

CABINET

MINUTES AND DECISION RECORD

8 November 2010

The meeting commenced at 9.15 a.m. in the Civic Centre, Hartlepool

Present:

The Mayor, Stuart Drummond - In the Chair

Councillors: Jonathan Brash (Portfolio Holder for Performance Portfolio Holder)
Gerard Hall (Adult and Public Health Services Portfolio Holder)
Cath Hill (Children's Services Portfolio Holder)
Hilary Thompson (Culture, Leisure and Tourism Portfolio Holder).

Officers: Nicola Bailey, Director of Child and Adult Services
Dave Stubbs, Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods
Denise Ogden, Assistant Director (Neighbourhood Services)
Graham Frankland, Assistant Director (Resources)
Martyn Ingram, Business Transformation Team
Steve Hilton, Public Relations Officer
David Cosgrove, Democratic Services Team

84. Apologies for Absence

Robbie Payne (Deputy Mayor) (Finance and Procurement Portfolio Holder), Pam Hargreaves (Regeneration and Economic Development Portfolio Holder), and Peter Jackson (Transport and Neighbourhoods Portfolio Holder).

85. Declarations of interest by members

None.

86. Inquorate Meeting

It was noted that the meeting was not quorate. The Mayor indicated that (as permitted under the Local Government Act 2000 and the Constitution) he would exercise his powers of decision and that he would do so in accordance with the wishes of the Members present, indicated in the usual way. Each of the decisions set out in the decision record were confirmed by the Mayor accordingly.

87. Confirmation of the minutes of the meeting held on 11 October 2010

Confirmed.

88. Business Transformation – Service Delivery Option for Environment (*Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods*)

Type of decision

Key Decision Test (i) applies. Forward Plan RN 33/10.

Purpose of report

To inform Cabinet of the findings of the Environment service delivery options review and the options appraisal aspect of the review.

Issue(s) for consideration by Cabinet

The Assistant Director (Neighbourhood Services) presented an overview of the Options Report for the Environment Service Delivery Review. This service delivery review has an efficiency savings target of £185,340 which is a 5% savings target from a baseline budget of £3,706,770.

The objectives of the review were to:

- Create and maintain high quality, well-managed neighbourhoods that are clean, green, and attractive and respected and enjoyed by all.
- Work in partnership to secure well maintained dynamic and responsive community green spaces, parks, play and recreational game space resources;
- Contribute to a greener, healthier, happier and more satisfying place to live for the people of Hartlepool.

The review focus covered a broad spectrum of services delivered by the Neighbourhood Services Division, including;

- i. Parks and Countryside: including Play Spaces, Recreational grounds, Bowling greens, Allotments and Horticultural services including Tanfield Road Nursery, the grounds maintenance of open spaces and Cemeteries and Crematoria;
- ii. Street Cleansing: including the street cleansing, Foreshore and Beach safety and the drug related litter service; and
- iii. Environmental Action: including Climate Change, Environmental Education and Enforcement and Pride in Hartlepool

Where posts are funded from external partners or Working Neighbourhoods Fund (WNF), the cost of these projects had not be included in setting the financial baseline or considered as part of achieving the efficiency target but the functions/activities had been taken into account in terms of their potential loss on the service as a whole.

In order to obtain a representative view of the services from Hartlepool residents the review team considered current surveys, evaluations and consultation carried out by the Council and its partners, some of which are summarised below.

The Ipsos MORI survey carried out in 2008 showed that four in five Hartlepool Borough residents (86%) were satisfied with their area as a place to live, this was in line with the national average (85%) and there had been no significant change since 2004. Residents in wider Hartlepool were more likely to say they were satisfied with their area compared to residents in NRF areas (94% vs. 78%).

Looking at ideas for improving residents' quality of life, improvements relating to the environment, such as removing litter and improving the general appearance of the area, were cited by a quarter of residents in Hartlepool 24%, this appeared to be a particular concern for residents in the NRF areas with 28% saying this. Overall, a third of residents (32%) perceive dogs causing a nuisance or a mess as a problem in the town. This was significantly higher compared to the national average, and was thought to be a bigger problem in the NRF areas.

More than half of Hartlepool residents (53%) felt that litter and rubbish in the streets was a problem, rising to 62%, this was the most frequently mentioned problem by residents in the borough overall. NRF areas record a higher level of dissatisfaction with the state of litter and rubbish in the streets (62%).

On a more positive note, abandoned or burnt out cars are seen as a problem among very few residents overall (3%) compared to the national average.

Poor quality or lack of parks and open spaces is seen as a problem by a quarter (27%) of residents for Hartlepool and rises to over a third (36%) among the population of NRF areas.

Three in four (75%) Hartlepool residents say they are satisfied with the public parks and open spaces in their area. Those in the wider Hartlepool area (84%) are more satisfied. By contrast satisfaction is lower among residents living in NRF areas. Public parks and open spaces are, however, the most used local services by Hartlepool residents (56%).

The services included within this SDO review perform well and were often taken for granted but when performing poorly they have a significant impact to individuals, communities and the town as a whole.

The transformational aspect in delivering these services occurred as part of the management restructure. Client and contractor services for Parks and Countryside and Horticultural services merged and street cleansing devolved to Neighbourhood Management, in recognition that not one size

fits all.

The efficiency target of £185K has been partly achieved through;

- Early Retirement/Voluntary Redundancies from Parks and Countryside, Environmental Action and Street Cleansing services made as part of the Neighbourhood Services management structures contributing towards this SDO review equating to £105k
- Football academy partnership with HCFE £25k

The remainder of the efficiency target could be achieved through the

- Decentralisation of street cleansing service by transferring town wide services to neighbourhood management £20k
- Focus on replacing existing litter bin and dog foul bin bins £10k
- Review leasing arrangements and spare capacity of street cleansing vehicle provision £25k

The services included within this review would continue to review working practices to be more effective and efficient through multi-skilling environment operatives and protecting frontline services.

It was also recommended that a business case is developed for a horticulture nursery in Hartlepool as a growth opportunity for the Council; the business case should consider all options for Tanfield Road and other suitable sites.

The options considered as part of the review include:-

- a) Sell Tanfield Nursery.
- b) Buy plants in.
- c) Outsource service.
- d) Reduce service standards.
- e) Invest and develop the Nursery
- f) Introduce Café/catering facilities for Cemetery and Nursery visitors.

Cabinet Members supported the proposals around the development of the Tanfield Nursery. There was concern at the loss of the additional staff supported by the Working Neighbourhoods Fund (WNF) in the Stranton/Grange area and also the general reduction in front line services the public see on a daily basis. The Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods commented that the department had been working towards incorporating the NDC area provision as the end date for those services had been known and plans had been put in place. The total cessation of WNF by the government had been anticipated but as finance was not in place; there was little option but to cutback these services.

The Mayor welcomed the savings that were being achieved through the Business Transformation process particularly as the savings were now at the higher end of the range originally anticipated. However, the level of cuts

now required due to the grant reductions announced by the government would make these savings not the solution they were originally anticipated to be but only part way to what was required. It was highlighted by both Directors that the SDO's that were still to come to Cabinet, the year 3 reviews, would be briefer than the year 2 reviews currently submitted and would tackle substantially greater budgets and savings.

Decision

1. That the savings the £130,000 savings already achieved as outlined in section 10 of the main report be noted.
2. That the preferred efficiency savings as outlined in section 10 of the main report be approved.
3. That the development of a business case for a horticultural nursery in Hartlepool as a growth opportunity for the Council be noted and approved.

89. Business Transformation – Service Delivery Review Options Analysis Report for Engineering Consultancy (*Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods*)

Type of decision

Key Decision Test (i) applies. Forward Plan Ref: RN 12/09.

Purpose of report

To inform Cabinet of the findings of the Building and Engineering Consultancy service delivery options review and the options appraisal aspect of the review.

Issue(s) for consideration by Cabinet

The Assistant Director (Resources) outlined the Options Report for the Building and Engineering Consultancy Service Delivery Option Review. The service delivery review had an efficiency savings target of £120,000 which was a 5% savings target of a budget initially assessed at £3 million (The initial savings target was £154,000, but £34,000 had been moved to the Integrated Transport Unit SDO which was a Year 3 review).

The aim of this review was to explain what the service does, the purpose and value of the services provided and how services were currently provided and could be provided in the future.

The two Consultancies within the Regeneration and Neighbourhoods Department currently provide a full range of design, inspection (conformity) and professional advice to all client departments within the council and to external clients.

Both Consultancies operate very much like an external consultant and have had efficiency as a priority in order to provide quality and value to the

various Clients. They could be viewed as a cost or an overhead, similar to Facility Management Services, but they should collectively be perceived as an integral part of the Council's business. The vision of the consultancies was to establish the services as key strategic business units that add value to services, and provided, with other elements within the Business Division, the delivery mechanism for Council's and Schools Capital Programme.

The most significant challenge faced by the Building Consultancy is the Building Schools for the Future (BSF) and Education Capital Programmes. In BSF the team are providing the Council's client agent role in technical project management (one member of staff sits within the Schools Transformation Team). This involvement will be developed in relation to design support, ICT integration with the Design and Build Contractor, and the provision of Contract Management for the Dyke House and ICT infrastructure projects to other schools. It was anticipated that the BSF programme of new build / refurbishment would extend over all secondary schools for a five-year period but unfortunately this will not now be the case. The autumn spending review may allocate additional capital funding for schools although not on the same scale as BSF or indeed the original primary capital programme. There will be a need to resource to whatever the requirements are either internally or externally. The extent of the allocation is unknown and this presents a risk for the future.

Both the Engineering and Building Consultancies have statutory functions which must be undertaken. These include: -

Building Consultancy

- Gas safety inspections,
- Legionella monitoring and
- Periodical electrical testing and inspection.

The relatively small budgets allocated to these functions is subsidised by the fee earning activities.

Engineering Consultancy

- Contaminated Land
- Coast Protection
- Land drainage

Cabinet has previously agreed to the centralisation of budgets relating to property which includes building maintenance. The Building Consultancy provides the client role in specifying, procuring and monitoring work to safeguard the Council. These elements are the responsibility of the Building Consultancy to deliver in the most efficient and effective way on behalf of the Council for all Council buildings (whether in-house or via external means).

Based on the performance management and benchmarking information the

review team focused on three areas to identify the overall efficiencies required to achieve the £120k target for this SDO review.

- i. Change to current service arrangements
- ii. Growth and income generation
- iii. Procurement and the negotiation of existing contracts

A number of routes were available for the procurement and delivery of this service.

- The In-house Option Approach
- Framework Arrangement
- Joint Venture Company (JVC) or Private/Public Partnership
- Outsourcing
- Public / Public Partnership Arrangement

It should be noted that although the options highlighted above were considered as discrete approaches, in reality they represent a sliding scale between in-house delivery at one end and full outsourcing at the other. In between these extremes, the approaches differ mainly in the level of risk and ownership transferred by the Council. Drawing upon the considerations outlined in the main report the review team concluded that a mix of the in-house focused structure with a Framework support arrangement appears to fit most closely with the requirements of the SDO and is the preferred option. However, a future mid to long term option could be to investigate a Public / Public arrangement with other Tees Valley authorities. If the future shape of the authority takes more of a commissioning direction rather than as a provider, then this option would need to be reviewed.

A workshop has already been established by the Tees Valley “Chief Engineers” group which was currently developing a protocol for collaborative working amongst the Tees Valley Local Authorities. This was an initial step towards a public / public arrangement. Indications were that Hartlepool were well placed to provide consultancy services in certain technical areas and would be able to generate income through this process.

The Engineering Consultancy is currently engaged on a Coast Protection Management Strategy which is expected to lead to significant grant funding, currently estimated at around £30M over the next few years. By maintaining an in house Consultancy to manage the process as well as design and manage the construction works, the associated grant funded fees will provide significant income to the Authority.

In terms of frameworks the Regional Improvement and Efficiency Partnership were proposing to set up regional frameworks for technical consultants and construction works. There would be an opportunity to use this facility although the timing and nature of this was uncertain at present.

One of the few budgets that is available to the Building Consultancy team from central resource is a £60,000 Legionella budget for management and

control within public buildings. It was anticipated that savings in this budget could meet the required target. This would be achieved by already established reductions in costs including associated contracts and expected efficiencies across the consultancy as a whole and anticipated income from future workload together with changes to working practices and use of technology (e.g. mobile working).

The Engineering Consultancy efficiency saving of £60,000 would be achieved through operational improvements as set out in paragraph 10.3 of the main report. This would reduce costs and generate increased fee income and would yield a saving/surplus in the Engineering Consultancy management account of £60k which could be passed on to the Council's General Fund Budget to achieve the target.

The preferred option was to progress an In-House Focused Structure with a Framework Support Arrangement. In the short term this approach would involve the Council retaining responsibility for driving, implementing and delivering the Building and Engineering Consultancy service. With a core in-house workforce the approach would require the procurement of a framework agreement with a number of external consultants. This would allow access to a wider pool of resources and the opportunity to share expertise and possibly training and costs etc.

It was also the preferred option that the in-house teams continue their responsibility for the variety of statutory functions, retain key design capacity and develop their income generating capability. There were potential opportunities in delivering services to public sector partners such as the Cleveland Fire Brigade and the PCT currently being approved.

The Consultancies would manage and co-ordinate the day to work and individual procurements and projects. Framework consultants would be engaged on a call off basis to support the internal service. Equally, the Consultancies would lead on the procurement of consultants and contractors to undertake the design and construction of projects.

The Consultancies would benefit from establishing closer working relationships through this framework agreement, with a selection of suppliers to ease the procurement process and ensure that it works effectively.

Since this approach is lead by the Consultancies and involved use of framework consultants as and when required, it provided the most flexibility of the discussed options. This was important in allowing the opportunity for the Consultancies to develop and amend their strategy and approach with relative freedom. An in-house approach did not require a significant up-front procurement process, which could delay the whole SDO initiative and result in a loss of momentum. External involvement could be procured as and when required such that real progress can be made quickly.

A subsequent element of the preferred option was that the Consultancies

should be the “first port of call” for any departmental requirement. It would be the responsibility of the Consultancies to deliver based on the best solution available.

In the medium to longer term this SDO Review would need to be revisited in the light of future capital programmes.

Regional/sub-regional collaboration strategies were currently being considered. There was a Regional Improvement and Efficiency Partnership project looking at the potential of a regional framework of consultants, and this option may be a way forward in the medium term. In addition, Tees Valley collaborative working would be considered.

Depending on what the shape of the Authority might be in the longer term, there may be a drive in the future for a more commissioning role (with a client base) and with the service provision externalised or via a public/public or public/private partnership.

Members welcomed the move to ensuring the income generation of the service and considered it an imperative that all departments used the service. Should they not, then this should be reported and explained to Members.

Decision

1. That the alternative delivery models which were stated in Section 8 of the main report be noted.
2. That the preferred option as stated in Section 9 of the main report be approved and the intention to review this in the light of future capital programmes and potential partnerships and collaborative arrangements is noted.
3. That the strategy to achieve £120,000 of savings which was stated in Section 10 of the main report is approved.

90. Business Transformation – Regeneration and Neighbourhood Management Service Delivery Options Review (*Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods*)

Type of decision

Key Decision test ii applies. Forward Plan reference Number RN 35/10.

Purpose of report

To seek Cabinet approval to recommended efficiencies relating to the Regeneration and Neighbourhood Management (NM) SDO review. The review has an efficiency target of 7.5% of baseline budgets, which equates to circa £60,000.

Issue(s) for consideration by Cabinet

The Assistant Director (Neighbourhood Services) reported on the services covered in the review cut across the Community Regeneration Team, the Major Projects and regional/sub-regional engagement sections of the Urban and Planning Policy Team and the Community Engagement and Empowerment aspect of Neighbourhood Management, reflecting strong joint working arrangements required to deliver regeneration in the town.

Since the scope was agreed in May 2010, in year cuts had been announced which together with the outcome of the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) in Autumn may result in the reduction and / or potential future loss of WNF funding which may hit local community engagement and empowerment mechanisms hard. As such the Community Network function has been included within the scope of this review.

Numerous options examining Community Development and Empowerment across the north east region had been explored regarding the future shape of how the Authority continued to provide these services in the future. The current structures for engagement in Neighbourhood Management were the Neighbourhood Action Plan (NAP) forums which feed into the Neighbourhood Consultative Forums (NCFs) and from there into the Hartlepool Partnership and the Council. This formal structure was underpinned by a number of resident associations and groups which operate at neighbourhood level and were the lifeblood of the consultation structures.

Hartlepool Community Network leads the Strengthening Communities theme of the Community Strategy and supports the capacity of people to be involved. Hartlepool Voluntary Development Agency hosts the Community Network, which was currently funded by Working Neighbourhoods Funds. Options regarding the shape of the function were set out in the report, and would be considered as part of the overall WNF review currently underway.

The regeneration landscape, availability of funding and Government focus and priorities towards regeneration are continually changing. The report identifies and highlights some initiatives/projects which had been undertaken over the years. An important role of the Major Regeneration team was its engagement at the Tees Valley level. Strategic involvement with TV partners had helped to secure recognition of Hartlepool's regeneration objectives in influential policy documents which in turn had also ensured significant funding investment had been secured.

The Government's Big Society seeks to make society stronger by getting more people to work together to run their own affairs locally. It aims to put more power and responsibility into the hands of families, groups, networks, neighbourhoods and locally based communities and to generate more community organisers, neighbourhood groups, volunteers, social enterprises and small businesses. Such aspirations could not be achieved without support and although Hartlepool is fairly well advanced in terms of

community engagement, volunteering and social enterprise development, the broad skills which exist within the various teams involved in neighbourhood management and community regeneration would be important in facilitating such activity. New Local Government and Localism Bills are expected to be published later this year, which would give further direction and indication of Government policy.

As part of the SDO review the future shape of community development and engagement has been considered at the same time as providing efficiencies within the system to achieve the £60,000 efficiency target. Options for which are referred to within the body of this report. However with the impending cuts in public monies to be announced as part of the upcoming CSR, it makes sense to wait until the council receives more details regarding the Big Society, Area Based Grants and WNF before determining the final outcome.

Cabinet acknowledged that the new Localism Bill would have a significant effect on this area of service and that some radical decisions may need to be taken. Cabinet Members did feel that the voluntary sector did need to build itself up to be in a position to take full advantage of the changes that were coming, particularly in bidding to provide local services. These groups could not complain if the local authority commissioned services from out of town providers if they had not prepared themselves adequately for the tendering process. With the finances that were to be available to the council, there would be little room for sentiment.

There was also a call for the ending of the neighbourhood forums at the earliest opportunity. The very low attendance by the public at these meetings was sited as the main reason. There were other Cabinet Members who considered that the forums would be best placed to meet the requirements of the Localism Bill and the government's Big Society.

Decision

1. That the SDO savings as follows are approved:-
 - Neighbourhood Services Management Structure £20,000 as identified in 4.13 of the main report.
 - Specialist and technical support to strategic partners £40,000, as referred to in the main report paragraph 6.8.
2. That officers are authorised to determine appropriate arrangements (including structures) to deliver an agreed future shape of Community Engagement and Empowerment which reflects the integration of relevant services to be reported back to Cabinet. This should include consideration of the potential cessation of current functions and activities.

91. Business Transformation – Overview Report for Adult and Social Care Provider Services - Service Delivery Options (SDO's) *(Director of Child and Adult Services)*

Type of decision

Key decision Test (i) applies. Forward Plan Ref: CAS 79/10.

Purpose of report

To seek Cabinet approval for both the recommended efficiencies within adult social care services commencing from April 2011 and the potential direction of travel in respect of service re-design. This SDO has an efficiency target of £169,000 which is 5% of a total budget of £3.3m.

Issue(s) for consideration by Cabinet

The Adult and Public Health Services Portfolio Holder and the Director of Child and Adult Services outlined the overview report for Adult Social Care Provider Services' (SDOs) including the appendices setting out the detailed efficiency savings within the Disability Day Opportunities, Direct Care and Support and the Mental Health (MH) and Learning Disability (LD) Services, commencing, subject to approval, in April 2011. The overview report also set out a potential direction of travel over the next eighteen months: to re-model services in line with the government agenda to modernise adult social care services through self-directed support, personalisation and actively explore the potential of making greater use of trading opportunities and social enterprises as these relatively recent developments are now being more actively considered by some Local Authority's in preference to 'outsourcing'.

In relation to the identified efficiency of £169,000 this would be realised by:

- Re-modelling the currently separate LD and MH employment and community support services into a single, integrated progressive service for all people with disabilities or mental health issue. This would maximise capacity, reduce waste and duplication and release vacancies, generating an efficiency of £59,229.
- Re-modelling the Disability Day Opportunities Service and the deletion of a part-time vacancy would generate a saving of £10,072.
- Re-modelling the Direct Care and Support Service and in doing so deleting a supervisor post to create a flatter management structure; transferring some staff into the new LD and MH employment and community support service; re-negotiating contracts of employment for some staff to ensure there is one universal contract for all direct care staff; refreshing the training of staff in relation to re-ablement; releasing 'managed' vacancies. This would generate an efficiency saving of £99,699.

This early remodelling work would ensure the services were fit for purpose

and were efficiently managed. One of the longer term options for service transformation could be the development of a Local Authority Trading Company (LATC) or staff cooperative/social enterprise (SE) who could run these services in 2011/12. Appendices 2, 3, and 4 to the report referred to the three SDOs relating to the efficiency target of £169,000.

The option of developing a LATC or SE would include the following service areas:

- Mental Health and Learning Disability Employment and Community Support
- Disability Day Opportunities
- Direct Care and Support Services; including Re-ablement and Telecare

The creation of a LATC or SE would represent a significant shift in the way the Council operates and delivers its social care services. The benefit of both these models is that they would be able to trade on the open market, develop innovative services in response to people's choices and offer their services to other LAs.

Specifically in relation to LATCs, Councils had the power to create a LATC under the Local Government Act 2003. Within this specific model of service delivery the LA owns 100% of the shares and company profits can either be put back into the LA's budgets or be re-invested in the development services provided by the LATC.

Consideration would be given to developing a LATC or SE on a sub-regional or regional basis to maximise economies of scale, reduce risk and potentially develop a broader range of initiatives.

This aspect of the SDO would also consider the optimum model of service delivery to address the early intervention / preventative agenda for people with low or moderate needs within the Fair Access to Care Services (FACS) eligibility criteria. One further option, amongst all the other competing options, was to use a Local Area Co-ordination model, and this could involve considering the potential transfer of some staff / funding to a Connected Care Community type of Community Interest Company (CIC) which would enable the roll out of this based model across the borough. Preventative models were recognised as being important as they were proven to reduce or delay the number of people needing more expensive services further downstream.

The proposals in the report delivered £169,000 of savings which was in line with the Business Transformation target. If Cabinet decides to refrain from endorsing these proposals then the savings would have to be found from other, unplanned cuts across adult social care services.

The direction of travel set out in the report achieved the required efficiencies, re-models services in line with the personalisation agenda and

establishes an infrastructure that could be potentially 'driven' in any direction of the Council's choosing. Importantly the SDO provided a framework to think more radically about the future of adult social care in Hartlepool and laid out the intention to actively explore the potential of transferring some services to a LATC or, if desired, potentially support some staff to develop some form of SE or even make better use of the Local Area Co-ordination model CIC in 2011/2012.

It was anticipated that those services retained within the LA would focus on other social care statutory responsibilities and the core business of safeguarding vulnerable adults and the assessment and care management functions of adult social care, thereby managing the most complex cases and supporting the most vulnerable people in Hartlepool. However, even within this model there was still the option of joining up some services on a sub-regional basis. Appendix 1 to the report set out one potential model for this direction of travel.

Cabinet considered that there were voluntary and charity groups in the town providing some excellent mental health and learning disability services. Cabinet was concerned that the valuable input from these organisations should not be lost.

The Director commented that she believed that a joint approach to something like a LATC was the only way forward as Hartlepool was not large enough to develop a truly sustainable service on its own.. Work had been carried out to ensure that the services worked more effectively and there had also been significant de-layering of management structures to ensure greater efficiency. The Director stated that she had full confidence that the services provided after the implementation of the review would provide good, safe services to people in Hartlepool. .

Decision

1. That the recommended options for achieving £169,000 of efficiencies through implementing the SDOs set out in section 4.2 of the report and at appendices 2, 3 and 4 are approved.
2. That the recommended direction of travel over the next eighteen months, as set out in the report, is endorsed; that is to undertake further research, analysis and debate to determine the potential scope of and business case for the re-design of adult social care services to include the option of developing a Local Authority Trading Company or Staff Cooperative/Social enterprise, if staff and Council were so inclined, or make better use of Local Area Co-ordination in 2011/2012, subject to a further report being submitted to Cabinet.

The meeting concluded at 10.10 a.m.

P J DEVLIN
CHIEF SOLICITOR
PUBLICATION DATE: 11 NOVEMBER 2010