

<b>Board Meeting Paper</b>	
<b>Sep 14 BM 10.0</b>	
<b>Purpose of report</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Decision <sup>1</sup> <input type="checkbox"/> Discussion / debate <input type="checkbox"/> Information only <sup>2</sup>
<b>Sensitive Information?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>If sensitive, protective marking<sup>3</sup></b>	
<b>Date of Meeting</b>	10 September 2014
<b>Agenda Item</b>	10
<b>Report Title</b>	Board committees and task forces 2014-15
<b>Sponsor</b>	Colin Foxall
<b>Author(s)</b>	Jon Carter



<b>1. Summary</b>
<p>The new roads remit has prompted a look at governance arrangements within Passenger Focus. This is also driven by a growing awareness that the time the full board has to devote to issues of substance is very limited. In particular, issues such as franchising, bus, coach and tram, and now roads, require more attention than the board can currently manage. It is therefore proposed that a series of 'task forces' are created to close this gap and consider policy issues in greater detail.</p> <p>A change is also required in respect of the chair of the Statistics Governance Group.</p>
<b>2. Recommendations / decision required</b>
<p>The board is asked to agree:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) To the creation of the task forces, with membership as set out on the attached document, with the initial task of considering scope and remit, and to report back to the board as soon as reasonably practicable; and</li> <li>(b) To the appointment of Stephen Locke as chair of the Statistics Governance Group with effect from 23 September 2014.</li> </ul>
<b>3. Further details</b>
<p>These are as set out on the attached document. All board members have been consulted on membership.</p> <p>The Chairman is very conscious that these governance proposals should not restrict the capacity of his successor to propose further changes that he or she considers necessary. On the other hand, an incoming chair is unlikely to want to make any immediate changes, and there is a clear and present need for these arrangements. It is proposed therefore that the task forces are established with a requirement that their functioning is reviewed after a period of no more than a year.</p>

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

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

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

#### 4. Implications – Financial, Risk, Legal, Staffing

The key implication is staffing, and providing support to the groups. This will largely fall on the Passenger and Passenger Issues Teams and the Chief Executives Team. In developing scope and remit, the task forces must have regard to the capacity of the organisation to support them.

#### 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

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

<b>Based on the information above, and having regard to the guidance below, the sponsor and author of this paper agree that (✓)</b>	
(a) A full equalities impact assessment is <b>not</b> required	✓
(b) A full equalities impact assessment is <b>not</b> 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	
<b>Please provide a brief explanation of why you have arrived at this conclusion</b>	
<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>	