

APPENDIX A.I

Internal Governance Review: Recommendations Table

	Recommendation	Comments	Status
1	The constitution is not current in some areas referenced by the Armada Way Learning Review and would benefit from being made current at the next planned refresh.	This is being implemented as part of the full constitutional health check being undertaken at present	In progress – external consultant engaged.
2	Consider introducing stage gate reviews in relation to key Capital Programme decisions, as recommended in the Delivery Management & Governance section further below.	Already included in the Capital Programme Handbook	Complete
3	Consider a single route for chair-of-scrutiny-committee agreement i.e., the Overview & Scrutiny Committee, as per 2012 regulations.	Already correct and in accordance with legislation however constitutional amendment required to make sure correct title is used ie: Chair of Overview Scrutiny and Management Committee	Complete subject constitutional amendment
4	Consider amending the requirements on 'agreement' and 'reasonableness' such that they are taken together in the same forum, rather than each taken separately in different forums.	Relevant provisions reviewed and already correct and in accordance with the wording of the legislation	Complete
5	Consider a mandatory stay period - say 24 hours - before implementing urgent decisions, unless an objectively evidenced emergency condition exists, in which case the stay may be waived, but only with formal justification recorded and published at the point of decision.	Definition of urgent decisions means it requires immediate implementation, therefore recommend that the Chair of OMSC is given 24 hours to review the decision before making a decision as to urgency	Complete subject to minor constitutional amendment
6	The urgency provisions would benefit from clarification and consistent assignment of responsibilities.	Provisions have been reviewed and whilst correct in terms of the legislative	Complete subject to final review by external consultant

		requirements would benefit from a refresh and greater clarity	and constitutional clarification
7	Consider adding agreement to the reasonableness of [urgent] decisions to Part B, para 10.6.	Legislation requires that the decision cannot be reasonably deferred. The wording in the constitution includes reasonableness considerations but is not consistent throughout. This will require minor amendment	Complete subject final review by external consultant and constitutional clarification
8	Part G, para 5.6: consider replacing the words “you are encouraged to”, to “you should always”.	Reviewed and this suggestion is not agreed	Complete – no further action
9	Consider setting out the ‘recording of advice requirements’ in the next constitution refresh, as recommended elsewhere in this review.	Formal decisions already enhanced with legal and financial implications. Other templates being reviewed for addition of the same standard advice sections. Consider requirements for recording of informal decisions, for example a decision taken by the Leader to take a decision himself rather than by cabinet.	Partially complete. Review of the recording of informal decisions required
10	No changes to the Leader’s Scheme of Delegation recommended.	No action required	Complete – no further action
11	Consider clarifying the downward limits of Tier 1 delegation.	Agreed requires amendment to definitions of Chief Officers, Strategic Directors and Services Directors to include removals of references to Tiers 1 and 2	Review complete – constitutional update required
12	Consider publishing officer delegations more widely.	A fully review of the Officer Scheme of	Ongoing – to be completed as part of

		Delegation is required and will be undertaken as part of the constitutional review	the full review of the constitution
13	@ Part G, section 2.5 of the constitution, consider replacing 'anything necessary' with 'anything necessary and lawful'.	Agreed – constitution to be amended	Complete subject to amendment to constitution
14	It is for the Council to determine the balance of Pros & Cons that is right for it, but the case for change does not seem strong. In considering whether to extend the forward plan, and duration of any extension, also consider:	The Council's use of the forward plan has been reviewed. The Council currently complies with the 28-day minimum requirement and there is no proposal to set a time limit above this, however, officers are encouraged to ensure that large projects/decisions are placed on the forward plan as early as possible.	Complete – requests of officers are made on a regular basis for matters which could be placed on the forward plan as soon as it is established that a decision is likely to be taken within the next 3 – 6 months
15	Consider re-drafting Capital Programme Officer Group (CPOG) terms of reference to better reflect its contribution to the Capital Programme.	The terms of reference have been reviewed as suggested and updated by the s151 Officer. They now require annual consideration by CPOG.	Complete subject to approval by CPOG
16	Consider re-drafting the Capital Programme Board (CPB) terms of reference to improve the assessment of delivery challenges and risks.	The TOR have been amended and are subject to an annual review by CPB	Complete subject to final approval by CPOG
17	Consider re-drafting the Capital Handbook – see Capital Handbook Review - to address factual inaccuracies and omissions.	A review of the Capital Programme Handbook has been undertaken by the s151 Officer and amendments made which require sign off at the CPOG	Complete subject to formal approvals

18	Portfolio holders should not hold memberships of Officer led capital project delivery boards.	Each directorate to review its own internal project delivery boards to ensure that only officers are members of such boards.	Ongoing – Strategic Directors to review and report back to CMT.
19	Consider requiring the Scrutiny Management Board to review Capital scheme decisions that are Key decisions.	Scrutiny Management board reviews all key decisions on the forward plan. They review the Leader's forward plan at every meeting to decide which decisions will be on forthcoming agendas. Agenda setting sessions take place regularly to decide which matters will be considered by the Scrutiny Committees.	Complete but subject to ongoing review with the relevant decision-making processes as to which matters are placed before Scrutiny Management Board