

Board Meeting Paper	
Jul 15 BM D 3.0	
Purpose of report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Decision ¹ <input type="checkbox"/> Discussion / debate <input type="checkbox"/> Information only ²
Sensitive Information?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
If sensitive, protective marking³	
Date of Meeting	16 July 2015
Agenda Item	D 3
Report Title	Subsidiary bodies
Sponsor	Chair
Author(s)	Jon Carter



1. Summary
<p>Section 3.5 of Passenger Focus's <i>Constitution General</i> requires the Chair to nominate members of subsidiary bodies. These are currently the Audit & Risk Assurance Committee, Statistics Governance Group, Remuneration Committee and Passenger Contact Group. These appointments take effect once endorsed by the Board.</p> <p>The Chair proposes an additional appointment to the Statistics Governance Group. This in turn provokes an update to the Group's terms of reference. The opportunity has been taken to include the tram passenger survey and road surveys within the terms of reference.</p>
2. Recommendations
<p>(a) The Board is asked to endorse the Chair's nomination to have immediate effect as set out below:</p> <p>(b) The Board is asked to endorse the updated terms of reference of the Statistics Governance Group.</p>
3. Further details
Statistics Governance Group
Theo de Pencier
4. Implications – Financial, Risk, Legal, Staffing,
There are no serious implications arising from this report.
5. Background information
<p>The complete <i>Constitution General</i> and <i>terms of reference of subsidiary bodies</i> are available to Connect users in the corporate governance document library of the CEO Home page https://portal.transportfocus.org.uk/teams/CEO/default.aspx and are publicly available.</p>

¹ If a decision is required, or you are asking for the paper to be formally noted, please set this out in section 2

² If for information only, please make clear in section 1 **why** this information is being provided

³ ie **OFFICIAL/SENSITIVE**: plus COMMERCIAL / POLICY / MANAGEMENT-STAFF / PERSONAL PROTECT

6. Equalities screen

Sometimes, an equalities impact assessment (EIA) is required for a given report, proposal or project. To help decide whether an EIA is required, a screen must be undertaken based on the information provided above. The screen seeks answers to four questions which are used to determine impact on the protected characteristics – major, minor or none (default). Please choose the correct impact value and, if **major**, link it to an explanation below.

Gender	Age	Sexual orient'n	Disability	Marital status	Political belief	Religious belief	Racial group
1. What is the likely impact on equality of opportunity for those affected by this policy, for each of the Section 75 equality categories?							
None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
2. Are there opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity for people within the Section 75 equalities categories?							
None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
3. To what extent is the policy likely to impact on good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group?							
					None	None	None
4. Are there opportunities to better promote good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group?							
					None	None	None

Summary of **major** impacts

1	
2	
3	
4	

Conclusion (the board's consideration of this paper may result in a change of conclusion)

Based on the information above, and having regard to the guidance below, the sponsor and author of this paper agree that (✓)	
(a) A full equalities impact assessment is not required	✓
(b) A full equalities impact assessment is not required at this time but the impact values above suggest the matter should be kept under view during the lifetime of the project	
(c) A full equalities impact assessment is required and should be completed during the lifetime of the project	
(d) A full equalities impact assessment is required and should be completed immediately	
Please provide a brief explanation of why you have arrived at this conclusion	
<p><i>The proposal has little no relevance to equality of opportunity or good relations and / or is purely technical in nature and will have no bearing in terms of its likely impact on equality of opportunity or good relations for people within the equality and good relations categories.</i></p>	