



Sow & Penk

Internal Drainage Board

Virtual Meeting

Microsoft Teams

Log-in Instructions to be issued nearer the date

Meeting Papers

Wednesday 3 February 2021

Meeting at 11:00am



Shire

Group of IDBs

**Epsom House
Malton Way
Adwick le Street
Doncaster DN6 7FE**

T: 01302 337798

info@shiregroup-idbs.gov.uk

www.shiregroup-idbs.gov.uk

Meeting Papers

Prepared by:

Clerk - Craig Benson BA Business Studies

Engineer - Paul Jones ONC, HNC, BSc (Hons) MSc (Eng) GMICE

Finance Officer - David Blake BSc (Hons) Accounting

Finance Officer - Mark Joynes BSc (Hons) Mathematics

Rating Officer - Janette Parker

Purpose

These meeting papers have been prepared solely as a record for the Internal Drainage Board. JBA Consulting accepts no responsibility or liability for any use that is made of this document other than by the Drainage Board for the purposes for which it was originally commissioned and prepared.

Carbon Footprint



A printed copy of the main text in this document will result in a carbon footprint of 173g if 100% post-consumer recycled paper is used and 220g if primary-source paper is used. These figures assume the report is printed in black and white on A4 paper and in duplex.

Agenda

| | | |
|------------|--|-----------|
| 1. | Governance | 4 |
| 1.1 | Apologies | 4 |
| 1.2 | Declaration of Interest..... | 4 |
| 1.3 | Complaints and FOI..... | 4 |
| 1.4 | Minutes of Meeting 18 November 2020..... | 4 |
| 1.5 | Matters arising there from not elsewhere on the Agenda..... | 8 |
| 2. | Clerk's Report | 9 |
| 2.1 | Policy | 9 |
| 2.2 | Legislation..... | 9 |
| 2.3 | Environment Agency..... | 9 |
| 2.4 | Bank Mandate..... | 9 |
| 2.5 | ADA..... | 9 |
| 2.6 | Board Key Performance Indicators..... | 10 |
| 3. | Financial Report..... | 11 |
| 3.1 | Rating Report..... | 11 |
| 3.2 | Schedule of Payments..... | 12 |
| 3.3 | Audit..... | 12 |
| 3.4 | Budget Estimates, Rates and Special Levies for the Year Ending 31 March 2022 | 13 |
| 3.5 | Five Year Budget Estimate | 15 |
| 4. | Engineer's Report..... | 16 |
| 4.1 | Asset Management..... | 16 |
| 4.2 | Planning, pre-application advice, consents, enforcement | 16 |
| 5. | Health and Safety Report | 17 |
| 5.1 | Accidents, Incidents and near misses | 17 |
| 5.2 | COVID-19 | 17 |
| 6. | Environmental Adviser's Report | 18 |
| 6.1 | Legislation..... | 18 |
| 6.2 | Policy | 18 |
| 7. | Any Other Business | 18 |
| 8. | Date of Next Meeting | 18 |
| 9. | APPENDIX A – ADA Letter to IDB Members | 19 |
| 10. | APPENDIX B – Minutes of the Audit Review Meeting | 22 |
| 11. | APPENDIX C – Risk Register..... | 24 |

1. Governance

1.1 Apologies

1.2 Declaration of Interest

1.3 Complaints and FOI

1.4 Minutes of Meeting 18 November 2020

Present

Ray Sutherland (RS)
Len Bates (LB)
Frances Beatty (FB)
Ralph Cooke (RC)
Andrew Harp (AH)
Angela Loughran (AL)
Mark Winnington (ML)
Neil Brown (NB)
Anthony Parrot (AP)
Jeff Sim (JS)

Also in attendance on behalf of Staffordshire Borough Council:

Phil Bates (PB)

In attendance on behalf of JBA Consulting, Clerk, Engineer and Environmental Adviser:

Craig Benson (Clerk to the Board)
Paul Jones (Engineer to the Board)
David Blake (Finance Officer to the Board)
Janette Parker (Rating Officer to the Board)

Kevin Haseldine (KH)
Ben Howlett (BH)

Apologies for Absence

2020.50 None received.

Hydraulic Modelling

2020.51 RS proposed this be covered first as KH and BH were in attendance from the commissioned contractor JBA to give a presentation on the completed model. BH & KH introduced themselves to members with KH beginning the presentation by explaining what had been undertaken on behalf of the Board and what information had been utilised. BH then explained how the model had been built and the results generated.

2020.52 MW stated that it had been very interesting and that whilst he understood the concept there was a lot of technical data which was slightly confusing. He then queried in terms of the 100-year floods what quantity of water was being used. KH responded that in terms of technicality they had maps of the results which would help put this into context. He added that it was not possible to put a figure on the quantity of water as this varied between each catchment, as could be seen on the report provided, and that the flow rate had been calculated for each system. MW continued by stating that whilst it was great having the model and appreciating the different catchments it was a problem being a Local Councillor on how to refer that back to the person in the street, asking what happened if there was another high amount of rainfall and could it show the effect of say 3

inches of rainfall and the subsequent resulting problems and 10 inches and the results. BH pointed out that there were challenges in FRM and it was very hard to put to a real event. He added that data from a real event could be utilised by adding a probability to it and then back tracing it but pointed out that the results from the model could be taken to inform questions to produce a subsequent report. Eng referred to the Smart PDF's that had been produced from the model and distributed to members prior to the meeting stating that modelling outputs had been put into a format that was useful to members and FRM partners visually trying to demonstrate what the worst case scenarios may look like. He stated that these would help the Board focus and prioritise its activities as well as help to demonstrate why the Board does what it does. He then added as a reference point that a 1 in 10-year rainfall event is seen as a quarter inch runoff in 24 hours. RS noted that the maps were available on the Board's website but that somewhat confusing to those not technically minded and requested that a training session be arranged for members where the maps could be explained in more simplistic terms. Eng confirmed this could be arranged. FB queried information provided regarding Millmeece and if referred to water levels. KH advised that the map showed the ground elevations and then demonstrated the model outputs of different flood event scenarios. FB then asked if the IDB was in a position to look at innovative solutions or would that be the EA responsibility. Eng advised that flood mitigation was reviewed by Lead Local Flood Authorities and the EA and the IDB role was to work with RMA's in reporting on flood activities. RS asked in what way did the Board liaise with LFA Planning consultees. Eng advised that IDB's relationships with Local Planning Authorities was based on the Land Drainage Act and that they commented on any application that affected a watercourse. JS advised that the EA were updating their flood model of Stafford which was due in April and asked if the model information should be shared with them. He also asked if the model gave the options to change management of drains, for example Doxey Marshes which was a low lying nature reserve had a main drain running through which was cleared every year but were there options shown to change this on a rotational basis. Eng advised that the model was part funded by the EA so there were aware of the results. He added that with regard to Doxey Marshes the model was not specific on rotation, do nothing scenarios and vegetated flood outlines had been produced and could see what the impact of these would be and the information could then be used to review systems moving forwards. RS thanked BH & KH for their presentation and they left the meeting.

Declaration of Interest

2020.53 None.

Complaints and Freedom of Information Requests

2020.54 None.

Minutes of the Last Meeting

2020.55 Minutes of the last meeting held were considered, **proposed as a true record by FB, seconded AH, All in favour.**

Matters Arising

2020.56 FB advised in relation to item 2020.31 and the Stafford Brooks project that funding had now been authorised and was hopeful that this would now progress.

CLERK'S REPORT

2020.57 Policies for Adoption – Information noted.

2020.58 National Flood Risk Management Strategy – Information noted with Clerk advising that the Board's policy would need amending if significant changes were made.

2020.59 DEFRA – Precept and Highland Water Contributions – Information noted with Clerk advising that the review could result in the Board having to pay more Precept yet receive less Highland Water Contribution but believed there would be the possibility of consultation at some point in the process.

2020.60 Bank Mandate – Clerk reminded members that David Blake was the new Finance Officer to the Board and as such Board approval was required to add him to the list of signatories.
Approval proposed by FB, seconded TP.

2020.61 ADA – Clerk advised that Eng had attended on behalf of the Board and that, as a virtual meeting, it had been well attended. Eng informed members that the EA had confirmed that Grant In Aid had been doubled to 2.5 billion and that DEFRA had announced a Resilience Fund which would be for new projects looking at new ways of reducing flood risk and that applications could be made via Lead Local Flood Authorities. He then confirmed that he would issue information on this to all members after the meeting.

2020.62 KPI – Clerk advised that following the modelling outputs and the potential better understanding that the section “Reduction of Waterlogging and Flood Risk to Assets” could now be amended to “Good” and that this would be updated for the next meeting.

FINANCIAL REPORT

2020.63 Rating Report – FO confirmed that all Special Levy payments had now been received and that 90% of drainage rates had been collected with an outstanding balance of £1,270. He added that five accounts were now with Solicitors for further action.

2020.64 Schedule of Payments – **Approval of schedule proposed by FB, seconded AH.**

2020.65 Audit – Information noted.

2020.66 Budget Comparison for the Year Ended 31 March 2021 – FO advised that this had now been updated and that a copy would be sent to members after the meeting. He stated that the report was a snapshot against the budget set, noting that an additional £35,000 income had been received from the EA towards the model which had not been budgeted for. With regards expenditure he added that the County Show hadn’t happened due to the Covid restrictions so the budgeted £3,000 hadn’t been utilised but that the Catchment modelling had incurred an extra cost of £6,500, that the modelling of Penkridge had not been budgeted for and that BAP costs were due shortly. He concluded by stating that maintenance costs were where they would be expected to be in line with budget.

2020.67 Five Year Budget Estimate – FO again advised that the report had now been updated and that he would issue a copy to members after the meeting. He took members through the report advising that expenditure was now above budget with the increase being due to the unbudgeted Penkridge model but that this was offset by the additional funds received from the EA which had been expected in the previous financial year. FO then stated that the Boards reserve level would therefore be at 52% against the target of 60% and that in order to ensure income was greater than expenditure Years 1-5 on the report showed the expected income required to cover expenditure in order to meet the reserve level which foresaw a need to increase drainage rates. He then added that this was a live document being constantly reviewed and updated when new information was received. FB enquired as to what the £3,000 costs for the BAP related to. FO responded this was for the works carried out by the Staffordshire Wildlife Trust. JS confirmed that this covered the survey time and production of the report.

ENGINEER’S REPORT

2020.68 Hydraulic Modelling – Eng confirmed from earlier discussion that he would arrange a training session for members to clarify the results of the model.

2020.69 Penkridge – Eng advised that the desktop study had now been completed and that whilst part of Penkridge fell within the Board’s district the rivers that flowed through were Main River and therefore the responsibility of the EA. He said that the study gave an improved understanding of the flood risk to Penkridge and that this was severe for a number of properties referring to addresses provided in the papers. He added that the scoping report showed that the main river systems had significant parts which had been culverted and that it was interesting to note the ordinary watercourses outside the district that flowed into this catchment. He then advised that

the Consultants recommendations were that a more detailed model be undertaken in line with that recently completed for the full district and requested Board approval to approach the EA in relation to funding. **LB thanked Eng for excellent work done already and proposed that the Consultants recommendation be followed, FB seconded.**

2020.70 Ordinary Watercourses – Information noted.

2020.71 Enforcement – Eng advised that unconsented works had been carried out by the landowner to Seighford ponds on the Millian Brook system. He added that this was an IDB maintained ordinary watercourse and that the tenant had deepened and widened this without comment or consent and had also created a significant bund. He stated that the Board were in a difficult position regarding legal enforcement as under the LDA they could pursue an obstruction to flow of which there was none at present. The main issue surrounded future maintenance which would now be unfeasible with the current machinery as the watercourse had been widened. He advised that there had been a conversation with the tenant who stated they were not aware consent was required but that believed they could do the works as riparian owners. Eng suggested that the Board could request that the bund be removed and revert the maintenance to the responsibility of the landowner in future. MW stated he was not aware of this issue and asked why the work had been done, that if maintenance not undertaken what would be impact on Stafford itself and did the EA have an opinion. Eng responded that he was unaware of the reason for the works, the Board contractor had noted when attempting maintenance and highlighted the need for IDB consent with the tenant. Eng added that couldn't confirm but may have also needed planning permission and with regard to the EA, they would respond in terms of Main River but this was far enough away from Main River for them not to be involved. He did state that the information would be provided to them in terms of possible flood risk. MW declared an interest as Officer of the Borough Council stating that the issue needed reporting to both the Borough and County Council planning departments. Eng requested names of possible contacts. RS declared an interest as Chair of the Borough Planning Committee confirming that it was a Borough issue. MW stated that it affected both and advised Eng to contact Mike Brundy at the County Council and John Holmes at the Borough Council. NB added that he owned the land adjacent to the fishing ponds and stated that the works had made an enormous difference to him as, after having his fields under water last year, the water levels were now back to a normal level. He added that there would be no implications downstream as the water fed into the channel under the motorway and that during flood conditions the water went back upstream as due to the hard channel roadway and concrete pillars of the motorway bridge the water couldn't get out at that end. FB stated that the Board should go with the recommendation to transfer maintenance to the landowner as it was the simplest solution. Eng concurred this could be done despite any further action being taken by the Councils and recommended that the bund be removed as well. **RS agreed and requested approval to FB suggestion that maintenance be transferred to the owner and that the bund be removed. AH seconded, All in favour.**

HEALTH & SAFETY REPORT

2020.72 Information noted. Clerk advised of the recent outbreak of Avian Flu and that the Board's Contractor had been informed to ensure their bio-security policy and risk assessments were up to date and that any sightings of dead birds should be reported to DEFRA.

ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISER'S REPORT

2020.73 Legislation – Information noted.

2020.74 Biodiversity Action Plan – Clerk stated that this had been reviewed for the last 5 years by the Board's Environment Officer and the report was attached with the meeting papers. He then added that the proposals for 2020 to 2020 were also attached which had been produced with JS and the Staffordshire Wildlife Trust and required Board approval. **TP proposed approval of, AH seconded.**

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

2020.75 TP advised members of the recent death of John Hilderley who had been ill for some time. Members requested a letter be sent from the Board stating how much he had contributed and how much he would be missed. RS concurred with the Clerk confirming this would be done and adding that it was a sad loss of a founder member of the Board. It was also agreed that flowers would be sent to his wife.

2020.76 LB asked for advice on who he could contact regarding flooding problems in Great Worley. MW suggested Kath Berry. LB advised that was who had contacted him. AH suggested contacting the County Council. MW then added that Kath Berry needed to contact the flood team at the County Council.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

2020.77 RS thanked everyone for their contributions and confirmed the date of the next meeting as 3 February 2021.

1.5 Matters arising there from not elsewhere on the Agenda

2. Clerk's Report

Recommendation:

- Members note information contained in the Report

2.1 Policy

The Board policies have been reviewed. Most require a minor alteration to change the reference to the Clerk or Chairman. The Board's Policy Statement will require changing to reflect the new objectives as detailed in the National Flood & Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy.

2.2 Legislation

Nothing to report.

2.3 Environment Agency

Flood and Coastal Resilience and Innovation program deadline has been extended to 29 January 2021 for those Local Authorities who are leading on submitting an "Expression of Interest".

2.4 Bank Mandate

The Financial Officer has been added to the Bank Mandate as a signatory on the accounts.

2.5 ADA

Following on from the Government's announcement in Spring that it was looking to phase out the use of red diesel as part of its drive to reduce carbon emissions and improve air quality.

ADA have been asked by DEFRA to respond on behalf of the IDB community to the public consultation with regard to the reforms to the tax treatment of red diesel and quantify the scale of the impact on the sector. DEFRA's informal view, at this stage, is that IDBs would not be covered by the agricultural exemption.

ADA have therefore requested that each IDB forward their usage details for the year ending 31 March 20 to them, to enable ADA to respond on behalf of the industry. This information has been compiled and sent.

The ADA Chief Executive has also written a letter to all IDBs and this is attached at Appendix A.

2.6 Board Key Performance Indicators

| SOW & PENK INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD | Key Performance Indicators | | Inadequate | Work to be done | Adquate | Good | Very good |
|------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|------------|-----------------|---------|------|-----------|
| | Management of the Board | | | | | | |
| | | Compliance with Audit Requirements | | | | | |
| | | Health & Safety | | | | | |
| | | Partnership working | | | | | |
| | | Overall | | | | | |
| | Reduction of waterlogging & flood risk to assets | Asset Management | | | | | |
| | | Flood Risk Management Strategy | | | | | |
| | | Flooding - Learning Outcomes | | | | | |
| | | Overall | | | | | |
| | Environment | Water Framework Directive | | | | | |
| | | Invasive Species/Designated Sites | | | | | |
| | | Conservation & Biodiversity | | | | | |
| | | Biodiversity Action Plan | | | | | |
| | | Overall | | | | | |
| | Supporting | Financial Statements | | | | | |
| | | Receipt of Drainage Rates | | | | | |
| | | Governance Documentation | | | | | |
| | | Overall | | | | | |
| | Overall Performance | | | | | | |

3. Financial Report

Recommendation:

- To note the information contained in this report
- To approve the Rate Removals
- To approve the schedule of payments
- To approve the Risk Register
- To approve the Estimates for the Year Ending 31 March 2022

3.1 Rating Report

Details of the Rates and Special Levies issued, and payments received up to and including 15 January 2021: -

| | £ | £ |
|--|------------|--------------------------|
| Balance Brought forward at 1 April 2020 | | 826.58 |
| 2020/2021 Drainage Rates and Special Levies | | |
| Drainage Rates | | 11,359.35 |
| Special Levies | | |
| Stafford Borough Council | 106,099.00 | |
| South Staffordshire District Council | 3,873.00 | 109,972.00 |
| Total Drainage Rates Due | | <u>122,157.93</u> |
| Less Paid:- | | |
| Drainage Rates | | 11,326.31 |
| Special Levies | | |
| Stafford Borough Council | 106,099.00 | |
| South Staffordshire District Council | 3,873.00 | 109,972.00 |
| Total Drainage Rates Paid | | <u>121,298.31</u> |
| Rate Refunds (overpayments) | | 294.73 |
| Balance Outstanding as at 15 January 2021 | | <u>1,154.35</u> |

| PROPOSED RATE REMOVALS – FOR BOARD APPROVAL | | | | |
|---|--------------|-----------------|---------------------|--|
| ACCOUNT | HECTARES | A.V. | RATES TO BE REMOVED | REASON |
| 1 | 15.134 | 879.00 | 58.45 | Now Special Levy – Sports Ground |
| 2 | 2.133 | 237.00 | 15.76 | Now Special Levy – Residential Development |
| TOTALS | 17.27 | 1,116.00 | 74.21 | |

3.2 Schedule of Payments

Payments made since those reported at the previous meeting:

| DATE | | REF | PAYEE | DESCRIPTION | TOTAL | |
|-------------|------|-------|--|----------------------------|-------------------|---|
| | | | | | £ | |
| 2020 | | | | | | |
| Oct | 15th | 19-20 | Environment Agency | Flood Defence Levy | 4,317.50 | |
| | | 21 | Littlehales Plant Hire Ltd | Maintenance | 44,483.70 | |
| | 30th | - | Lloyds Bank plc | Bank Fees | 6.26 | * |
| Nov | 2nd | - | Lloyds Bank plc | Lloyds Commercial Fees | 50.60 | * |
| | 11th | 22 | JBA Consulting | Management Services | 7,360.17 | |
| | | 25 | PKF Littlejohn | External Audit Fee 2019/20 | 480.00 | |
| | | 32 | EVO Payments International | Cardnet Fees | 41.82 | * |
| | 30th | - | Lloyds Bank plc | Bank Fees | 4.93 | * |
| Dec | 4th | - | Lloyds Bank plc | Lloyds Commercial Fees | 50.40 | * |
| | 10th | 35 | EVO Payments International | Closure Fees | 20.05 | * |
| | 24th | 29 | Littlehales Plant Hire Ltd | Maintenance | 45,707.51 | |
| | | 28 | Schofield Sweeney LLP | Legal Fees - Rate Demands | 90.00 | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | Total Amount of all Payments | | 102,612.94 | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | * Total Amount of Cheques sent out signed by the Clerk Only | | 174.06 | |

3.3 Audit

3.3.1 Internal Audit Review Meeting

The minutes of the meeting are attached at Appendix B.

3.3.2 Risk Register

Members are required to review and approve the Risk Register that is attached at Appendix C.

3.4 Budget Estimates, Rates and Special Levies for the Year Ending 31 March 2022

| | 2020/21 | | | | 2021/22 | |
|--|----------------|--------------------|----------------|---|---------------|----------------|
| Approved Estimate | | Estimated Out-Turn | | | | Estimate |
| £ | £ | £ | £ | | £ | £ |
| | | | | INCOME | | |
| | | | | Drainage Rates on Agricultural Land:- | | |
| 11,354 | | 11,360 | | 6.65p in £ on AV of £170,552 | 11,342 | |
| | | | | Special Levy:- | | |
| | | | | Stafford Borough Council | | |
| 106,099 | | 106,099 | | 6.65p in £ on AV of £1,638,785 | 108,979 | |
| | | | | South Staffs District Council | | |
| 3,873 | | 3,873 | | 6.65p in £ on AV of £58,240 | 3,873 | |
| 0 | | 35,000 | | EA Grant - Doxey & Tillington Marshes SSSI WLMP | 0 | |
| 0 | | 50 | | Other Income | 100 | |
| <u>200</u> | 121,526 | <u>150</u> | 156,532 | Interest etc | <u>200</u> | 124,493 |
| | | | | EXPENDITURE | | |
| 8,900 | | 8,635 | | Flood Defence Levy | 8,900 | |
| | | | | Conservation Budget: | | |
| 3,000 | | 3,000 | | Biodiversity Action Plan | 3,000 | |
| | | | | Maintenance: | | |
| 79,739 | | 80,615 | | Maintenance | 81,681 | |
| 30,730 | | 41,401 | | Catchment Modelling | 0 | |
| | | | | Administration: | | |
| 3,000 | | 0 | | County Showground | 3,000 | |
| <u>26,241</u> | <u>151,610</u> | <u>23,440</u> | <u>157,091</u> | Administration | <u>26,591</u> | <u>123,172</u> |
| | (30,084) | | (559) | Surplus - (Deficit) | | 1,321 |
| | <u>124,300</u> | | <u>92,431</u> | Balance Brought Forward | | <u>85,872</u> |
| | 94,216 | | 91,872 | | | 87,192 |
| | <u>6,000</u> | | <u>6,000</u> | Transfer To Doxey & Tillington Marshes Acc. | | <u>6,000</u> |
| | 88,216 | | 85,872 | Balance Carried Forward | | 81,192 |
| Previous Years Rates in the £ | | | | | | |
| 1995/1996 : 4p - 1996/1997 : 4.2p - 1997/1998 : 4.2p - 1998/1999 : 4.2p - 1999/2000 : 4.2p - 2000/2001 : 4.2p - 2001/2002 : 4.2p | | | | | | |
| 2002/2003 : 4.2p - 2003/2004 : 4.4p - 2004/2005 : 4.4p - 2005/2006 : 4.4p - 2006/2007 : 4.4p - 2007/08 : 4.4p - 2008/09 : 4.6p | | | | | | |
| 2009/10: 4.6p - 2010/11 : 4.6p - 2011/12 : 5p - 2012/13 : 5.4p - 2013/14 : 6p - 2014/15: 6.12p - 2015/16 : 6.12p - 2016/17 : 6.24p | | | | | | |
| 2017/18: 6.24p - 2018/19: 6.36p - 2019/20 : 6.5p - 2020/21 : 6.5p | | | | | | |
| Penny Rate : £18,245 | | | | | | |

| DOXEY & TILLINGTON MARSHES SSSI WLMP ACCOUNT | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|----------------------|
| | 2020/21 | | | | 2021/22 | |
| Approved Estimate | | Estimated Out-Turn | | | | Estimate |
| £ | £ | £ | £ | | £ | £ |
| | | | | INCOME | | |
| 6,000 | | 6,000 | | Transfer From Revenue | 6,000 | |
| <u>30</u> | 6,030 | <u>30</u> | 6,030 | Interest etc | <u>30</u> | 6,030 |
| | | | | EXPENDITURE | | |
| | | | | Maintenance: | | |
| 1,230 | | 0 | | Maintenance | 1,230 | |
| | | | | Capital Expenditure: | | |
| <u>0</u> | <u>1,230</u> | <u>0</u> | <u>0</u> | Capital Expenditure: | <u>0</u> | <u>1,230</u> |
| | 4,800 | | 6,030 | Surplus - (Deficit) | | 4,800 |
| | | | | | | |
| | <u>40,922</u> | | <u>61,325</u> | Balance Brought Forward | | <u>67,355</u> |
| | | | | | | |
| | <u>45,722</u> | | <u>67,355</u> | Balance Carried Forward | | <u>72,155</u> |

3.5 Five Year Budget Estimate

| Sow And Penk IDB | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|----------------|--------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Revenue Account | 2020/21 | 2020/21 | 2021/22 | 2022/23 | 2023/24 | 2024/25 | 2025/26 |
| | App | Estimated Out-turn | | | | | |
| | Budget | | | | | | |
| | £ | £ | £ | £ | £ | £ | £ |
| Income | | | | | | | |
| Drainage Rates | 11,354 | 11,354 | 11,342 | 11,939 | 12,365 | 12,791 | 12,791 |
| Special Levies | 109,972 | 109,972 | 112,852 | 118,792 | 123,034 | 127,277 | 127,277 |
| Grant In Aid- Catchment Modelling | - | 35,000 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Bank Interest, Other Contributions | 200 | 250 | 300 | 200 | 200 | 500 | 500 |
| Total Income | 121,527 | 156,577 | 124,494 | 130,930 | 135,599 | 140,568 | 140,568 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Expenditure | | | | | | | |
| Flood Defence Levy | 8,900 | 8,900 | 8,900 | 8,900 | 8,900 | 9,167 | 9,167 |
| Administration | 26,241 | 24,357 | 26,591 | 26,857 | 27,125 | 27,397 | 27,671 |
| Maintenance of Drains | 61,739 | 64,739 | 66,231 | 68,218 | 70,264 | 72,372 | 74,544 |
| Additional Maintenance | 18,000 | 15,000 | 15,450 | 15,914 | 16,391 | 16,883 | 17,389 |
| Catchment Modelling | 30,730 | 37,206 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Penkridge Modelling Assessment | - | 4,195 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Biodiversity Action Plan | 3,000 | 3,000 | 3,000 | 3,000 | 3,000 | 3,090 | 3,183 |
| County Show Budget | 3,000 | - | 3,000 | 2,500 | 2,500 | 2,500 | 2,500 |
| Cont To Derrington | | | | | | | |
| Total Expenditure | 151,610 | 157,397 | 123,172 | 125,388 | 128,181 | 131,409 | 134,453 |
| Surplus/(Deficit) | (30,083) | (820) | 1,322 | 5,542 | 7,418 | 9,160 | 6,115 |
| Balance Brought Forward | 124,300 | 92,430 | 85,609 | 80,931 | 80,473 | 81,892 | 85,051 |
| Balance | 94,217 | 91,609 | 86,931 | 86,473 | 87,892 | 91,051 | 91,166 |
| Transfer to Doxey & Till Marshes Account | 6,000 | 6,000 | 6,000 | 6,000 | 6,000 | 6,000 | 6,000 |
| Balance Carried Forward | 88,217 | 85,609 | 80,931 | 80,473 | 81,892 | 85,051 | 85,166 |
| Doxey & Tillington Marshes Acc | 66,033 | 67,355 | 72,155 | 76,955 | 81,775 | 86,595 | 91,415 |
| Penny Rate in £ | 6.65p | 6.65p | 6.65p | 7.00p | 7.25p | 7.50p | 7.50p |
| Penny Rate £18,245 | 56% | 52% | 63% | 61% | 61% | 62% | 61% |
| | | | | | | | |
| | 2020/21 | 2020/21 | 2021/22 | 2022/23 | 2023/24 | 2024/25 | 2025/26 |
| Doxey & Tillington Marshes Acc | App | Estimated Out-turn | | | | | |
| | Budget | | | | | | |
| | £ | £ | £ | £ | £ | £ | £ |
| Income | | | | | | | |
| Transfer from I&E | 6,000 | 6,000 | 6,000 | 6,000 | 6,000 | 6,000 | 6,000 |
| Interest | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 50 | 50 | 50 |
| Total Income | 6,030 | 6,030 | 6,030 | 6,030 | 6,050 | 6,050 | 6,050 |
| Expenditure | | | | | | | |
| Maintenance | 1,230 | - | 1,230 | 1,230 | 1,230 | 1,230 | 1,230 |
| Total Expenditure | 1,230 | - | 1,230 | 1,230 | 1,230 | 1,230 | 1,230 |
| Surplus/(Deficit) | 4,800 | 6,030 | 4,800 | 4,800 | 4,820 | 4,820 | 4,820 |
| Balance Brought Forward | 61,233 | 61,325 | 67,355 | 72,155 | 76,955 | 81,775 | 86,595 |
| Balance Carried Forward | 66,033 | 67,355 | 72,155 | 76,955 | 81,775 | 86,595 | 91,415 |

4. Engineer's Report

Recommendation(s):

- To note the information contained in this report

4.1 Asset Management

4.1.1 Hydraulic Modelling

A Training Session for Members on the modelling outputs is to be arranged and the suggested date is 10th March 2021 10am – 12 noon.

We intend to share the IDB model data with the Environment Agency to improve their Main River modelling and to assist in reviewing flood risk from a catchment perspective as RMA partners moving forwards. The results of the Main River and IDB models will also help with identifying Main River maintenance opportunities under PSCA.

4.1.2 Penkrudge

We have liaised with the Environment Agency regarding the additional survey and modelling required in Penkrudge to improve understanding of flood risk.

The rivers flowing through Penkrudge are Main River and we are pleased to report that the EA has just undertaken additional survey and will be modelling and sharing their report with the IDB.

The EA have been invited to the May//June meeting to provide an update for the Board and hopes to provide a Briefing Note in the interim.

4.1.3 Ordinary Watercourses

All planned maintenance completed.

4.2 Planning, pre-application advice, consents, enforcement

4.2.1 Planning Applications

Our email address for planning enquiries is planning@shiregroup-idbs.gov.uk

Officers have reviewed planning applications between October 2020 and January 2021 of which 3 have required comment on behalf of the Board.

4.2.2 Land Drainage Act 1991 Section 23 and 66 (Byelaw) Consents

Our email address for consent applications is consents@shiregroup-idbs.gov.uk

1 consent has been received by the Board between October 2020 and January 2020 and is currently under consideration.

5. Health and Safety Report

Recommendation:

- Members note information contained in the Report

5.1 Accidents, Incidents and near misses

No accidents, incidents or near misses to report.

5.2 COVID-19

The area is currently under COVID-19 lockdown restrictions.

JBA offices have continued to remain open during this pandemic and we continue to deliver our services. JBA have adopted flexible working with remote working from home for those staff who can. We will be receiving and reading email as normal, but we may not always be available directly on the office number to take calls.

Board operations

During this period, the Board's day to day activities have not been adversely affected. Updated "essential travel for work" letters have been issued to the Board's contractors.

6. Environmental Adviser's Report

Recommendation:

- Members note information contained in the Report

6.1 Legislation

Nothing to Report.

6.2 Policy

Nothing to Report.

7. Any Other Business

8. Date of Next Meeting

1 June 2021
17 November 2021



9. APPENDIX A – ADA Letter to IDB Members

A copy of the letter can be found over the following pages.



Representing Drainage Water Level & Flood Risk Management Authorities

Rural Innovation Centre, Avenue H,
Stoneleigh Park, Warwickshire, CV8 2LG
Telephone: +44 (0) 2476 992889
Email: admin@ada.org.uk
Website: www.ada.org.uk
Twitter: @ada_updates

To: All IDB Members

by e-mail

21st December 2020

Dear Members

ADA Drainage Board Membership 2021

2020 has been a particularly stressful year on the counts of both the COVID19 crisis and the severe weather and its consequences for some of us at the start of the year. All of that will, without doubt, have economic, social and environmental consequences for us all and ADA is very keen to help minimise those consequences through keeping Government focussed on one of the basic foundations of our society – Flood & Coastal Erosion Risk Management (FCERM). Thank you to all of you for continuing your support of ADA in the face of all the pressures facing you and thank you for all that you have done in working collaboratively with other ADA members.

With some cautious optimism, it seems that spending pledges are to be maintained on capital investment for FCERM projects and even the revenue allocation afforded to Defra for the next 12 months is a positive one. ADA knows that you will be under huge pressures in the wake of the COVID19 crisis and that, I am sure, is where we can continue to be of help to you as core members of our organisation and the wider “flood family”.

Many of the things I said we would focus on last year have come to fruition, notably around our involvement and support of the FCERM Strategy update, and our help in influencing Defra’s FCERM Policy Statement and support of the Environment Bill. The (only) positive side of the pandemic has led ADA to have more direct communication with Defra at the highest levels as well as engaging with providing evidence to parliamentary committees such as EFRA and finding more time to respond to the plethora of consultations which have been undertaken this year.

We have also made real progress on developing an Environmental Good Governance Guide for IDB Board members which we hope to publish in the first quarter of 2021. Many of you have also made significant progress in improving attendance at your Board meetings and general governance, some of which has probably been a direct result of having to conduct meetings online. Whilst the online meeting derogation to your standing orders remains in force until May 2021, ADA is talking to Defra about the possibility of making that a permanent change so you have a choice about how you conduct your meetings in the future.

Carbon reduction measures, climate change adaptation and resilience are key areas of interest and commitment for ADA in support of its members’ future activities and we will be examining how we can achieve that and how we can help you in transforming your activities.

ADA will be updating its Memorandum & Articles of Association in 2021 and, as core members, we will be seeking views on proposed changes which are simply intended to update and keep ourselves operating to current business standards and to the wishes of our members. A wider consultation will be carried out in the early part of 2021 and your views will be most welcome before we finalise an amended version for sign-off at our next AGM.

I have unfortunately not been able to visit many of you this year and virtual meetings do not replace the quality of face-to-face meetings. They do, however, have a place for more routine business and I have made full note of how that has allowed better communication where physical meetings often excluded



Representing Drainage Water Level & Flood Risk Management Authorities

Rural Innovation Centre, Avenue H,
Stoneleigh Park, Warwickshire, CV8 2LG
Telephone: +44 (0) 2476 992889
Email: admin@ada.org.uk
Website: www.ada.org.uk
Twitter: @ada_updates

certain participants. ADA will be using the pandemic experience to try and better tailor the future needs of its members through a balanced mix of physical and online events.

In the circumstances, it is only right that ADA has frozen its subscription fees for the next 12 months and so your membership fees will stay unchanged for 2021. The industry as a whole enormously benefits from your individual membership and the ADA team and I would very much welcome your Drainage Board's continued support during the next 12 months in order to build on our recent work (see our plan for 2021 overleaf), and thank you again for being a member of ADA.

On behalf of us all, may I wish you and your colleagues a Merry Christmas and hoping that 2021 will be happier, healthier and more prosperous than 2020.

Innes Thomson, Chief Executive, ADA

Outline Plan for ADA actions in 2021

Below are brief details of what you can expect from us in 2021:

- 1. Publication of Environmental Good Governance Guide**
- 2. Promote safer working practices** with guidance, workshops and links relating to health, safety and welfare for our members, building on our recent HS&W survey.
- 3. Complete the Development of educational resources** for 11 to 14 year olds to stimulate their thinking about the lowland water environment and career opportunities in water and flood management.
- 4. Publish guidance on engaging with developers** related to flood management features and financial contributions.
- 5. Climate change adaptation and resilience**
- 6. Public Sector Co-operation**
- 7. Continue to contribute to policy development** particularly around FCERM funding, controlled flood storage, sustainable drainage, resilient infrastructure and embankments, asset transfer, and IDB ratings reform with Defra, MHCLG and other government departments.
- 8. Provide a platform to share knowledge and innovation** through events such as FLOODDEX 2021 at the Peterborough Arena on the 7th and 8th April and at our Annual Conference in Westminster in November.

10. APPENDIX B – Minutes of the Audit Review Meeting

Held online, Microsoft Teams
Monday, 23 November 2020

Present:

| | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Mr Adrian Black (AB) | Scunthorpe & Gainsborough WMB |
| Mr Christopher Day (CD) | Ancholme IDB |
| Cllr Ray Sutherland (RS) | Sow & Penk IDB |
| Mr Andy Cane (AC) | Brodericks GBC |

In Attendance on behalf of JBA Consulting:

Mr Mark Joynes (MJ) (Financial Officer to the Shire Group of IDBs)

Introductions and Apologies for Absence

MJ welcomed the members. Apologies for absence were received from Mr Michael Dougherty, Mrs Rosemary Webster and Mr David Blake of JBA Consulting.

Minutes of the Last Meeting / Matters Arising

The panel approved the minutes as a true and fair record with no matters arising.

Risk Register

The panel discussed the outline document. MJ explained that although the document had been reviewed, few changes had been made since the previous year. The draft outline registers would be issued to the chairmen before the January/February board meetings. The versions appearing in individual meeting papers would be greatly expanded. AC asked if any panel members had any feedback. CD said the Ancholme IDB viewed the document very positively. AB agreed, saying there had been no negative feedback from Scunthorpe & Gainsborough WMB. AC said the document generally achieved its aims well. RS said the document was well-received with Sow & Penk IDB. MJ said the Register provided members with an opportunity to consider all aspects of the Board's management and an opportunity to comment on any issues.

Internal Auditor's Report

The internal auditor reviewed the work undertaken on the 2019/20 accounts. In general, the internal auditor was satisfied with how things were run and said there were no major concerns. He said the Boards' control procedures were fit for purpose. Also, he expressed the view that Risk Registers underpin the internal control environment. The panel then discussed the following points:

Supplier Bank Details and Associated Fraud Risk

AC said that further to the previous year's review, there had been no major incidents, nor had there been any in the preceding year. CD asked AC what the particular concerns were and what more could be done. AC said that everything that could be in place was in place. CD agreed that in particular, suppliers contacting the Boards informing them of changes of bank details should be treated with care. MJ offered that almost every communication received, whatever the medium, should be treated with suspicion.

Decision Making & Member Attendance

The panel briefly discussed this issue. AC said that while this may not be a huge issue, it arose every meeting. MJ said that members could not be forced to attend, and they would continue to contact the authorities, asking them to ensure their appointed members attend. AB said attendance had improved since the advent of virtual meetings, although some of the elected members may struggle with the technology, broadband signals, etc. He asked how long virtual meetings would continue. MJ said the Board were covered for their Jan/Feb 2021 meetings but possibly not the summer 2021 meetings.

UPDATE – The Boards' own Standing Orders do indeed allow for all members to remotely attend any meeting taking place before 7 May 2021. This aligns with the period specified for similar bodies by statute.

Reserve Levels

AC said he found all the Boards' reserve levels to be adequate and the five-year plans were in place to assist.

System Backup Procedures

AC said the System backup procedures in place had been reviewed and were found to be adequate. CD asked to what extent officers were working from home and if there were any associated security risks with these arrangements. MJ confirmed the officers were indeed working from home for the most part, as per JBA guidelines, but that officers did work in the office occasionally as when necessary. He told the members strict guideline were in place for office-based work with regard to Covid safety. He said that data security was as robust as when using a VPN as when working in the office.

UPDATE – The virtual private network (VPN) is indeed secure. Remote access to the servers requires valid ID, a valid JBA machine and requires up-to-date Sophos Antivirus software be installed on the machine. All JBA laptops are 256-bit encrypted.

External Auditor's Report

The AGAR Section 3s were reviewed by the panel and more specifically the External Auditors' comments. The panel was pleased to note there were no matters arising giving cause for concern. MJ further told the members there were no 'other matters' raised in any of the reports. There had been some initial concern about the timings of document signings, but they had been the result of the restrictions imposed by the Covid-19 lockdown and the matter was soon dropped.

Any Other Business

CD asked what the arrangements should be in place for chairman signing minutes of previous meetings. AB pointed out that two virtual meetings had now taken place and the Board had approved the minutes of the previous meetings, but he had not himself signed the minutes. MJ said he was not certain if the minutes could be approved in some electronic format or if the paper copies would need to be issued by post. RS said this was exactly the issue he intended to raise. He said the Covid-19 situation would only be resolved when vaccines became widely available. He asked about how elections could take place. MJ said as drainage board elections were largely postal in nature, it may not be a problem.

UPDATE – During the course of any meeting, minutes of the previous meeting will be approved by the Board. Hard copies of the minutes of the previous meeting will be sent by post to the chairmen for wet signatures soon after the meeting takes place.

RS said the standard of minute-taking was very high and expressed gratitude to minute-taker for this, and for the prompt manner in which the minutes were processed.

Date of Next Meeting and Close of Meeting

The next meeting of the panel will be held on Monday, 22 November 2021 at 10.00am at the offices of JBA Consulting, Epsom House, Chase Park, Redhouse Interchange, Doncaster, DN6 7FE.

MJ thanked the members for attending. CD thanked AC for all the work done on audits and MJ for the working done in preparing and presenting the meeting papers.

The meeting was closed at approximately 10:30am.

11. APPENDIX C – Risk Register

A copy of the draft register can be found over the following pages.

Sow & Penk IDB- Risk Register Jan 2021

| | OBJECTIVE | RISK | Current Controls/Assurances | Risk | | | Status | Mitigation/Action Plan | Owner/Target Date |
|--|--|---|---|--------|------------|-------|---|---|----------------------|
| | | | | Impact | Likelihood | Score | | | |
| S U S T A I N A B I L I T Y | Objective 1 : Provide & Maintain Sustainable Flood Protection through Water Level Management | Lack of direction, Conflicting aims & objectives (Internal & External) | Policy statement on Flood Protection and Water Level Management | Med | Unlikely | 2 | ACCEPT- RISK LEVEL ACCEPTABLE | | Next Review 30/06/21 |
| | | | The board has an extensive list of policies | | | | | | |
| | | Human Resource Risk- Contractors National/International Emergencies | Contractors go through tender process if necessary | High | Likely | 6 | TRANSFER- RISK TOO HIGH, TRANSFER ELSEWHERE IF POSSIBLE (EG. INSURANCE) | Monitor Suppliers/Review Succession Plans Disaster/Emergency Protocols Online Communication- Microsoft Teams | Next Review 30/06/21 |
| | | | Timely Contractual performance review- Time & Quality | | | | | | |
| | | | Succession Planning/Business Continuity Reviews | | | | | | |
| | Objective 2: Promote & Integrate Biodiversity with the boards primary and operational activities | Risk of prosecution for not adhering to Environmental Legislation | Board directly employs a suitably qualified Env. Officer | High | Unlikely | 3 | REDUCE- ACTION REQUIRED TO REDUCE RISK | Refresher presentation to be given to Operatives & Contractors before start of summer works season. Continue to communicate Environmental best working practices | Env Officer- Ongoing |
| | | | Extensive Environmental Surveys carried out | | | | | | |
| | | | Species reporting on all new watercourses | | | | | | |
| | | The board does not deliver on the duty to protect and where practicable enhance the environment | The board has a Biodiversity Action Plan | Med | Unlikely | 2 | ACCEPT- RISK LEVEL ACCEPTABLE | | Next Review 30/06/21 |
| | | | Produce Environmental Annual Report and Action Plan for the year ahead. | | | | | | |
| I N N O V A T I O N | Objective 3: Embrace new technology/methods introduced into the industry | Financial Limitations | Cost Savings- Payback Calculation | Med | Unlikely | 2 | ACCEPT- RISK LEVEL ACCEPTABLE | | Next Review 30/06/21 |
| | | | Research & Development Included in Budget | | | | | | |
| | | | PWLB- Potential to borrow | | | | | | |
| | | Historical Viewpoint- 'we've always done it this way' can stifle innovation | Long Term Asset Management Strategy Adopted | Med | Unlikely | 2 | ACCEPT- RISK LEVEL ACCEPTABLE | | Next Review 30/06/21 |
| | | | Forward Thinking Board | | | | | | |
| | | Uncertainty- results limited as technology/methods are in early stages of its lifecycle | The Board would always look to trial new technology | Med | Unlikely | 2 | ACCEPT- RISK LEVEL ACCEPTABLE | | Next Review 30/06/21 |
| | | | Economies of Scale through Shire Group of IDBs reduces risk to SPIDB | | | | | | |
| | Objective 4: Promote Innovation, ensure the board is continually looking at ways to improve and grow | Members lack understanding of the Board's objectives, latest legislative requirement and latest developments in the industry. | Land Drainage Act provides for election of members every 3rd Year | High | Unlikely | 3 | REDUCE- ACTION REQUIRED TO REDUCE RISK | Member Interaction/Presentations | Ongoing |
| | | | Training Courses for board members | | | | | | |
| | | | Legislative/Industry developments promoted on the website and in meetings | | | | | | |
| | | Board Structure- Limited diversity of members background | Elected/Nominated split dependant on Annual Values | Low | Likely | 2 | ACCEPT- RISK LEVEL ACCEPTABLE | | Next Review 30/06/21 |
| | | | Nominated members typically have knowledge of WLM | | | | | | |
| | | Short Termism- Reduction of cost philosophy | Elected members must be nominated by Landowners in the district | Low | Likely | 2 | ACCEPT- RISK LEVEL ACCEPTABLE | | Next Review 30/06/21 |
| | | | STP/MTP/LTP | | | | | | |
| | | Unsuitable members appointed to the Board | Long Term Forecasting, 20 years Budget plans, Long Term Capital plan | Low | Likely | 2 | ACCEPT- RISK LEVEL ACCEPTABLE | | Next Review 30/06/21 |
| | | | Elected members must be nominated by Landowners in the district | | | | | | |
| | | | Members register of interest | | | | | | |

Sow & Penk IDB- Risk Register Jan 2021

| OBJECTIVE | RISK | Current Controls/Assurances | Risk | | | Status | Mitigation/Action Plan | Owner/Target Date |
|-------------------|---|--|--------|------------|-------|--|---|----------------------------------|
| | | | Impact | Likelihood | Score | | | |
| STAKEHOLDER VALUE | Objective 5: To be a self sufficient IDB that provides value to 'our' stakeholders at all times | Reduction in income to the Board to maintain an appropriate provision of services | High | Unlikely | 3 | REDUCE- ACTION REQUIRED TO REDUCE RISK | Provide all significant ratepayers/creditors with the Long-Term forecast, allowing them to make provisions accordingly. | Senior Finance Officer Mar 21 |
| | | Timely invoicing of Drainage Rates account holders annually, monitoring of collection rates and take follow-up action when non-payment. | | | | | | |
| | | Submit Highland Water claims to the EA. | | | | | | |
| | | Overspending, not obtaining value for money | High | Unlikely | 3 | REDUCE- ACTION REQUIRED TO REDUCE RISK | Cash Flow analysis incorporated into monthly budget review, ensure value for money is sought on every purchase | FO-2021 |
| | | Monthly Budget reviews, Budget to date and out turn analysed by members at meetings | | | | | | |
| | | Financial Regulations- >£5000 2 quotes > £20,000 Tender Process | | | | | | |
| | | Approved Suppliers List with specific criteria that is regularly monitored | | | | | | |
| | | Perception that this isn't the case | Med | Likely | 4 | REDUCE- ACTION REQUIRED TO REDUCE RISK | Promote the board, shout about the good work Sow & Penk IDB do Tap into to Social Media to do this | SGAT- Ongoing |
| | | Internal/External Audits & IDB1 forms | | | | | | |
| | | Website promoting board Activities | | | | | | |
| | | Lead Role in partnership working/PSCA agreements | | | | | | |
| | | Flood damage to third party | High | Unlikely | 3 | REDUCE- ACTION REQUIRED TO REDUCE RISK | Insurance policies reviewed annually for the Board and risks required changes to cover reassessed. | SFO- Jan 2021 |
| | | Insurance Policies to cover main risks including asset failure and indemnity for third party damage | | | | | | |
| | | Catchment Mapping completed | | | | | | |
| | Objective 6: To be a champion of partnership working, work collaboratively where this can deliver shared research objectives more cost-effectively and for the wider good of all connected | Miscommunication causing differing expectations/goals | Med | Unlikely | 2 | ACCEPT- RISK LEVEL ACCEPTABLE | Monitor all relationships with all connected stakeholders, continue to be a champion of partnership working | Next Review 30/06/21 |
| | | Close working relationships with all connected stakeholders | | | | | | |
| | | Historic Agreements | | | | | | |
| | | Drive for partnership working | Med | Unlikely | 2 | ACCEPT- RISK LEVEL ACCEPTABLE | Monitor all relationships with all connected stakeholders, continue to be a champion of partnership working | Next Review 30/06/21 |
| | | Lack of formal structure and clear risk-sharing arrangements | | | | | | |
| | | Good working relationship with LLFA | | | | | | |
| | | Clear definition of role between IDB & other Stakeholders | Med | Unlikely | 2 | ACCEPT- RISK LEVEL ACCEPTABLE | Monitor all relationships with all connected stakeholders, continue to be a champion of partnership working | Next Review 30/06/21 |
| | | Internal & External Conflicts, which could create a lack of trust | | | | | | |
| | | Conflict Management Policy | | | | | | |
| | | Open & Honest- 100% Transparent- Minutes on website | | | | | | |
| COMPLIANCE | Objective 7: Ensure that the board always complies with all recommended accounting practices | Adverse audit reports, legal action and loss of confidence in the IDB. | High | Unlikely | 3 | REDUCE- ACTION REQUIRED TO REDUCE RISK | 1. Continue to work with Internal Auditor to always minimise risks associated with accounting practices, especially when new risks emerge 2. Review current SGAT processes & procedures and update where appropriate | Finance Team- May 2021 & Ongoing |
| | | Put in place a satisfactory Governance framework, including: - Internal Audit contract & access to the Boards. - External Audit Service - Financial regulations in place for each Board - Business continuity & recovery plan - Insurance Policies proportionate to identified risks - Appropriate ICT systems to support key functions (Ratings, Finance and GIs). - ADA Practitioners' Guide (2006), as revised 2017 - Data processing, handling and retention in compliance with ICO's Guidance & Licence for each Board. | | | | | | |
| | | Adhere to Board Approved Financial Regulations | | | | | | |
| | | Experienced and suitably qualified finance officers | | | | | | |
| | | Bank Mandate in place, always two signatories needed | | | | | | |
| | | New Supplier Checks- Proof of Banking Details | High | Unlikely | 3 | REDUCE- ACTION REQUIRED TO REDUCE RISK | Continually Review current SGAT processes & procedures and update where appropriate | Finance Team- Ongoing |
| | | All Purchase Ledger Transactions are reviewed by the board | | | | | | |
| | | Adequate Insurance to cover such Losses | | | | | | |
| | | Loss of Control through inadequate processes. | High | Unlikely | 3 | REDUCE- ACTION REQUIRED TO REDUCE RISK | Continually Review current SGAT processes & procedures and update where appropriate | Finance Team- Ongoing |
| | | Audit approved documented processes, that have a clear segregation of duties | | | | | | |
| | | Bank Mandate in place, always two signatories needed | Med | Unlikely | 2 | ACCEPT- RISK LEVEL ACCEPTABLE | Review Reserves level (50%) at the monthly budget meetings | Next Review 30/06/21 |
| | | Liquidity issues, lack of reserves | | | | | | |
| | | The Board has adopted a reserves policy | | | | | | |
| | | Short, Mid & Long Term Budgetted | | | | | | |
| | | Boards financial position presented at Board meetings | | | | | | |
| | Objective 8: Ensure that at all times the board complies with all current EU & UK legislation | Risk to Board Members | Med | Unlikely | 2 | ACCEPT- RISK LEVEL ACCEPTABLE | Monitor any changes to current EU & UK legislation | Next Review 30/06/21 |
| | | Qualified & experienced staff attempt to advise the board | | | | | | |
| | | Ultimately, all decisions should be discussed and made as a collective | | | | | | |
| | | Adequate Insurance underaken | High | Unlikely | 3 | REDUCE- ACTION REQUIRED TO REDUCE RISK | Monitor any changes to current EU & UK legislation | Next Review 30/06/21 |
| | | Access specialist advice as required, eg Finance, Legal, H&S, Insurance, etc. | | | | | | |
| | | Peer Group support, e.g. ADA's Policy & Finance and Technical Committees | | | | | | |

**Shire Group of IDBs
Epsom House
Malton Way
Adwick le Street
Doncaster DN6 7FE**

**T: 01302 337798
info@shiregroup-idbs.gov.uk
www.shiregroup-idbs.gov.uk**

JBA Consulting has offices at

**Coleshill
Cork
Doncaster
Dublin
Edinburgh
Exeter
Glasgow
Haywards Heath
Isle of Man
Leeds
Limerick
Newcastle upon Tyne
Newport
Peterborough
Saltaire
Skipton (Belle Vue Mills)
Skipton
Tadcaster
Thirsk
Wallingford
Warrington**

