues relating to appraisals had been resolved. The Interim Manager indicated that there had been a positive response to the completion of appraisals but difficulties in capturing the information within the software were still continuing. Both the Chief Executive and the Interim Manager shared the frustrations expressed by Members and the Interim Manager added that being able to capture the data would assist with workforce planning.

In response to a question from Councillor Arnold Woolley, the Interim Manager advised that the Council's induction programme had recently been updated to include those employees who had changed jobs within the Authority. It was expected that this would be undertaken even though the information was not being captured. Councillor Woolley expressed his concern that the expectation was not being delivered and that there were no controls in place to monitor this. The Chief Executive referred to the transition arrangements that were in place and the Interim Manager explained that both the employee and the manager had to sign to indicate that the induction had taken place. The Chairman asked whether there were any employees who had not had an appraisal for longer than a year. The Interim Manager responded that there was a system in place to monitor when appraisals took place which would include the date of the appraisal and any follow up action or competency assessment that had been carried out.

The Chairman sought clarification on the 77 agency placements that had exceeded the 12 week Agency Worker Regulations threshold. The Interim Manager explained that the regulations gave agency workers additional protection after 12 weeks on areas such as pay and holidays.

Councillor Arnold Woolley raised concern at the number of agency workers who had been in place for more than 12 weeks and queried why they were not employed by the Council to fill the vacancies that they were covering. He also asked about costs for the Council in addition to employment costs and felt that further explanations were required. In response, the Interim Manager advised that length of time shown was for the placement rather than for the time that an individual had been in the post. She explained that the longer placements were in Streetscene where a number of vacancies were being held and added that in this area, agency workers would be paid less than the general operatives

in Streetscene because of the nature of the work that they undertook. The Chief Executive explained that a number of vacancies were being held pending the completion of a number of ongoing service reviews. Councillor Woolley expressed significant concern at the way some of the information was reported as he felt that it could be misinterpreted. The Interim Manager agreed to look at the issue for the next Workforce Information report. The Chief Executive also indicated that a report on the use of Agency Workers could be prepared for submission to a future meeting.

**RESOLVED:**

That having considered the Quarter 3 Workforce Information report, the Committee is assured of progress.

**94. FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME**

The Member Engagement Manager introduced the report to consider the Forward Work Programme for the Committee.

He detailed the items for consideration at the 14 April and 12 May 2016 meetings and indicated that the report on the Use of Agency Workers could be included on the 12 May 2016 agenda. Presentations on BT and the Flintshire Community Endowment Fund were due to be submitted to the April and May meetings respectively.

The Chief Executive explained that the newly appointed Emergency Planning Manager would be in attendance at the April meeting.

**RESOLVED:**

- (a) That the Forward Work Programme, as submitted with the verbal amendments, be approved; and
- (b) That the Member Engagement Manager, in consultation with the Chair, Vice-Chair and officers, be authorised to vary the work programme between meetings.

**95. MEMBERS OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC IN ATTENDANCE**

There were no members of the public and one member of the press in attendance.

(The meeting started at 10.00 am and ended at 12.51 pm)

.....

**Chairman**