The Planning Inspectorate
Yr Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

FINAL
(22 March 2018)

Minutes

Title of meeting	Planning Inspectorate Board Meeting
Date	25 January 2018 **Time** 9:30
Venue	Temple Quay House, Bristol
Chair	Jayne Erskine (**JE**) – Chair and Non-Executive Director
Present	David Holt (**DH**) – Non-Executive Director
	Susan Johnson (**SJ**) – Non-Executive Director
	Sarah Richards (**SR**) – Chief Executive
	Tony Thickett (**TT**) – Director, Wales
	Navees Rahman (**NR**) – Director of Corporate Services
	Steve Hudson (**SH**) – Director of Corporate Services
	Simon Gallagher (**SG**) – Director of Planning, DCLG
In attendance	Caroline Bee (**CB**) – Head of Finance, Commercial & Performance (Items 5, 6 & 7)
	Tim Guy (**TG**) – Director, Transformation (item 8)
	Rachael Pipkin (**RP**) – Head of Assurance, Benefits & Change (item 8)
Board Secretary	Jo Esson (**JEs**)
Apologies	Ben Linscott (**BL**), Pauleen Lane (**PL**), Natasha Perrett (**NP**)
Observer	None

Part One: Schedule of Actions – 18 July 2017

	Owner	Action	Para	Timeframe
9	Tim Guy	Update the Board at the November meeting on progress on benefits realisation and the more detailed business case following outputs of the IWPS discovery phase.	6.13	**Complete -** Item 8 on the January Board agenda.

Part One: Schedule of Actions – 14 September 2017

	Owner	Action	Para	Timeframe
3	Simon Gallagher	Check with DCLG colleagues if the Minister needs to be notified of the changes to 1 and 2 day inquiry process.	2.8	**Complete**
8	Steve Hudson	Ensure that a clear transfer of benefits into budgets was enacted for the 2018/19 plan.	5.11	**Complete -** Item 7 on the March Board agenda.

Part One: Schedule of Actions – 23 November 2017

	Owner	Action	Para	Timeframe
3	Steve Hudson	Review unit costs and segmental reporting as part of the year end process	2.13	**July 2018**

	Owner	Action	Para	Timeframe
5	Steve Hudson	As part of the update on budget setting for 2018/19 to ensure that the 167 day assumption is reviewed and that the budget setting process considers low, medium and high workload scenarios.	6.2	**Complete -** Item 7 on the March Board agenda.
6	Tim Guy	January Board a highlight of costs and benefits and an indication of when we will see balance of milestones. Report results of mini reset of SOC include a little bit more about IWPS expanded model and what that does to our costs and benefits.	7.17	**Complete -** Item 8 on the January Board agenda.
7	Presented at People Committee by Tim Guy (Sarah Richards/ Steve Hudson)	February People Committee – a deep dive on capability and capacity issue with expansion to include fact that we have business as usual to maintain and identified need to give people some broader skills as well as issues around transformation pack.	7.25	**Complete –** Item 6 on the February People Cttee agenda.

Part One: Schedule of Actions – 25 January 2018

	Owner	Action	Para	Timeframe
1	Sean Canavan	Arrange for Conflict of Interest/disclosure information to be added to CQPSC dashboard.	2.5	**By April CQPSC meeting**
2	Simon Gallagher	Identify suitable MHCLG representatives to attend CQPSC and People Committees.	2.5 & 2.7	**TBC**
3	Teresa Stanley	Identify replacement for Ernie Trigg as People Committee Minutes secretary.	2.7	**Complete**
4	Natasha Perrett	Add annual report from the Health and Safety Committee to the People Committee forward planner.	2.7	**Complete –** added to People Cttee forward planner.
5	Jo Esson	Update, circulate and publish the final Terms of Reference.	2.8	Awaiting confirmation from SG (action 2).
6	Natasha Perrett	Agree timing of next review of effectiveness with new Board Chair.	2.9	When appointed
7	Natasha Perrett	Circulate draft minutes for CQPSC in November, and ARAC and People in December.	3.0	**Complete**
8	Natasha Perrett	Add Diversity and Inclusion to Board Forward Planner in June.	4.7	**Complete -** added to Board forward planner.
9	Natasha Perrett	Add a deep dive into Risk S-13a (physical protests/personal attacks) to ARAC Forward Planner.	5.6	**Complete -** added to ARAC forward planner.
10	Mark Southgate	Provide report on mitigations etc for S-13a to Board members before the next Board meeting.	5.6	**By Mid-March**

	Owner	Action	Para	Timeframe
11	David Holt	Consider in the light of MS' update for Action 10 whether the ARAC deep dive would be required.	5.6	**End March**
12	Jo Esson	Ensure risk data provided for dashboard includes Post mitigation score.	5.7	**Complete**
13	Steve Hudson	Establish where there is variation in the time to validate for different procedures.	5.10	**Complete –** the 48 hours quoted in the dashboard refers to Written Reps and Hearings only. Inquiries follow a different process, this is made clear on our website.
14	Sarah Richards	Consider how the current year performance should be reported in Annual Report.	6.7	**Complete**
15	Sarah Richards	Circulate draft targets submission to Board members for comment.	6.8	**End March**
16	Natasha Perrett	Circulate the Business Planning presentation to Board members.	7.0	**Complete –** circulated 26 February.
17	Jayne Erskine, David Holt, Susan Johnson	Advise TG of any areas they would like specific briefing on at the engagement session in February.	8.7	**Complete**
18	Sarah Richards	Discuss with SG what further mitigations if any should be put in place for Risk S-05, or whether the risk has reached the point that the executive should 'accept' it.	9.2	**End March**
19	Jo Esson	Close Risk S-16 and for the executive to monitor against any changes in circumstances.	9.3	**Complete**
20	Steve Hudson	Ensure a paper comes to Board so they are sighted on the risk associated with aspects of GDPR that will not be ready for May.	9.5	**Complete -** Item 6 on the March Board agenda.
21	Strategic Support	Reschedule April and May meetings	10.2	**Complete**

Minutes

1.0	**Welcome and Declaration of Interests** 1.1 The Chair welcomed Steve Hudson to his first meeting. He would be covering the Director of Corporate Services post during Navees Rahman's parental leave. 1.2 Apologies had been received for Ben Linscott, Pauleen Lane and Natasha Perrett. 1.3 The Chair called for Declarations of Interest (DoI), of which there were none.

2.0	**Minutes of 23 November Board meeting – Part one**
	2.1 There were no comments on the text of the Minutes.
	Actions
	2.2 Action 11 (pg 2) – JE asked if the communication with customers had happened, and what the reaction had been. SR confirmed that it had been done and that the information would be updated monthly, but she was not aware of any specific reaction.
	2.3 Actions 3, 5 & 7 (pg 3) – To be changed from NR to SH.
	Agreed: 2a) Subject to the amendment above, the Minutes were agreed as a true record.
	Draft Board and Committee Terms of Reference
	2.4 The following additional changes to Planning Inspectorate Board Terms of Reference (draft v4 Nov 2017) were agreed: • Under 'Responsibilities': Insert the date of the current approved Framework Document in brackets (October 2012, amended July 2014). • Under 'Responsibilities': Add in reference to 'risk appetite' in the relevant bullet. • Under 'Responsibilities': The inclusion of responsibility for reviewing Health and Safety arrangements twice a year was queried, and Board agreed to move this to the People Committee as a review of an annual report from the Health and Safety Committee. • Under 'Membership': Change reference from 'Members unable to attend…' to 'Members of the Executive unable to attend…'.
	2.5 The following additional changes to the Customer, Quality and Professional Standards Committee Terms of Reference (draft v5 Nov 2017) were agreed: • Under 'Responsibilities': Reference to the Conflict of Interest Policy in the final bullet was queried. To support this responsibility, Sean Canavan to arrange for relevant data to be added to the Committee Dashboard. • Under 'Membership': SG to identify a suitable MHCLG representative to attend the Committee. • Under 'Membership': To ensure consistency, change reference from 'Any lead staff members unable to attend…' to 'Members of the Executive unable to attend…'.
	2.6 The following additional changes to Audit and Risk Assurance Committee Terms of Reference (draft v3 Nov 2017) were agreed: • Under 'Membership': Add Steve Hudson's name. • Under 'Membership': To ensure consistency, change reference from 'Any lead staff members unable to attend…' to 'Members of the

Executive unable to attend…'.

2.7 The following additional changes to People Committee Terms of Reference (draft v2 Nov 2017) were agreed:
- Under 'Responsibilities': Add reference to reviewing an annual report from the Health and Safety Committee.
- Under 'Membership': SG to identify a suitable MHCLG representative to attend the Committee.
- Under 'Membership': Identify replacement for Ernie Trigg.
- Under 'Membership': To ensure consistency, change reference from 'Any lead staff members unable to attend…' to 'Members of the Executive unable to attend…'.

2.8 All the Terms of Reference were agreed subject to the changes above.

2.9 It was also noted that the timing of the next review of effectiveness would be discussed with the new Chair once appointed.

Agreed:
2b) Sean Canavan (SC) to arrange for Conflict of Interest/disclosure information to be added to CQPSC dashboard.
2c) SG to identify a representative of MHCLG to add to those attending the CQPSC and People Committees.
2d) TS to identify replacement for Ernie Trigg as People Committee Minutes secretary.
2e) NP to add annual report from the Health and Safety Committee to the People Committee forward planner.
2f) JEs to update, circulate and publish the final Terms of Reference.
2g) NP to agree timing of next review of effectiveness with new Board Chair.

3.0	**Committee update**

a) Customer Quality and Professional Standards Committee (CQPSC) – 25 January

3.1 SJ reported that the Committee in the morning had:
- A deep dive on the Welsh Language Risk including assurance from TT on measures to ensure we are compliant with the Welsh Language Standards. The team are waiting on a meeting with the Commission to discuss the Standards, specifically timescales for turn-around on NSIP documentation. The Committee were assured that the risk is being managed well. The team are reviewing the scores.
- Discussed the Customer Workstream action plan, with the Business Case being submitted shortly. There had been a number of stakeholder events around the country over the last 9 months or so, with good information coming from those in terms of possible quick wins, and improvements we can deliver. How this is resourced is one of the key challenges.
- Observed the Operational Delivery Transformation (ODT) 'Show and Tell' – the kick off for the extended Inspector Workforce Planning and

	Scheduling (IWPS) project. • Reviewed the Dashboard (also on Board Agenda) and were pleased with some of the very positive feedback from local plans customers. **Agreed:** 3a) JEs to circulate draft minutes for the Committee meetings held since the previous Board in November. • CQPSC in November • ARAC and People in December
4.0	**CEO report** Note: The update on the People Survey will be given at the next People Committee. 4.1 DH asked if there was a difference in approach to this round of recruitment which accounted for the change identified. SR confirmed that it was not different but we have now reviewed how we approach recruitment to maximise the opportunity. We have gone to the market again on the revised basis. Firstly, testing of candidates had been done on the basis that they needed to come in as 'fully formed' Inspectors, which they do not – the process is to seek those with the right potential. Secondly, seeking candidates from a wider pool of disciplines in a way not done before. Work is being done by Sean Canavan (SC) as part of workforce planning looking across the sector at where Inspectors will be coming from in the next 5 years. As we look for 4-5 years' experience, those people will already be employed in a relevant job now. This will be the evidence base that the organisation can use to decide whether to fundamentally change the way we recruit, the skills we look for and so on. Early indications are that there is a real problem. 4.2 TT confirmed that there had been a good response to the advert (more than 120), sifted down to around 60 for the Assessment Centre. 21 of those could have been appointed. We may be fishing in a diminishing pool as we have gone out to the market quite a lot in the last two years. 4.3 SR stated that we are testing some of our assumptions by going to market again almost immediately. One of the areas to consider is part time working. We currently only offer part time as blocks of time rather than days per week. Although there would be some problems to overcome, it would be possible to change this, which could currently be putting some people off, particularly those with caring responsibilities who need predictability. Given this is a home working job, which can be flexible, we could be excluding candidates unnecessarily. This needs to be part of our push to be a more inclusive organisation. 4.4 SJ asked what the gender balance is for Inspectors. SR replied that 68% of current Inspectors are male and 32% female. In terms of recruitment, the proportions vary over the last 2 years from 50/50 for the last 2 campaigns, to the most recently completed one which was more male dominated. SR stated that we need to be clear about what the gender split is within the

sections of the market we use – eg is it different for planners, or lawyers, or architects, or surveyors? Our recruitment is impacted by this national position and then by how attractive the private sector is in these professions. This is why 95% of our recruits come from local government.

MHCLG update

4.5 SG reported on:
- the Department's name change which took place since the last Board meeting. This has not signalled a change of direction but has re-emphasised the
- drive for more housing. The Inspectorate's challenge is the need to focus both on the volume business with little impact on supply, and on major casework (inquiries) where the volumes are small but the impact on delivery is far greater;
- the significant political interest in the Inspectorate and in appeal handling times, particularly in relation to large cases involving housing; and
- that Melanie Dawes, as CS Gender Champion, is keen to make progress on the issues around the Inspectorate's gender pay gap.

4.6 DH queried whether the gender pay gap issue was related to the average pay, rather than pay for job families. SR confirmed that it was the average of all male salaries vs the average of all female salaries – a very raw measure. Our results are skewed by the Inspector workforce, and are difficult to address structurally as they are also impacted by the same gender structure of the industry/professions referred to in the discussion on recruitment. SR confirmed that further work is going to be done in terms of the office-based workforce, particularly in the lower grades. SJ advised that a greater degree of granularity in reporting can help identify patterns that might not otherwise be obvious. The Equality and Human Rights Commission is looking at a comparison in those sectors that could be seen as gender stereotyped such as construction, looking at the difference between one firm and another – some organisations appear to be succeeding whilst others are not. We should be looking at this and considering what they are doing that others aren't.

4.7 JE queried whether this matter should be added to the forward planner. SR identified that this forms part of our Diversity and Inclusion work which we will have to report on, so bringing that back to Board would be helpful.

4.8 SJ asked if (a) MHCLG were still going to be producing a Social Housing paper, and (b) when the work on gap time between permissions and building (Chaired by Oliver Letwin) would be complete. SG confirmed that (a) was not impacted by the recent changes. Oliver Letwin is due to report for the Autumn budget, with an interim report in the spring. His work is focussing on large sites with permissions, and is most of the way through a tour of 20 or so such sites across the country as part of evidence gathering.

Agreed:
4a) NP to add Diversity and Inclusion to Board Forward Planner in June.

5.0	**Monitoring Performance – Dashboard**
	5.1 JE noted that the Board had both the updated November dashboard, and the one for December.
	5.2 DH reflected on the discussion at CQPSC on the distinction between the data in the final column of the first table on page 2 showing a prediction for future performance, and the data in the preceding 3 columns showing historical information, and how to best use that information to inform future discussion and NED challenge at Board, concentrating on possible levers to impact on the predictions and resourcing choices that need to be made.
	5.3 NR noted that this information is relatively immature, having been introduced only 3-4 months ago. The team will need to test in future how accurate the forecast turns out to be.
	5.4 SG queried how the forecast is produced. SR confirmed it was based on casework in the pipeline, together with known information about resource availability. CB added that the team were seeking to build in forward looking intelligence, particularly around income generating work, and (limited) elements of seasonality. SG suggested recording and sharing the methodology used once the intelligence-based version is ready.
	5.5 DH queried the current position on Strategic Risk S-13a (pg 3) on physical protests/personal attacks, where our appetite is averse, but it remains at Amber, and sought reassurance about trajectory for this important matter. TT confirmed that he is conducting a review of the relevant Policy on handling such cases, following issues raised by Inspectors.
	5.6 NR confirmed that the post-mitigation score is 8 which would be at target. It was agreed that the item should be added as a Deep dive to the ARAC Forward Planner. Mark Southgate (MS) as risk owner would provide an update for Board members on the mitigating actions and timeframes to get to Green, and DH would consider in the light of that update whether the ARAC item would be required.
	5.7 JEs suggested that the Risk entries on the Dashboard show the post mitigation scores alongside the current score.
	5.8 SJ queried whether there was anything more that could be done to realise the savings for the space vacated in TQH. NR confirmed that the Inspectorate was doing what it could, by raising the matter regularly with Cabinet Office and the sponsorship team in MHCLG. The drivers to reduce our usage of the building remain – savings to the public purse, reducing consumption and emissions, and changing the way we work. SG confirmed that he wasn't aware of anything more that could be done.
	5.9 SJ raised her concern about how this would be taken at year end. NR confirmed that we were likely to be able to say we balanced the budget despite not having made a cashable saving.

	5.10 SG referred to the positive news in the pg 1 narrative on time to validate, but queried whether these were all simple written reps cases with the more complicated cases taking longer. SR confirmed that this should not the case as the process was the same for all cases, but we would investigate. **Agreed:** 5a) NP to add Deep dive physical protests/personal attacks to ARAC Forward Planner. 5b) MS to provide report on mitigations etc for S-13a to Board members before the next Board meeting. 5c) DH to consider and advise of any update to ARAC Forward Planner. 5d) JEs to arrange for Post mitigation score to be shown alongside latest score on the Dashboard. 5e) SH to establish where there is variation in the time to validate for different procedures.
6.0	**Shadow reporting and measures timetable** 6.1 SR confirmed that points previously raised (listed in Appendix 2 of the paper) had been addressed. SR is aware that it does not contain numbers to aim at yet, and these need to be added before submission to Ministers. 6.2 Currently average time to decide all planning and HAS written reps casework has been almost static, at between 18 and 19 weeks, for 14 months. This is worth celebrating given the volatility of the average before that, which was distorted by looking at 80%. So SR recommended that this figure be proposed for next year, particularly given that there are so few levers to change that performance, namely - inspector resource; - efficiency; - cost shift; - custom and practice; and - statutory framework. The ambition will be different following the changes arising from the ODT project, but we are not there yet. 6.3 SJ referred to the mention of party behaviour in the inquiries submission to the Secretary of State. SR confirmed that this was also an issue for the volume casework but in relation to our tolerance for accepting incomplete or invalid submission of appeals – this was a 'pain point' that had been discovered during the ODT work to date. This underlines the importance of clear guidance of what is and is not acceptable. 6.4 DH asked about the tension between Ministerial targets and customer experience. Does this take us closer to that? SR confirmed that customers tell us they want three things – certainty of timescale, timeliness ie done in what appears to them to be a reasonable time, and some want speed, but not many. For inquiries, we are in a position restricted by the custom and practice of agreeing of dates between the parties. TT confirmed that the

parties are concerned about any proposed change as it is seen to impact on their ability to have the advocate or witness of their choice. The other dimension is that local authorities provide the venue for inquiries. SJ confirmed that straw polls at the stakeholder events have been overwhelmingly in favour of the Inspectorate setting the date, as then neither main party can play games, use delaying tactics etc. SJ's experience of similar inspectors/regulators is that they determine the date, and no negotiation. SG it is up to us to put forward to the Minister what it should be, though we need to be aware of the difference between the high volume written reps casework where ODT should drive performance improvement over time and where performance is already pretty consistent, and the lower volume, more complex hearing and inquiry cases which drives different party behaviour. There is also a difference between what the Minister is hearing whenever there are meetings with developers, and the customer insight that the Inspectorate obtains direct. We need to come up with a proposition which strikes the right balance between predictability/certainty and deliverability.

6.6 JE queried the timescale for agreeing targets for 2018/19. SR confirmed that within the Inspectorate, there is a need to operate a regime that drives improvement, so the new (shadow) measures would be used by the executive in any event. We are working out how to best show this to the Board alongside what is being done about both variability and outliers. Separate reporting will be put in place where necessary to report to customers and stakeholders. This work is not yet complete. SG confirmed that the executive would be looking at agreeing new measures with the Minister for use in 2018/19.

6.7 DH raised the issue of the impact on the 2017/18 Annual Report where the change would need to be signalled carefully (eg if we were to not achieve a target this year and drop it next year or vice versa) and where the window for setting that future direction is quite short. SG confirmed that any signals of this sort could only be given once there had been Ministerial approval of the new KPIs.

6.8 JE asked what further input from the Board might be useful. SR confirmed that input to a draft of the submission outside committee would be valued.

6.9 SR confirmed that there was appetite by the executive to progress with actions to reduce timescales for inquiry casework as set out in the submission to the Secretary of State. Further thought is being given to potential unintended consequences.

Agreed:
6a) SR to consider how the current year performance should be reported in Annual Report.
6b) SR to circulate targets submission to Board members for comment.

7.0	**2018/19 Business Planning and Objectives – OFFICIAL part two minutes**
8.0	**Transformation: Infographic and decision points**
	8.1 TG introduced the new infographic and the key decision points, following challenge from DH at the previous meeting. The next opportunity for NEDs to be involved with the programme will be on the afternoon of 22 February when there would be a session in Morph on the Target Operating Model. The engagement session in April is likely to cover Organisational Development and Design (OD&D).
	8.2 Overall programme remains at Amber. The Organisational Agility and Digital business cases were approved by the Investment sub-committee in December – with thanks to SG and colleagues for their support in getting there. Our greatest risk remains capability and capacity but that is for People committee, not Board. A formal issue has been raised in relation to the potential underspend in 2017/18, and we are looking to address this. ODT Discovery has started running for 8 weeks, followed by consideration of the next steps.
	8.3 Page 3 of the Infographic showed the new Plan on a Page, designed to be viewed A1 'poster' size (which can be seen in Morph) with a re-baselined plan. A more rigorous planning process has been put in place. The current position on the overall programme timescale was also shown, with 2017 as the year of business cases and 2018 as the year of delivery (plus the SOC reset and ODT business case in around 3 months and the Customer business case shortly). The SOC reset is likely to be late April/early May given where progress with ODT. The final page showed the current funding position, and assurance actions being tracked through ARAC. The infographic will also be used at Transformation Programme Board, and in any briefing for the Permanent Secretary.
	8.4 RP showed the Board a high level breakdown of deliverables and their relationship to benefits realisation, with RAG rated key milestones.
	8.5 DH queried whether the milestones shown were the right ones. They appear to be programme related rather than specifically related to benefit delivery eg it is tracking a process rather than confirming whether the outcome of that process is delivering as expected. TG clarified that the milestones shown with a circle round them are those that indicate where benefits begin to be realised. Those without circles are key points on the way to delivery, which if they slip would impact on our ability to deliver as planned. SG also emphasised that these milestones also indicated the point at which the Board can be confident about the delivery of the benefits.
	8.6 SJ cited the Organisational Agility milestone on 'Principles' in March. Is the gap between that and the benefits starting in March 2019 where we complete the work on the Target Operating Model / OD&D, resulting in the implementation of the new structure? SR confirmed that this was the anticipated position ie that by the end of 2018, we will know the steps needed

	to realize benefits from March/April. Benefit delivery will have a lead time, in terms of staff reductions. Further detailed planning will take place at the project level. TG confirmed that the level of detail should allow identification of areas for future deep dives or engagement pieces. 8.7 TG asked the NEDs to identify any areas they would like specific briefing on at the session in February. **Agreed:** 8a) NEDs to advise TG of any areas they would like specific briefing on at the engagement session in February.
9.0	**Review of Board and Committee risks** 9.1 NR refreshed the Board on the allocation of risks to Committees and the Board, the outcome of the discussions at ARAC and People Committee, and that the review by CQPSC is outstanding. This is the Board review. 9.2 NR proposed the closure of S-05 relating to the changing policy environment, given that all mitigations are complete and have resulted in a better understanding and links with the Department. DH queried whether we have reached the risk appetite level. NR confirmed that he believed the likelihood could be decreased to reach that level. SJ argued that the iterative conversation with the Minister about targets is a policy area and therefore she was reluctant to agree to the risk being closed at this point. SG stressed that this risk was about unexpected policy changes and there remained a possibility that despite the links put in place, changes could still occur. There is also the customer dimension where there is action we can take to give them greater understanding of the Inspectorate's role in relation to policy-making. This risk will remain open and be monitored. 9.3 NR proposed the closure of S-16 relating to transformation funding, given that the SOC and associated funding have been agreed in principle and the target risk appetite has been reached. The Board agreed. 9.4 NR gave a brief update on GDPR activity which is coming back to ARAC in March. NR reported that the project is on track to deliver the high priority aspects to address the highest risks by May; we have met with MHCLG and Companies House to ensure alignment with the Department and share best practice; our weakness is in relation to the role of our Information Asset Owners; the information audit is on track with nearly all returns in; the central guidance has been issued to support the contracts review and the Commercial team are engaged, and are securing additional resource to do the work; specific training for asset owners, and across the business, is being planned and scheduled. The Project Board agree the status is Amber. 9.5 DH suggested that the Board be sighted on the matters that will not be complete by the implementation date, so this should be put to Board in March.

	Agreed: 9a) SR to discuss with SG what further mitigations if any should be put in place (Risk S-05), or whether the risk has reached the point that the executive should 'accept' it. 9b) JEs to close Risk S-16 and for the executive to monitor against any changes in circumstances. 9c) SH to ensure that a paper comes to Board so they are sighted on the risk associated with those aspects of GDPR that will not be ready for May.
10.0	**Review of meeting, forward planner & AOB** 10.1 JE reviewed the meeting, noting the following in particular: • Review of the Board and Committee Terms of Reference and the need for MHCLG involvement at CQPSC and People Committee. • Item on Diversity and Inclusion to be added to the Forward Planner. • Submission on Targets for 2018/19 to be circulated for comment outside the meeting. • Positive message on budget planning that we are currently close to balancing, though it was noted that the position is still changing. A good debate around associated risks, particularly around workload. • Closure of the original transformation funding risk. 10.2 Due to JE's non-availability in May, the following changes to the Board and Committee schedule were agreed: • NED session planned for 26 April move to 24 May afternoon • People Committee planned for 24 May move to 26 April • Board move from afternoon to morning on 24 May **Agreed:** 10a) Strategic Support to reschedule April and May meetings.

Next meeting: 22 March 2018, 13.00 – 16.00