Cabinet



Title of Report: Report No:	Report of the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee: 30 July2015 CAB/SE/15/054		
Report to and date:	Cabinet	8 September 2015	
Portfolio Holder:	Ian Houlder Portfolio Holder for Resources and Performance Tel: 01284 810074 Email: ian.houlder@stedsbc.gov.uk		
Chairman of the Committee:	Sarah Broughton Chairman of the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee Tel: 01284 787327 Email: sarah.broughton@stedsbc.gov.uk		
Lead Officer:	Christine Brain Scrutiny Officer Tel: 01638 719729 Email: christine.brain@westsuffolk.gov.uk		
Purpose of report:	On 30 July 2015, the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee held an informal joint meeting with Members of Forest Heath's Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee, and considered the first four items jointly:		
	(1) Balanced Scorecard and Quarter 1 Performance Report 2015-2016;		
	(2) West Suffolk Risk Principles;	Management Approach and	
	(3) West Suffolk Strat Monitoring Report	tegic Risk Register Quarterly – June 2015;	
	(4) Work Programme	Update;	
	(5) Annual Performan	ce Report for The Apex;	

	(6) Financial Performance Report (Revenue and Capital) Quarter 1 – 2015-16; and		
	(7) Annual Treasury Management Report 2014-2015 and Investment Activity 1 April – 30 June 2015.		
	Separate reports are included on this Cabinet agenda for Items (2) and (7) above.		
Recommendation:	The Cabinet is requested to <u>NOTE</u> the contents of Report CAB/SE/15/054, being the report of the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee.		
Key Decision:	Is this a Key Decision and, if so, under which		
(Check the appropriate box and delete all those that do not apply.)	<pre>definition? Yes, it is a Key Decision - □ No, it is not a Key Decision - ☒</pre>		
	Report for information only.		
			e reports listed in Section 2 below.
Alternative option(s): • See		• See	e reports listed in Section 2 below
Implications:			
Are there any financial implications?		tions?	Yes No
If yes, please give details Are there any staffing implications?		ions?	Please see background papers. Yes □ No □
If yes, please give details		0113.	Please see background papers.
Are there any ICT implications? If		If	Yes □ No □
yes, please give details			Please see background papers
Are there any legal and/or policy		licy	Yes □ No □
implications?		· 2	Please see background papers.
Are there any equality implications? If yes, please give details		ions?	Yes \(\text{No} \(\text{Diagrams} \)
Risk/opportunity assessment:		t:	Please see background papers. Please see background papers.
Man, opportunity assessment.			Trease see suckground papers.
Ward(s) affected:			Please see background papers.
Background papers:			Please see background papers, which
			are listed at the end of the report.
Documents attached:			None

1. Key issues and reasons for recommendation

1.1 <u>Balanced Scorecard and Quarter 1 Performance Report 2015-16</u> (Report No: PAS/SE/15/017)

- 1.1.1 The Committee received Report No: PAS/SE/15/017, which set out the West Suffolk Balanced Scorecards being used to measure the Council's performance for 2015-2016 and an overview of performance against those indicators for the first quarter of 2015-2016. The six balanced scorecards (attached at Appendices A to F) were linked to the Head of Service areas, including the proposed performance measures, targets and quarter one data.
- 1.1.2 It was envisaged the Balanced Scorecard report would replace a number of existing reports that currently went to the Committee, such as the quarterly Key Performance Indicator (KPI) report, quarterly Strategic Risk Register report and the Bi-annual Corporate Complaints and Compliments report. It was also envisaged that the Balanced Scorecard approach would remove the need to report the current quarterly KPI (Appendix G) and the bi-annual corporate Complaints and Compliments report after quarter 1. From quarter 2, it was envisaged that the quarterly Strategic Risk Register report would no longer be required as this would be covered within the Balanced Scorecard from quarter 2.
- 1.1.3 Unless otherwise stated, all performance figures reported in the scorecards were from a West Suffolk perspective. Where the performance for either individual Council was significantly different from the West Suffolk figure details would be provided in the comments box.
- 1.1.4 Members scrutinised the balanced scorecards and asked questions to which officers duly responded.
- 1.1.5 There being no decision required, the Committee noted the performance indicators and targets being used to measure the Council's performance for 2015-2016; and reviewed the Balanced Scorecards for Quarter 1, 2015-2016.

1.2 <u>West Suffolk Strategic Risk Register Quarterly Monitoring Report – June 2015 (Report No: PAS/SE/15/019)</u>

- 1.2.1 The Committee received and noted the first quarterly risk register monitoring report in respect of the West Suffolk Strategic Risk Register. The Register was updated regularly by the Risk Management Group and at its recent meeting the Group reviewed the target risk, the risk level where the Council aimed to be, and agreed a current risk assessment. These assessments formed the revised West Suffolk Risk Register (Appendix 1). Some individual controls and actions had been updated and those which were not ongoing and had been completed by June 2015 had been removed from the Register.
- 1.2.2 There had been no new risks or amendments made to any existing risk and no new risks had been closed since the Strategic Risk Register was last report to the Committee.
- 1.2.3 Members considered the report and did not raise any issues.

1.3 Work Programme Update (Report No: PAS/SE/15/020)

1.3.1 The Committee received and noted its Work Programme which provided items scheduled to be presented to the Committee during 2015-2016.

1.4 <u>Annual Performance Report for The Apex (Report No: PAS/SE/15/021)</u>

- 1.4.1 The Committee received and Report No: PAS/SE/15/021, which set out The Apex's financial position for the year ending 2014-2015. The report included an executive summary, then details on The Apex's performance, Sodexo catering contract, analysis of budgets and conclusion.
- 1.4.2 The Apex budget for 2014-2015 had reduced from £742,250 to £671,840. Increased revenue had contributed to a positive variance of £74,732 against budget at the financial year-end and the outturn figure was £597,108, showing a reduction of £145,142 compared to the 2013-2014 budget.
- 1.4.3 The Apex continued to be a valuable community asset and more and more non-performance events were taking place which were open to the public. The Apex management team had been successful in reducing the subsidy over the last financial year, mainly due to increasing revenues from ticket sales.
- 1.4.4 The Committee scrutinised the annual performance report in detail and asked a number of questions to which the Portfolio Holder and officers duly responded. Questions and responses covered topics including the venues capacity; increasing the usage of the venue during the day and the progress made in reducing the Council's subsidy.
- 1.4.5 There being no decision required, the Committee noted the Annual Performance Report for The Apex.

1.5 <u>Financial Performance Report (Revenue and Capital) Quarter 1 – 2015-16 (Report No: PAS/SE/15/022)</u>

- 1.5.1 The Committee received Report No: PAS/SE/15/022, which set out the financial performance for the first quarter of the 2015-2016 and forecasted outturn position for 2015-2016.
- 1.5.2 Attached at Appendix A and B to the report was the current forecast position for the year end, which currently showed an underspend of £51,500. Appendix C set out the Council's capital financial position for the first three months of 2015-2016, which showed expenditure of £360,000. The Resources and Performance Team would continue to work with Budget Holders to monitor capital spend and project progress closely for the remainder of the financial year and an updated position would be presented to the Committee on a quarterly basis. Finally, a summary of the earmarked reserves was attached at Appendix D, along with the forecast year end position for 2015-2016.
- 1.5.3 The Committee scrutinised the report and asked questions to which officers duly responded. In particular discussions were held on the year end

variances over £25k in relation to Section 106 costs and building control income / planning income under-achievements to which responses were provided.

1.5.4 There being no decision required, the Committee noted the 2015-2016 year end forecast financial position.

2. Background Papers

- 2.1.1 Report No: <u>PAS/SE/15/017</u> to the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee: Balanced Scorecard and Quarter 1 Performance Report 2015-16
- 2.1.2 Report No: <u>PAS/SE/15/019</u> to the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee: West Suffolk Strategic Risk Register Quarterly Monitoring Report June 2015
- 2.1.3 Report No: <u>PAS/SE/15/020</u> to the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee: Work Programme Update
- 2.1.4 Report No: <u>PAS/SE/15/021</u> to the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee: Annual Performance Report for The Apex
- 2.1.5 Report No: <u>PAS/SE/15/022</u> to the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee: Financial Performance Report (Revenue and Capital) Quarter 1 2015-2016