


<b>Board Meeting Paper</b>		
<b>Nov 16 BM D 2.1</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>	16 November 2016	
<b>Agenda Item</b>	D 2.1	
<b>Report Title</b>	Governance 2017-18	
<b>Sponsor</b>	Jon Carter	
<b>Author(s)</b>	Jon Carter	

### 1. Summary

Board and committee terms of reference are periodically updated. Any significant change requires board and/or management team approval. On this occasion, a number of significant changes are proposed to certain terms of reference and some minor changes have been made to others. It is thought helpful however to see the 'suite' of documents in one place together with a governance 'map' so any links between them may be more readily appreciated. **They are thus provided in a separate volume.**

### 2. Recommendations / decision required

- (a) The Board is asked to **approve** the following significant changes:
- The updated CPP2.1 Constitution-General and CPP2.2 Board Reserve Powers
  - The abolition of the Remuneration Committee, Highways Task Force (which never met) and the Bus, Coach and Tram Task Force
  - The widened remit of the renamed Audit, Risk Assurance and Remuneration Committee along with its updated terms of reference (CPP2.3)
  - The widened remit of the Statistics Governance Group along with its updated terms of reference (CPP2.6)
  - The updated CPP2.5 Management Team terms of reference
  - New terms of reference for the Business & Innovation Group
- (b) The Board is asked to **agree** the Chair's nomination of Dr Stuart Burgess CBE to membership of the Audit, Risk Assurance and Remuneration Committee;
- (c) The Board is asked to **note** minor updates or no change to other terms of reference

### 3. Further details

The board is reminded that the 2016 change programme has resulted in the loss of a support post within the Chief Executive's Team and a further downsizing in management capacity is planned for April 2017. We have therefore had to look carefully at what core activities must be supported in the most efficient way and what appears to be no longer necessary.

<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

Management team has also concluded that it can do without the Change Team and the Open Data Board.

It has however been an excellent opportunity to perform a general tidy-up and remove lingering references to previous regimes!

#### *Constitution General and Board Reserve Powers*

For some reason the relevant provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 were not incorporated into here at time, so this has now been done. As previously agreed the number of public board meetings has been reduced to three annually, and new provisions for out of meeting approvals have been made. The management team's revised delegation (of £95,000) has been updated and specific provision has been made for category D projects so that, for the time being, they come to the board for approval.

#### *Audit, Risk Assurance and Remuneration Committee*

There appears less and less of a case to maintain a bespoke remuneration committee so it is proposed its purpose and functions are folded into that of what we will now call ARARC. In fact, the current cyclical agenda will work very well in this regard. Both the National Audit Office and Government Internal Audit Agency have been consulted on this change and are quite content in general, and apparently even more content if they can leave the meeting before it turns its attention to discussing remuneration matters.

#### *Statistics Governance Group*

These terms of reference have been updated to include the TPS, SRUS and Online Panel.

#### *Management Team*

These terms of reference have been updated to include the delegation mentioned above.

#### *Business and Innovation Group*

This group started life just over a year ago without terms of reference but with an informal mandate to think outside the box. Whilst its core job of finding additional income within markets in which we operate has effectively ended – because those markets we now understand to be essentially conflicted – it is suggested it continues to offer a very useful place, not immediately obvious elsewhere, for discussion on business activity, efficiency and effectiveness. Draft terms of reference have been provided for the aboard to discuss and agree.

Other terms of reference included in the pack have been tweaked with minor revisions only as and if necessary.

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

There are no significant implications arising from this paper, the contents of which have been discussed and agreed by management team in advance of seeking the board's approval.

## 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	

### 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>	