

## LGBCE (18)9<sup>th</sup> Meeting

Minutes of meeting held on 18 September 2018, at 1.15pm, in LGBCE Board Room, Windsor House, London, SW1H 0TL

### Commissioners Present

Professor Colin Mellors OBE (Chair)  
Susan Johnson OBE  
Peter Maddison QPM  
Andrew Scallan CBE  
Steve Robinson  
Amanda Nobbs OBE

### LGBCE Officers Present:

Jolyon Jackson CBE	Chief Executive
Lynn Ingram	Director of Finance & Resources
Marcus Bowell	Director of Strategy & Communications
Alison Evison	Review & Programme Manager
Richard Buck	Review Manager
Jo Porter	Review Manager
Mark Cooper	Review Officer (item 10)
Dan Carlsson-Hyslop	Review Officer (item 8)
Jonathan Ashby	Review Officer (item 9)
Emily Starkie	Review Officer (item 12)
David Owen	Review Officer (item 11)
Karen Cleverly	Finance Lead (minutes)

## Apologies for Absence

There were no apologies for absence.

## Declarations of interest

Susan Johnson and Richard Buck declared an interest in item 10, Crawley, and took no part in the discussions of that item. Peter Maddison declared an interest in item 8, Cambridge City Council, and took no part in the discussions of that item.

## Minutes of LGBCE's meeting on 21/08/2018

The Review and Programme Manager circulated a revised paragraph relating to the Isle of Wight Draft Recommendations item. This would be inserted into the minutes. Otherwise the minutes were agreed as a correct record.

### Matters Arising

There were no matters arising.

### Actions from the previous Commission meeting

The following actions were reported on:

The Chief Executive reported that the availability of Commission papers would be revisited after the 'Upping the Game' project.

Keeping a log of wards over 10% was in progress and would be completed in October.

The Director of Strategy & Communications had looked into the prospect of funding from MHCLG as part of its digital transformation but had concluded that this was not appropriate at the current time. However, officers had arranged to meet with Reigate & Banstead Borough Council to discuss the tool used by the council in putting together their warding patterns. They would report their findings to the Commission at the next meeting.

Members suggested a conversation with the LGA about ways of enhancing the consultation process on boundary reviews.

#### 1. Chair's Report

The Chair gave a verbal report on his meeting with Craven Council (North Yorkshire).

It was formally noted that the Boundary Commission for England had released its final report on changes to parliamentary boundaries.

#### 2. Chief Executive's Report

The Chief Executive mentioned that papers for the meeting had been compiled on SharePoint for the first time. Two Commissioners reported having had problems downloading the papers.

He welcomed a new member of staff to the team; Chloe Baker, Review Assistant.

### 3. ARC and Commission Responsibilities - LGBCE (18)104

The Director of Finance & Resources (DFR) explained that the report arose from the strategy event and the review of effectiveness. She explained that LGBCE's Corporate Governance Framework was in the process of being reviewed and would be considered by ARC in October.

Members made the following comments:

- The table should specify that risk appetite is approved by the Commission.
- The 2018 UK Corporate Governance Code recommends that the strategic risk register should be considered by the main board at least twice a year. This was agreed.
- Clarification that any statutory health & safety breaches should be reported to the Commission, not to ARC.
- Clarification that the Corporate Governance Framework was reviewed every two years, with an annual 'sense check'.

There was a discussion about the Terms of Reference of the ARC and the role of the independent member. The following were agreed:

- A means of rotating membership of ARC among all Commissioners should be considered, perhaps reducing the term to two years.
- A Board member should be the Chair of ARC (i.e. not the independent member).
- As the independent member was as a full member of ARC, they would be included for quorum calculation. Quorum was two members.
- Paragraph 7 was redundant and could be removed.

#### **Agreed**

The DFR would implement the changes as part of the review of governance materials.

### 4. Information Security Presentation

The DFR outlined that the overall objective for information security arrangements at LGBCE was to spend the IT budget wisely, make use of economies of scale, keep up to date with new advances and be part of bigger platforms with associated security arrangements (e.g. Microsoft 365). A mixture of strategies, policies and training were employed to achieve good security without a prohibitive cost.

The presentation had been given to ARC in June and the Committee had asked for it to be presented to the whole Commission.

The Contracts & IT Lead then gave a presentation on IT security arrangements along with the representative from Wavex.

The Chair thanked both for the clear presentation and the following queries and comments were made:

- As part of 'Cyber Essentials' the National Audit Office now assess organisations against a risk wheel. The DFR would carry out some research on this.
- The IT contractor was asked how LGBCE would score on a scale of one to ten. He felt a score of eight was about right, with a good balance of risk vs cost vs usability.
- The ARC had discussed the return on investment in information security and had decided our level of investment was appropriate for the size of the organisation.
- The procedure for the case of a ransomware attack had been tested.
- The process for keeping information security up to date involved monthly meetings to look at future threats, defences and appropriate solutions for the organisation. An example had been the move to Windows 10.
- Different organisations had different requirements for iPads. LGBCE's solution was to protect only the corporate data, rather than the entire device.
- Another round of information security training would be organised in the near future.

## 5. Future Business – LGBCE (18)105

The next policy session would concentrate on concluding the recent discussions about council size.

## 6. Operational Report - LGBCE (18)106

The Chief Executive presented the Operational Report for September and the Commission noted its content. In addition to the contents of the report, the team wished to delay the Halton review by a month because of Review Officer capacity. It would still be possible to conclude it within the financial year.

Steve Robinson and Peter Maddison would be declaring interests in Northamptonshire and would not, therefore, be able to be involved in these reviews.

The Review & Programme Manager provided clarification regarding the FOI and two complaints received about the East Hampshire review.

## 7. Barnet Council Size - LGBCE (18)107

It had been agreed to review Barnet due to time passed since the last review. According to the latest available electoral figures, 14 per cent of wards had variances greater than 10 per cent.

The current size of the Council is 63 members.

Following receipt of information about future governance and representational arrangements, it was recommended by LGBCE officers that there was sufficient evidence to support that the council size remain at 63 members.

The Commission considered all the available evidence and, on the basis of this evidence, it was minded to support a council size of 63 members.

### **Agreed**

The Commission agreed that a council size of 63 be used as the basis for the preparation of the Draft Recommendations.

## 8. Cambridge Draft Recommendations - LGBCE (18)108

*Peter Maddison left the room and took no part in the discussion on this item.*

The review of Cambridge City Council had commenced on 22 May 2018. According to the latest available electoral figures, 29 per cent of wards had variances greater than 10 per cent with seven per cent of wards being over 30 per cent.

At its meeting on 22 May 2018, the Commission had been minded to agree a council size of 42 and the Draft Recommendations being considered had been prepared on the basis of such a council size.

In preparing the draft scheme, the team had taken into consideration both the submissions it had received and the statutory criteria. The Draft Recommendations proposed a pattern of 14 three-member wards in total.

The Commission considered the recommendations in detail informed by the statutory criteria and taking into account the advice of officers and the submissions received.

It agreed the Draft Recommendations as presented.

### **Agreed**

Draft Recommendations for Cambridge City Council as presented.

## 9. Hartlepool Draft Recommendations - LGBCE (18)109

The review of Hartlepool Borough Council had commenced on 22 May 2018. According to the latest available electoral figures, 45 per cent of wards had variances greater than 10 per cent.

At its meeting on 22 May 2018, the Commission had been minded to agree a council size of 36 and the Draft Recommendations being considered had been prepared on the basis of such a council size.

In preparing the draft scheme, the team had taken into consideration both the submissions it had received and the statutory criteria. The Draft Recommendations proposed a pattern of 12 three-member wards.

The Commission considered the recommendations in detail informed by the statutory criteria and taking into account the advice of officers and the submissions received.

It agreed the Draft Recommendations as presented.

### **Agreed**

Draft Recommendations for Hartlepool Borough Council as presented.

## 10. Crawley Final Recommendations – LGBCE (18)110

*Susan Johnson and Richard Buck left the room and took no part in the discussion on this item.*

The review of Crawley Borough Council had commenced on 23 January 2018. According to the latest available electoral figures, 20 per cent of wards had variances greater than 10 per cent with one ward, Three Bridges, being over 30 per cent.

At its meeting on 23 January 2018, the Commission had been minded to agree a council size of 36 and had subsequently, on 22 May 2018, agreed Draft Recommendations.

Following publication, 90 submissions had been received commenting on the Draft Recommendations which had been considered carefully in the context of the statutory criteria.

Taking all of the submissions into account, for the reasons highlighted in the team's report, it was felt that there was sufficient evidence to move away from the Draft Recommendations in some aspects and these changes were reflected in the Final Recommendations put to the Commission for consideration.

The Final Recommendations proposed a pattern of 10 three-member wards and three two-member wards in total.

The Commission considered the Final Recommendations in detail, informed by the statutory criteria and taking into account the submissions received following publication of the Draft Recommendations.

It agreed the Final Recommendations as presented.

**Agreed**

Final Recommendations for Crawley Borough Council as presented.

## 11. Reigate & Banstead Final Recommendations – LGBCE (18)111

The review of Reigate & Banstead Borough Council had commenced on 23 January 2018. According to the latest available electoral figures, 21 per cent of wards had variances greater than 10 per cent with one ward being over 30 per cent.

At its meeting on 23 January 2018, the Commission had been minded to agree a council size of 45 and had subsequently, on 22 May 2018, agreed Draft Recommendations.

Following publication, 565 submissions had been received commenting on the Draft Recommendations which had been considered carefully in the context of the statutory criteria.

Taking all of the submissions into account, for the reasons highlighted in the team's report, it was felt that there was sufficient evidence to move away from the Draft Recommendations in some aspects and these changes were reflected in the Final Recommendations put to the Commission for consideration.

The Final Recommendations proposed a pattern of 15 three-member wards in total.

The Commission considered the Final Recommendations in detail, informed by the statutory criteria and taking into account the submissions received following publication of the Draft Recommendations.

The Commission agreed the Final Recommendations as presented.

**Agreed**

Final Recommendations for Reigate & Banstead Borough Council as presented.

## 12. Dover Final Recommendations – LGBCE (18)112

The review of Dover District Council had commenced on 23 January 2018. According to the latest available electoral figures, 14 per cent of wards had variances greater than 10 per cent with 5 percent of wards being over 20 per cent.

At its meeting on 23 January 2018, the Commission had been minded to agree a council size of 32 and had subsequently, on 22 May 2018, agreed Draft Recommendations.

Following publication, 83 submissions had been received commenting on the Draft Recommendations which had been considered carefully in the context of the statutory criteria.

Taking all of the submissions into account, for the reasons highlighted in the team's report, it was felt that there was sufficient evidence to move away from the Draft Recommendations in some aspects and these changes were reflected in the Final Recommendations put to the Commission for consideration.

The Final Recommendations proposed a pattern of one three-member, 13 two-member and three single-member wards in total.

The Commission considered the Final Recommendations in detail, informed by the statutory criteria and taking into account the submissions received following publication of the Draft Recommendations.

It agreed the Final Recommendations as presented.

**Agreed**

Final Recommendations for Dover District Council as presented.

### 13. South Norfolk Related Alterations - LGBCE (18)113

The Commission considered the content of the South Norfolk Related Alterations paper. It was minded to agree to the related alteration as the changes proposed would have a negligible effect on electoral equality.

**Agreed**

The Commission agreed to the making of an Order implementing the related alteration.

### AOB

Members felt that the organisation should respond to the call for evidence on how to encourage more disabled people to apply for high profile public appointments. This was agreed. The DFR would be the responsible officer.

**Close of Business 16:42**