

MINUTES of a meeting of **CABINET** held on 23 April 2020.

PRESENT

Councillor B Lewis (in the Chair)

Councillors A Dale, A Foster, C Hart, T King, S A Spencer and J Wharmby.

Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest made.

66/20 MINORITY GROUP LEADERS' QUESTIONS

Councillor P Smith asked the following question:

Agenda Item 6(a) – Budget Monitoring 2019-20 (as at 31 December 2019)

There would appear to be a number of areas within the budget where cost savings are not being met within the financial year, some of which have already rolled over from previous years. The HTI portfolio shows significant carry forward of saving requirement on Highway Maintenance, to the tune of £2.000m, and a further £5.234m of savings required which would appear to be needing to be pushed back to beyond this current financial year. There are similar examples in the Young People budget. Could the Director of Finance and ICT please detail his current understanding of the value of expected savings requirement which will need to roll beyond this financial year, broken down by portfolio areas please?

Councillor S A Spencer, Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Infrastructure responded that the Council were obviously facing some very serious circumstances as a result of the Covid 19 outbreak, the costs of which were not known at this stage. The Council had submitted its claim to the Government for the recent flooding which had occurred in November and February which was in excess of £20m but as yet no formal response had been received. The Council had become expectant of the availability of the pothole fund. Whilst this funding had been announced, the detail had not been made available, although it was anticipated to be £30m. There had also been other issues including excessive expenditure on winter maintenance where there had been very challenging whether in April at the start of the financial year which had had an impact on the budget. In addition, although the Sinfin site had not cost the Council to date, it had a knock-on effect on financial planning as the Council would have expected by now to be financing the

programme differently. There were also several other financial incidentals that were contributing to the problems and the Executive Director - Economy, Transport and Environment would provide further details.

67/20 MINUTES RESOLVED that the non-exempt minutes of the meeting of Cabinet held on 16 March 2020 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

68/20 CABINET MEMBER MEETINGS - MINUTES RESOLVED to receive the non-exempt minutes of Cabinet Member meetings as follows:

- (a) Corporate Services – 5 March 2020
- (b) Highways, Transport & Infrastructure – 16 March 2020
- (c) Adult Care – 19 March 2020
- (d) Clean Growth & Regeneration – 19 March 2020
- (e) Young People – 19 March 2020
- (f) Health & Communities – 21 March 2020

69/20 BUDGET MONITORING 2019-20 (AS AT 31 DECEMBER 2019) (Strategic Leadership, Culture and Tourism) The Director of Finance and ICT informed Cabinet of the Revenue Budget position as at 31 December 2019.

The report summarised the controllable budget position by Cabinet Member Portfolio as at 31 December 2019 and further reports would be considered at Audit Committee and Council in accordance with the Budget Monitoring Policy and Financial Regulations.

The COVID-19 crisis would impact on the Council's 2019-20 outturn. The additional costs of the Council's response, incurred up to 31 March 2020, were not reflected in the projected outturn at 31 December 2019 and the summary provided was before these additional costs were taken into account. However, that would mean that the total projected underspend of £5.080m was likely to be reduced to reflect the additional costs associated with the Council's response to the outbreak. These costs would be reported to Cabinet in the Revenue Outturn Report 2019-20 and the Director of Finance and ICT expanded on the latest position regarding the potential impact of the COVID-19 crisis.

A Council portfolio overspend of £0.577m was forecast, after the use of £3.382m of Earmarked Reserves to support the Highways, Transport and Infrastructure and Young People portfolios. Any underspends in 2019-20 would be used to manage the budget in 2020-21. A summary of the individual portfolio positions was detailed in the report and the Director of Finance and ICT asked Members to consider the following proposals:

There was a projected year-end underspend of £3.861m. It was proposed to transfer this current projected underspend to the Adult Care Budget Saving Pump Priming Earmarked Reserve, to part fund £4.210m due to Newton Europe in 2020-21 in respect of consultancy services provided in relation to the Better Lives programme, with the balance of £0.349m to be funded by a further transfer if additional underspends became available before the end of the financial year.

The Shipley Country Park project would require external consultants to be engaged. Therefore, it was proposed to contribute £0.100m from the Property Services' underspend to establish an earmarked reserve to fund this work.

Details of the Council's Earmarked Reserves balances as at 31 December 2019 were set out in Appendix 1 to the report. In addition to these balances, £0.684m of funding to ensure compliance with the General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) would be transferred to a newly established GDPR Earmarked Reserve as approved by Cabinet on 23 January 2020.

RESOLVED to (1) note the 2019-20 budget monitoring position as at 31 December 2019 before consideration of the impact of costs incurred in responding to the COVID-19 crisis;

(2) approve the establishment of a Shipley County Park Consultants Earmarked Reserve and a contribution of £0.100m from the Property Services budget into this reserve; and

(3) approve the transfer of the current projected underspend in Adult Care of £3.861m to the Adult Care Budget Saving Pump Priming Earmarked Reserve to part fund £4.210m due to Newton Europe in 2020-21, in respect of consultancy services provided in relation to the Better Lives programme, with the balance of £0.349m to be funded by a further transfer if additional underspends become available before the end of the financial year.

70/20 CIPFA FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT CODE (Strategic Leadership, Culture and Tourism) The Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) had published The Financial Management Code (FM Code) in October 2019. The FM Code provided guidance for good and sustainable financial management in local authorities, giving assurance that authorities were managing resources effectively.

The FM Code required authorities to demonstrate that the processes they had in place satisfied the principles of good financial management, which was an essential part of ensuring that public sector finances were sustainable. The FM Code identified risks to financial sustainability and introduced a framework of assurance. This framework was built on existing successful

practices and set explicit standards of financial management. Complying with the standards set out in the FM Code was the collective responsibility of elected members, the chief finance officer and their professional colleagues in the leadership team. Complying with the FM Code would help strengthen the framework that surrounded financial decision making. By following the essential aspects of the FM Code, local authorities were providing evidence to show they were meeting important legislative requirements.

The first full year of compliance would be 2021-22. This recognised that organisations would require time to reflect on the contents of the FM Code and allowed them to use 2020-21 financial year to demonstrate how they were working towards compliance. Whilst compliance with the standards was mandatory, the FM Code did not prescribe how they should be achieved. The standards were summarised in Appendix 1 to the report.

The Council would review its current processes, procedures and governance arrangements, to understand where it was already compliant with the FM Code standards and to identify any areas of non-compliance or where compliance was weak. In order to demonstrate conformity with the FM Code's standards, a document evidencing the applicable parts of the Council's Constitution, Financial Regulations, reports and policies would be compiled. Where evidence was found to be weak, the Council would develop practices to ensure that it was fully compliant by 1 April 2021.

The Audit Committee would receive regular reports on progress towards achieving the FM Code, including proposals for additional practices where appropriate and on compliance with the FM Code's standards. An annual report would be taken to Full Council alongside the Statement of Accounts in late Autumn each year, commencing in 2022, following the first full financial year of compliance.

RESOLVED to note the content of the report.

71/20 FUTURE MANAGEMENT OF EDUCATIONAL CHARITIES

(Strategic Leadership, Culture and Tourism) The County Council was the sole trustee for 47 charities established at various times over the past 150 years or so for educational purposes. Some were nominal in value with an annual income of only a few pounds and some were established for purposes or beneficiaries which no longer existed. In many cases, these charities were not registered and the County Council holds limited information about them which has led to them being inactive for some time.

This situation was not unique to the County Council, a fact that had been recognised by the Charity Commission and the Department for Digital Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS). To address the issue of the thousands of inactive funds which individually had small nominal incomes, but collectively

had a monetary value in the tens of millions, the Charity Commission, DCMS and the United Kingdom Community Foundations (UKCF) launched the Revitalising Trusts Programme. The aim of the programme was to assist dormant, ineffective or inactive charities and provide them with simple options to close or revitalise the charity.

The options available to trustees of charities which were no longer active were:

1. to consider transferring a charity's fund, using the Revitalising Trust Programme, to a central community fund managed by UKCF or to a local community fund managed by the local community foundation or to a charity with similar objectives depending on the governing document of the charity.
2. consider winding up a charity in line with the dissolution clause within its governing document.
3. consider amendments to the purpose of a charity in order that it can fulfil its purposes and undertake valuable charitable activities once again.

In the case of all three options advice was available from Toni Shaw, UKCF Trust Transfer Associate to guide the Council through the process of transferring a charity's funds for positive public benefit or to help the Council revitalise the objects of a charity.

The cost to the Council of administering the charities and their, in some cases, very small funds was not something that could be sustained going forward. It was more appropriate that the Council worked in partnership with organisations that had the expertise to manage the charities and their funds so that they benefit the young people of Derbyshire as was originally intended.

Officers had considered the options and believed that option 1 was the most effective way forward. This option would allow a charity's funds to be revitalised and would also enable the Council to stay involved in the distribution of grants. It would involve transferring most of the 47 charitable trusts to the local Derbyshire Community Foundation, Foundation Derbyshire, to revitalise those funds to provide benefits for the children and young people of Derbyshire. An alternative proposal had been put forward for the future management of the Heage Educational Charity which was addressed in the report.

Derbyshire Community Foundation (operating as Foundation Derbyshire (FD)) was established in 1996 and was an independent and well respected locally based charity that promoted and encouraged local philanthropy, creating funding sources for the hundreds of community groups and charities

delivering vital services across the county. The Foundation's Board Members included senior representatives from industry, law, the voluntary sector and banking in Derbyshire. To date, the Foundation had distributed over £15 million of grant funding across Derbyshire.

To date the Foundation had transferred charitable trusts worth in excess of £1.58m into bespoke named funds within its own endowment. FD provided accessible, transparent and supportive processes for applicants and provided the ability for former trustees to remain involved in decision making, if they so wished. Trustees could retain their involvement in grant making decisions, by participating in a dedicated "Named Fund Panel", which the Foundation would establish and administer on the Trust's behalf, and grants could be distributed and marketed in the name of the original charitable trust.

Following an analysis of the 47 educational charities, it had been established that 8 were for the benefit of Chesterfield College, 9 were for the benefit of current and former educational establishments in Derby City and one was for the benefit of a church Sunday school. The remaining 29 were for the benefit of various schools or former schools and education establishments in Derbyshire for their pupils and students. There were only 3 of the charities which had seen any activity in the last 5 years.

The proposal was that 43 of the charities were transferred to FD to administer. In the case of the smaller charities, their funds would be amalgamated to form larger funds to which the original beneficiaries could apply for grants, and any income which had not been taken up at the end of each year would be rolled forward into a wider education fund to which all schools and students in Derbyshire could apply for grants.

The charities of which Chesterfield College was the beneficiary would be amalgamated into a single Chesterfield College Fund for the benefit of students and former students. In the case of the Derby charities, these would similarly be amalgamated into a Derby City Learning Fund for the benefit of pupils in Derby schools, and the 3 Derby colleges charities would be amalgamated into a Derby Colleges Fund. The beneficiary schools and colleges had been consulted and no objections had been raised to the proposal.

There were 3 charities which benefit pupils and former pupils at secondary schools in Chesterfield. The largest of these was the Chesterfield School Foundation. The other 2 charities were the Pegasus Trust Fund and the Gertrude Weninger Trust Fund. The proposal was for the Pegasus Trust Fund to be administered by FD and to amalgamate both the Chesterfield School Foundation and the Gertrude Weninger Trust Fund into a Chesterfield School Trust Fund for the benefit of pupils and former pupils

under the age of 25 in accordance with the objectives of the current Chesterfield School Foundation charity scheme. The Fund would be administered by FD through a Chesterfield School Trust Fund Panel.

Further consideration would be given in due course whether to seek the Charity Commission's approval to merge the schemes of these three charities so that the pupils and former pupils of all eight secondary schools in the Borough of Chesterfield could benefit from all three funds.

The Heage Educational Charity, which primarily benefits the pupils and former pupils of Heage and Ambergate Primary Schools, and secondly, young people resident in the Parish of Ripley, had a substantial endowment. No objection had been received from either Heage or Ambergate Primary Schools to the consultation regarding the proposal that the fund should be transferred to FD. However, a request had recently been received from Ripley Town Council for the County Council to transfer the Heage Educational Charity to the Town Council to administer. The Town Council had indicated it had experience of appointing trustees to local charitable trusts, that a number of Town Councillors had experience as Chairs of local charities and not for profit organisations and that, in terms of experience of financial management, the Town Council's annual budget was £320,000 a year. Councillor Dale also referred to further correspondence from Ripley Town Council which had recently been received.

It was recognised that the Town Council provided valuable local knowledge of the needs of the local communities. However, whilst the experience gained by many of the Town Councillors from being involved in other local charities would undoubtedly be of benefit in considering applications for grants from the Heage Educational Charity in accordance with the charity's scheme, it did not necessarily mean the Town Council had experience of directly managing and investing a large permanent endowment of the size of the Heage Educational Charity, which was more than double the annual budget of the Town Council, or the internal resources to do so.

It was recommended that the Council did not agree to Ripley Town Council's request and transferred the management of Heage Educational Charity along with the other 42 charities listed in the appendix to the report to Foundation Derbyshire.

The County Council would be able to maintain involvement in decision making for all of the Funds by appointing a representative to each of the Panels. In addition, to ensure local involvement in decision making it was proposed that each Panel should include representatives recruited from the local communities by, for example, advertising in the local press and contacting local organisations.

The final group of 3 charities benefits pupils and former pupils at schools in Long Eaton. Enquiries suggested that there were other active charities which benefit the same groups and further work was being undertaken to establish whether the funds held by the County Council could be transferred to and administered by the trustees of those other funds. At present therefore it was not proposed to transfer those funds to Foundation Derbyshire.

It was proposed that the remaining charity, the William Pearce Foundation, established for the benefit of a Church Sunday School, should be transferred to the appropriate Parochial Church Council which was already a registered charity.

RESOLVED to (1) approve the transfer of the educational charities as listed in the appendix to the report, including the Heage Educational Charity, to Foundation Derbyshire to be administered as set out in the report;

(2) approve the transfer of the William Pearce Foundation to the Parochial Church Council of St Michael's Parish Church, Pleasley.

(3) authorise the Director of Legal and Democratic Services to execute all documents necessary for the purposes of the transfers;

(4) authorise the Director of Finance & ICT to transfer the funds of the charities concerned held by the County Council to Foundation Derbyshire once the legal transfers have been completed;

(5) agree and authorise the Cabinet Member for Strategic Leadership, Culture and Tourism to appoint representatives to the Fund Panels to be established by Foundation Derbyshire;

(6) note that the Council and Foundation Derbyshire will jointly recruit local individuals to serve on each of the Fund's Panels; and

(7) note that a further report will be presented to Cabinet regarding the future of the Long Eaton educational charities.

72/20 CHILDREN'S SERVICES CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2019-20 – S106 PROJECT ALLOCATIONS (Young People) Cabinet was informed of the receipt and availability of a recent Section 106 developer contributions and approval was sought for the allocation of the contributions to projects in line with the individual Section 106 agreements. Approval was also sought that, where appropriate, procurement exercises be undertaken to commission services and undertake works associated with the schemes.

There was significant housing growth in the normal area of John Port Spencer Academy and to date, the Authority had secured £12m developer contributions by way of Section 106 agreements. Given the size of the development, the Academy Trust had employed a specialist firm to assess the current accommodation and identify the projects needed to expand the school by 300 places for 11–16 pupils and increase the post 16 provision. At present the masterplan consisted of 5 projects and the Academy Trust was now in a position to identify the S106 contributions that would be used for each of the schemes. The funds listed in Appendix A to the report, were all available to claim from South Derbyshire District Council and therefore this report sought to draw those funds down. Once all the funding was in place, a separate Cabinet report would be submitted to seek approval for the use of that funding for the individual projects.

RESOLVED to (1) note the availability of S106 developer contribution funding and approve the following allocation as detailed in Appendix A to the report for John Port Spencer Academy amounting to £769,975.70; and

(2) approve that, where appropriate, procurement exercises be undertaken to commission services and undertake works associated with the schemes.

73/20 SUPPORT FOR MAINSTREAM SCHOOLS WITH SIGNIFICANT NUMBERS OF CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS (Young People) Under the national funding framework mainstream primary and secondary schools (which for the purpose of this report includes academies) were expected to fund the first £6,000 of additional costs for any child with additional educational needs. Costs in excess of the £6,000 threshold were funded from the High Needs Block rather than schools' delegated budgets, subject to the approval of a GRIP (Graduated Response for an Individual Pupil) or an EHCP (Education Health and Care Plan).

The expectation that schools met the first £6,000 of additional costs created a pressure for those schools with a significant proportion of children with an approved GRIP/EHCP. These pressures could be compounded in schools which had developed a good reputation for supporting children with special needs. Schools with this reputation contend that they incur significant costs for the many children on roll whose needs, whilst not at the GRIP/EHCP level, nevertheless required additional resources which created further pressure on the school's delegated budget.

At the July 2019 meeting of the Council an amended Motion was unanimously agreed which sought to ensure that every Derbyshire SEND (Special Educational Needs & Disability) pupil got the education they were entitled to.

The 2020-21 Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) settlement provided a £9.8m (14%) increase in High Needs Block (HNB) funding for Derbyshire, thus contributing towards meeting one of the objectives of the Motion. As an active member of the F40 group of low funded local authorities, Derbyshire would continue to press for further increases in education funding, including for high needs pupils, in future years' settlements.

As a result of the settlement the 2020-21 High Needs Block budget report to the Cabinet in March 2020 proposed an increase in the contingency fund to support schools with high proportions of pupils with SEN. Cabinet agreed that the fund should be increased to £0.500m for 2020-21 (£0.350m in 2019-20). £0.400m of the increased fund would continue to be allocated via a formula with £0.100m set aside to consider claims from schools experiencing exceptional circumstances.

The issue of SEN contingency funding was discussed at both the October 2019 and January 2020 meetings of the Schools Forum. The January meeting received a report setting out the current allocation arrangements as well as a potential alternative model for consideration.

The alternative model compared the costs of the support with a percentage of the notional SEN budget. Not all of the notional SEN budget would be included as it was recognised that a significant element of this funding would be required to support pupils with levels of SEN below the GRIP/EHCP threshold. In the event, whilst the Schools Forum recognised the logic of bringing the question of each school's resources into the calculation, they were concerned about the turbulence the new model would create. In particular there were concerns about the impact on junior schools and schools serving the most deprived areas. After a lengthy discussion the Schools Forum determined not to support the alternative model.

Given the views expressed by the Schools Forum it was recommended that the existing allocation arrangements were largely retained for 2020-21. Changes may need to be considered at a future date, perhaps following further national changes to high needs funding arising from the DfE's SEND Call for Evidence in 2019. Proposals to make significant changes would only be considered following consultation with schools and the Schools Forum.

As previously described, in 2019-20 support was targeted at schools with more than 3% of their population with an EHCP/GRIP, with 41 schools triggering support. Applying this threshold in 2020-21 87 schools would be eligible for support at a cost of £1.184m. The increases in both the number of schools qualifying for support and the number of pupils above the threshold reflected the significant increase in the number of children with an EHCP/GRIP.

The maximum allocation per individual school has been capped at £30,000, equivalent to 7.5% of the available budget. The support for only one school, Brookfield Primary School, had been limited by the application of this cap with the school's allocation being reduced from £52,258 to £30,000. The £22,258 saved would be added to the exceptional cases fund detailed in the report. Brookfield, alongside any other school, were able to submit a case for additional support over and above their formula allocation if they felt their circumstances justified this.

Given the available budget was £0.400m each school's actual allocation needed to be scaled back by 66.2% for 2020-21. A schedule of the resultant allocations was provided in Appendix 1 to the report.

Outside of the formula contingency fund, £0.100m was available to meet exceptional cases. However, schools wishing to access this resource would have to submit extensive details to support their claim.

RESOLVED to agree the high needs block contingency arrangements for 2020-21.

74/20 URGENT OFFICER DECISIONS (Corporate Services) The current challenges relating to the Covid 19 virus had necessitated urgent decision-making processes by Executive Directors and Directors to be implemented in order to ensure the welfare of service users and the public and to safeguard the interests of the Council

The Coronavirus Act 2020 had now been implemented alongside a range of related Regulations. The Regulations included provision for virtual meetings of Council bodies including Cabinet. These regulations took effect on 4 April 2020. Members will appreciate that prior to these Regulations being introduced and Cabinet meetings resuming, it had been necessary for a range of decisions to be made. These decisions had been made under the urgent delegated powers to Executive Directors as set out in the Constitution.

A schedule of these decisions together with supporting reports by Department, was set out in Appendices 1–5 of the report. Appendix 6, circulated as a separate document, detailed exempt officer decisions, and these were included in the confidential part of the meeting papers together with the reason that they are exempt.

In the main, the decisions related to short-term temporary arrangements which were subject to regular review. This was particularly important where subsequent Government guidance had been issued, notably in areas of Adult Care. As Cabinet was now able to function by meetings being held 'remotely' the need for officers to make urgent decisions would diminish over time.

RESOLVED to note the urgent decisions made under delegated powers arising from the Covid-19 virus pandemic.

75/20 TEMPORARY FUNDING FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE PROVIDERS DURING THE COVID-19 CRISIS (Adult Care) Shared guidance to local authority commissioners from the Association of Directors of Adult Social Services (ADASS), the Local Government Association (LGA) and the Care Provider Alliance (CPA) was made on the 13 March 2020. This was made in response to the requests from Commissioners and Providers that a national approach was needed to provide additional funding to the PVI sector.

This guidance and related LGA/ADASS communications supported Local Authorities making an additional 10% fee increase from 1 April 2020 for an initial 1 month to be reviewed on a monthly basis to assist providers with meeting the additional costs associated with Covid 19 in the adult care and health sector. It was acknowledged that providers would be variably impacted by Covid 19 but that it was better to have a standardised approach across the adult care and health sector to fund this market rather than asking each provider to submit evidence of additional costs.

The proposed actions were as follows:

- To implement an increase standard residential and nursing care home fees by 10% from 1 April 2020 for an initial 1 month

This would result in weekly increased costs for a residential placement of between £56- £58 per week for older people. For a nursing placement it would be between £60- £62.

- To increase specialist care fees by a value equivalent to standard nursing or residential fees for an initial 1 month.

The fees for specialist placements were often substantially more than the standard care home fees. The additional funding (top-up) paid for a specialist placement reflected the greater investment in staff and training to meet an individual's needs. It was not appropriate to inflate fees for these services by 10% as this would be a disproportionately greater amount than paid to care homes for older people that were experiencing many more incidents of having staff and clients with Covid-19 or similar. It was therefore suggested that providers were paid the equivalent value as standard care homes.

- To increase hourly Home Care and hourly Supported Living Fees by 10% for an initial 1 month

It was suggested that an additional payment be made equivalent to 10% of the value of all open Purchase Orders, which would give the equivalent of an hourly increase in payment from £1.57 per hour for the home care market and between £1.50 and £2.00 for supported living.

It was worth noting that there was an inherent risk that if additional payments were not made that the sustainability of individual services may be put at risk. Over half of the providers commissioned to provide care on behalf of Adult Care had made requests for funding to assist with meeting additional costs including spiralling costs of PPE and meeting the costs associated with backfilling self-isolated staff with agency workers and the additional staffing needed to care for people who were self-isolated, especially in a care home setting.

RESOLVED to increase payments on a monthly basis for the following service areas from 1 April 2020:

- standard residential and nursing care home fees by 10%
- specialist care fees by a value equivalent to the standard nursing or residential fees increase.
- hourly home care and hourly supported living payments by 10%

The Executive Director of Adult Social Care and Health to have delegated powers to make a decision following discussion and agreement with the Director of Finance and ICT and Cabinet Member for Adult Care to extend the additional funding agreement beyond April 2020 on a month by month basis for up to three months in response to ongoing concerns about Covid 19.

76/20 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC FROM THE MEETING. RESOLVED that the public be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the remaining items on the agenda to avoid the disclosure of the kind of exempt information detailed in the following summary of proceedings.

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED AFTER THE PUBLIC HAD BEEN EXCLUDED FROM THE MEETING

1. To consider Minority Group Leaders' Questions (if any).
2. To confirm the Exempt Minutes of the meeting of Cabinet held on 16 March 2020.
3. To receive the exempt minutes of Cabinet Member meetings as follows:
 - (a) Young People – 19 March 2020
4. To consider exempt reports as follows:-

- (a) Project to Upgrade Core Business Systems (SAP) – Executive Director Commissioning, Communities and Policy (Corporate Services) (contains information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Authority holding that information))
- (b) Urgent Officer Decisions – Appendix 6 (Corporate Services) (Contains exempt information)