



Doncaster East

Internal Drainage Board

Doncaster East IDB

Meeting Papers

Friday 10 February 2017, 14:00

To be held at:



Shire

Group of IDBs

Epsom House


Malton Way


Adwick le Street

Doncaster DN6 7FE

T: 01302 337798

Meeting Papers

Prepared by  Alison Briggs BSc (Hons) Env. Sc., MSc Env.
Mngt Climate Change, PIEMA
Senior Administrator and Environment Officer

Reviewed by  Ian Benn HNC/HND, DipNebosh, PGDip
H&S/Env Law, CQP
Chief Executive Officer

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.

AGENDA

1.	Governance	3
1.1	Apologies for Absence	3
1.2	Declarations of Interest	3
1.3	Minutes of the Meeting held 11 November 2016	3
1.4	Matters arising not elsewhere on the Agenda	8
1.5	Complaints/FOI requests	8
1.6	Working Group Code of Conduct sanctions and reconstitution	8
2.	Environmental Report	9
2.1	Legislation	9
2.2	Policy	9
2.3	Water Level Management Plans	9
3.	CEO Report.....	10
3.1	Board owned land	10
3.2	Environment Agency	10
3.3	Association of Drainage Authorities (ADA)	10
4.	Engineers Report	12
4.1	Water Level Management Committee	12
4.2	LDA 1991 (as amended) S23 and S66 Consents.....	12
5.	Finance.....	13
5.1	Rating Report	13
5.2	Audit	13
5.3	Estimates, Rates and Special Levies for the Year Ending 31 March 2018	14
5.4	Five Year Budget Estimate	16
5.5	List of Payments	17
6.	Health & Safety Report	18
6.1	Board Employees.....	18
7.	Representation	18
8.	APPENDIX A: Working Party notes.....	19
9.	APPENDIX B: Meeting of the Internal Audit Review Panel.....	21
10.	APPENDIX C: Risk Register.....	24

1. Governance

Recommendation:

- Approval of Minutes 11 November 2016 (Item 1.3)
- Resolution on Code of Conduct sanctions and reconstitution (Item 1.6)

1.1 Apologies for Absence

1.2 Declarations of Interest

1.3 Minutes of the Meeting held 11 November 2016

Member	15 11 13	14 02 14	27. 06. 14	14. 11. 14	13. 02. 15	16. 06. 15	06. 11. 15	12. 02. 16	17. 06. 16	29. 07. 16	11.11.16
Michael Brooke (MB)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	x	x	x
Paul Burtwistle (PB)	X	X	A	X	X	X	X	R	R	R	x
Roni Chapman (RC) DMBC	X	X	X	A	X	X	X	X	x	x	x
Peter Cornish (PC)	X	X	X	X	X	A	X	A	x	x	x
Catherine Anderson (DMBC)											x
Ken Durdy (KD)	X	X	X	X	A	X	X	X	A	X	x
Richard Durdy (RD)	A	X	X	A	A	X	X	X	x	A	x
Lee Garrett (LG) DMBC	X NE W	X	X	A	X	X	X	A	A	x	x
Neville Williams (NW)							X	X	x	x	x
Peter Wilkinson (PW)							X	X	x	-	x
John Hoare (JH) DMBC	X	X	A	A	X	A	X	X	x	-	x
Peter Horne (PH1)	X	X	A	X	X	A	X	X	x	x	x
Pat Hagan (PH) DMBC							A	A	A	x	A
Dave Ridge (DR) DMBC											A
Chris McGuinness (CMcG) DMBC	X	A	A	X	X	X	X	A	-	x	x
Roger Mitchell (RM) DMBC	X	X		X	A	X	A	X	A	-	Resigned
Martin Oldknow (MO) DMBC	X	X	X	A	X	A	X	X	A	A	x
Geoff Parker (GP1)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	x	x	x
Gordon Platt (GP2)	X	X	A	X	X	X	A	X	A	x	x
Chris Crowe (CC) Coal Authority		X	X	X	X	X	X	A	x	-	A Morritt X
Sue Wilkinson (SW) DMBC	X	X	X	X	X	A	X	X	x	x	x
Karen Winnard (KW) (DMBC)							X	X	x	x	x

Also attending:

JBA Consulting: Ian Benn (CEO)

Craig Benson (Finance Officer)

Alison Briggs (Environment Officer)

Martin Spoor (Asset Manager)

Environment Agency: Morgan Wray, Andrew Haigh, Kelly Golds

Governance

Apologies for absence

2016.68 Apologies were received from Pat Hagan and Dave Ridge.

Appointment of Chair

2016.69 SW proposed Chris McGuinness, seconded RC, all in agreement.

Appointment of Chair

2016.70 RC proposed Peter Horne, seconded SW, all in agreement.

Presentation

2016.71 The Chair presented former member Fred Paling with a tankard inscribed with the time spent as a member of the current and its predecessor Board. Fred Paling thanked the board for the present. His interest in land drainage comes from ancestral genes, Paling is Dutch for eel. Mr Paling informed Members how he had been involved with water level management throughout his working career. He advised of a quote "Those who show little respect from the past are poor guardians for the future" and asked members to consider the past before they started advising on the future.

Chair announcement

2016.72 Chair advised Members they had received details on the Agenda process including closed session for Thorne Moors Audit. EA presentation on Isle of Axholme Strategy would be taken out of sequence in Agenda.

Declaration of Interest

2016.73 MB, GP and PC in Isle of Axholme Strategy. A Morritt spoke on behalf of Coal Authority confirming its interest in the Board District. Members announced themselves for benefit of new members and EA introduced themselves.

EA Isle of Axholme Strategy

2016.74 Morgan Wray provided historic background to Asset Transfer and De-maining process of Main River Rationalisation Project advising Flood Risk is concentrated on a small portion of main river and there are high level drivers for rationalisation of this main river network. IoA is one of the rationalisation pilot projects, previous representations had been made on requirement for local control from local community, IDBs managing watercourses provides empowerment and control for water level management within the District. Review of original strategy recommendations advised move toward investigation what transfer and de-maining would look like. There are several local partners willing to take on additional powers. Reference to willingness is associated with a transfer of permissive powers.

CMcG felt process moving very quickly without appropriate information being made available to Board and term "local funding solutions will have to be found" was not acceptable. Board has not said it will not accept asset transfer but wishes to look at assets on an individual basis and requires detailed information as to cost on those assets. M Wray confirmed increased

resources allocation has provisioned EA work on pulling together costs; resource availability until March 2018. Asset transfer involving a payment to another authority is based on costs inclusive of a decommissioning cost and 3-years maintenance. MS advised some information received around costs on assets identified as early transfer sites however raised issues to which responses are expected but not yet to hand. Members noted Defra sets the direction, EA being directed away from water level management of agricultural land and focussing on high risk people and property.

A Haigh advised need to understand which is the best authority to undertake future maintenance within IoA. EA will continue to maintain tidal Trent defences, Keadby PS and West Stockwith PS however it to work with other RMAs to understand which is the correct RMA to accept some or all EA pump stations. Assets identified as part of the Strategy are more beneficial to land drainage rather than people and property.

M Wray confirmed associated costs need to be sustainable, there are possible funding routes through Local Enterprise Partnership schemes, look at changing IDB boundaries, and look at level of IDB precept £218,000 that helps support maintenance, conveyance and pump stations.

CMcG concerned requirement for local contributions to fund this and cost burden to council tax payers triggering more than 2% increase and referendum. Enquired where CA fits in to strategy and requirement for all interested parties around the table. A Morritt confirmed overarching issue with long term funding for Coal Authority. CA has 82 pump stations between Doncaster and Selby Board districts. In current financial climate, the Treasury cannot continue to fund however may be able to do better through rationalisation. Doncaster Drainage Acts provided land owners with pump stations when mines were in private ownership, very site specific issues, not catchment specific. Site specific is not sustainable from either capital or revenue positions. Local Flood Risk strategy also drives requirements. Humber Strategy boundaries being extended bringing further 55 sites within that strategy. GP2 queried if not sustainable for EA or CA why should local IDB take on. Advised sites are associated with land drainage, not flood risk to people and property.

MS advised modelling will advise on possibility to join catchments and bring in other local partners i.e. C&RT, Highways England. A Morritt confirmed requirement to rationalise PS feeding same catchment and of the requirement to work together with all interested parties on a catchment approach. IDBs must be involved in the process from the beginning, engagement and being at the table is vital for delivery. CA cannot afford to be in position where these strategies are not moving forward, its budget is cut annually, there must be a timescale for delivery. PB noted CA had obligation to deal with water level management issues it created. A Morritt advised legislation required a balance of reasonableness, that is an asset must have somewhere to pump highlighting the importance of the strategy. Opined legislation defines that a mine owner can refuse to do anything it does not think reasonable therefore assets must sit with a Flood Risk Management Strategy, all must be mindful of an overarching financial political agenda that dictates what the Coal Authority will do.

PH advised an agreement to asset transfer is the simplest part, accompanying financial consideration is the concern. A Morritt drew DMBC member attention to its own Flood Risk Management Strategy as required under Flood & Water Management Act advising if DMBC was committed to managing its socioeconomic situation and if DMBC considers that situation to be of sufficient importance, DMBC should be making the decision to fund its special levies and associated increase to deliver.

ABriggs advised the IoA Strategy an IDB issue, not that for DMBC. The Board has the legislative power to raise whatever income it requires to deliver what it considers necessary for water level management in its district. It was appreciated DMBC raise majority of Board income on behalf of Board however the Board is the Risk Management Authority in its district, therefore the main player in this discussion with the EA, not Doncaster Council.

Clerk advised Board cannot look at sites on an individual basis as referred to earlier. As noted by Members, some water must be raised 4 times before it passes through Keadby PS. There is a considerable amount of interconnectivity for water level management within this Board's district through Board assets, Coal Authority assets, Environment Agency assets, and Highways England assets.

PC advised the Strategy affects this Board, DMBC, North Lincs Council and Isle of Axholme & North Notts WMB. There may be assets of joint benefit to this and its adjacent IDB.

Andy Haigh confirmed the framework of Groups identified in presentation must be involved in discussions. MS confirmed Operation Group on which he represented the Board requires a clear position from the Board on the direction it requires its Officers to take; this information feeds into all working groups. The Board outside of that needs to sort out its own structures.

MO noted several meetings ago it was agreed to set up a working group which has not been convened because required information unavailable.

PB noted Board function was to move water, it was up to the Board to deal with the issue and tell the local authority and landowners what income it requires to fund.

Appointment of Committee Members

2016.75 EO advised the WLM Committee ToR does not define required numbers but all Committees should reflect bare majority in favour of special levy. The following volunteers for WLM Committee as G Parker, K Durdy, M Brooke, G Platt and P Burtwistle, P Cornish, R Durdy. SW advised unnecessary for each area because the Board was now discussing the whole catchment. GP1 advised bigger issue was non-attendance of nominated DMBC members that would affecting balance of decision making process. MO suggested Board either appoint appropriate numbers or live with it. LG appointed to WLM Committee.

2016.76 EO advised the Finance Committee ToR requires 6 members and should reflect the bare majority in favour of special levy. The following volunteers for Finance Committee as C Anderson, M Oldknow, G Parker, M Brooke, P Horne, N Williams, R Chapman. ToR will be changed.

2016.77 EO advised the Environment Committee ToR require 5 members and should reflect the bare majority in favour of special levy. The following volunteers for Environment Committee as N Williams, M Brooke, S Wilkinson, J Hoare, R Chapman.

Apologies for absence

2016.78 Apologies received from D Ridge and P Hagan. R Mitchell had recently resigned following a period of ill health.

Minutes of 11 November 2016

2016.79 Members agreed true record of the meeting.

Minutes of Extraordinary Meeting 29 July 2016

2016.80 Members agreed true record of the meeting.

Matters arising not discussed elsewhere on the Agenda

2016.81 None.

Complaints/FOI requests

2016.82 In addition to information in the papers a further FOI had been received regarding the route and ownership of Boating Dyke in Thorne where it passes through gardens of properties. Response confirmed the Board did not own the watercourse.

Board constitution

Code of Conduct

2016.83 Members agreed to set up a Working Group to make recommendation to Board.

Membership rationalisation

2016.84 Members agreed to set up a Working Group to make recommendation to Board. Working party emails to be sent around.

Environmental Report

2016.85 EO reported the October meeting had been postponed there being no matter upon which the Committee required to pass a resolution. Text in the papers was for Member information. Noted.

CEO Report

2016.86 Members noted the information contained in the report.

Engineers Report

2016.87 Members noted information contained in the report and two recommendations brought from the recent WLM Committee requiring Board resolution. No discussion or resolution reached.

Finance

2016.88 Members noted information contained within the report. PH advised amended Financial regulations require approval by Board. **Proposed PH, seconded NW, all in agreement.**

Health & Safety Report

2016.89 CEO advised nothing to report on accidents or incidents. Board employee attended Danvm DC tool box talks and briefings. Lone worker system operating correctly.

Any other business

2016.90 PB advised email information available to other IDBs within Shire Group when all copied into an email. Members resolved this Board membership detail would be retained within this Board. Further resolved current and new website will show Board Membership only, not contact detail.

Representation

2016.91 Members noted fora at which Board had been represented.

Date of next meeting

Environment	WLM	Finance	Board
8 May 2017	5 May 2017	9 December 2016	10 February 2017
16 October 2017	17 October 2017	2 June 2017	16 June 2017
		13 October 2017	10 November 2017

Thorne Moors WLM Audit - Private Session

2016.92 Management left the meeting.

2016.93 The Board agreed the actions included in the Audit report relating to:

- Follow up of financial legal and conduct matters regarding specified payments
- Provision of report to Environment Agency and Natural England and a follow up of referrals made previously to EA.
- Arrangements for avoiding conflicts of interest.
- The continuation of the review of the project by Faithful & Gould including a review of project management fees
- Board constitution

1.4 Matters arising not elsewhere on the Agenda

1.5 Complaints/FOI requests

1.6 Working Group Code of Conduct sanctions and reconstitution

1.6.1 Reconstitution

The working group met on 12 January 2017. Details notes of the meeting are available at Appendix A.

Discussions surrounded original agreement for 25 members, current lack of full Board membership attendance, difficulties in delivering full elected and charging authority representation, Board requirement to consider Policy & Strategy and delivering an effective decision making Board.

It was agreed the following reasons why the Board should consider reconstitution:

- Improve governance through appropriate balance of member attendance
- Ensure being quorate reflected appropriate balance member attendance
- Acknowledgement it was not easy to fill elected or nominated seats, evidenced by the current vacancies and regular non-attendances
- Fewer people make for better and more effective decision making
- In retaining district identity achieved local knowledge input

The Working Group recommends to the Board:

- **Agree reconstitution of Board to total 7 elected members**
- **Agree elected members will each represent one District**
- **Total Board membership will be 15**

1.6.2 Sanctions for breach of Member Code of Conduct

Timing constraints prohibited discussion at the meeting; ideas were aired in email correspondence. This Board approved adoption of the Cabinet Office Code of Conduct incorporating the Nolan principles of public life on 14 June 2013, appropriate for a non-departmental public body.

If a breach of the code is found against a charging authority Member, the matter can be referred to the Head of Democratic Services with a request for that Member removal.

If a breach of the code is found against an elected Member, under the Localism Act 2011 there is no sanction other than censure and/or removal from a Committee or position within the Board.

The House of Commons Standards Committee discussed the impacts of the Localism Act on local government early 2015.

2. Environmental Report

Recommendations:

- Note the information contained in this report
- Agree £1,000 contribution to R&D Eel Regulation fund 2016/17 and 2017/18 financial year (Item 2.1.1)

2.1 Legislation

2.1.1 Eels (England and Wales) Regulations 2009

The Board is requested to pledge £1,000 of its **unspent** 2016/17 BAP budget on the Research & Development Fund set up by ADA and to pledge future £1,000 contribution from its BAP implementation for 2017/18 financial year.

The R&D fund was referred to at the ADA Conference. ADA has pledged £1000 2016/17 and £1000 2017/18 financial year. To date £18,500 has been pledged by IDBs across the country. Monies will be used as match funding to access further Defra funds.

The funding will contribute to that already undertaken by the EA and Hull International Fisheries Institute on eel passability at pump stations, behaviour at weedscreens and on habitat suitable eel habitat upstream of station sites.

This Board has 9 pump station sites to which it either contributes or wholly owns requiring regulation compliance.

2.2 Policy

Nothing to report

2.3 Water Level Management Plans

2.3.1 Haxey Grange Fen SSSI

Work on review of the WLMP will conclude this year, the temporary log stop bund has worked well, delivering water to site through action of the wind pump.

3. CEO Report

Recommendations:

- Members note the information contained in this report
- Resolution on Board owned land (Item 3.1)

3.1 Board owned land

The Board owns approximately 1.5 acres of land at Short Lane Field, Bessacarr. The land has been let informally for an annual sum of £50.00 to the same ratepayer for at past 30 years. Payment was not made for 2016. The land remains occupied. Several attempts have been made to secure payment. Doncaster MBC is owner of the surrounding land, believed also rented to the same stock owner. The cost of pursuing through the courts is prohibitive.

The asset offers no contribution to Board function, and the Board requested to consider its sale. A valuation has not been sought prior to Board in principle approval.

3.2 Environment Agency

3.2.1 The Isle of Axholme Strategy (IoA)

The Environment Agency has made a request for all Partner support, including this Board, for the Keadby Pump Station project as part of the IoA Strategy. The Chairman provided that support which has been passed to the Agency.

3.3 Association of Drainage Authorities (ADA)

3.3.1 ADA Conference 2016 - Notes

Henry Cator stood in for President Lord Ramsey, unable to attend. Henry suggested the industry was taken for granted, noting IDB Members take seats on these small non-departmental public bodies as volunteers with immense local knowledge of their area.

Dr Therese Coffey, Minister for the Environment, spoke at length. Government appreciates the role and function of IDBs and the importance of ADA, speaking for the collective whole. She welcomed ADA's response to the flooding report suggesting the importance of integrating water, land management, development and the environment from source to sea. In connection with de-maining and asset transfer, she advised the Agency was not attempting to palm off responsibility but looking for willing partners and how PSCA's help support this process. She is very supportive and seeks to promote natural flood management and understand what it could look like in lowland areas. She noted Defra's appreciation on the work some IDB Officers had done on land values in connection with proposed new IDBs in Cumbria. She also acknowledged the statutory duty of local authorities to raise income on behalf of IDBs for those developed areas within the IDB District and how Board function assisted delivery of environment, food and farming requirements.

Alison Baptiste spoke on behalf of the Environment Agency expending on the requirement to de-main and transfer assets, likely to be with willing partner IDBs and other Risk Management Authorities. The ideal scenario was to deliver a local solution for local people however the Agency continues to require an oversight role.

Emma Howard-Boyd, Chair of the Environment Agency spoke on the work of water level management having a positive impact on daily lives but the requirement to think long term about nature and the protection of people from flooding. It was believed delivery would be through collaboration between partners to deliver a resilient England, advising not everyone can be protected all of the time. A catchment based approach would be required to deliver this; land management practices, soft engineering approaches, new measures with utility companies to strengthen infrastructure resilience. She advised of an Agreement with Stobart trucks to move goods required by the Environment Agency in connection with flood events around the country and the Woodland Trust and Forestry Commission were to plant trees. She noted how the PSCA were delivering efficient savings of between 5-10%. Mrs Howard-Boyd also advised the Agency was keen to work with willing partners. There requires a

rebalancing of both National and Local Flood Risk Management; the 25 year Environment Framework was soon to be published – how to fund the work remained an ongoing issue.

Minette Batters spoke for the National Farmers Union. She identified Brexit as the biggest challenge for the future. Trading relationships was the number one priority and access to the single market. It would be a significant change for agriculture. The budget was secure until 2020 but a new deal would have to be agreed before the end of the 2 year exit from Europe. She advised the public pay £0.23 per day toward the Commons Agricultural Policy, providing food, clean water and a clean environment and the importance of using the next two years to influence change. At the moment under the Water Framework Directive, one indicator failure meant watercourse failure suggesting by the next River Basin Management Plan period of 2027, was time within which the directive could be scrapped. The NFU fully supported IDBs working on main river under PSCAs and commented on the role of farming in mitigation of Climate Change.

Question Time followed with questions raised by a LLFA Member on SuDS and the requirement for all drainage assets to be adopted and maintained in perpetuity where Management Companies set up for this purpose frequently failed to deliver suggesting the FWMA Schedule 3 required enactment allowing the LLFAs to adopt systems. It was opined the Government is storing up problems because SuDS are not being developed properly and to deliver the catchment approach requires SuDS being developed.

A Member advised the CAP monies are not for farmers but subsidise consumer shopping lists.

On Grant in Aid an IDB Officer suggested whilst outcome measures were appropriate for accessing GiA, they need to be more aspirational, offering a lower level of protection in villages and reporting on the percentage of properties protected, advising property should be protected to a standard with support for offering advice on resilience to flooding.

Innes Thompson advised on the importance of soil as the most valuable farm asset and the need to protect it from erosion and maintain soil biota.

4. Engineers Report

Recommendation(s):

- To note information contained in this report

4.1 Water Level Management Committee

The next meeting of the Committee is scheduled for 5th May 2017 @ 10am.

The Public Contract Regulations 2015 compliant Watercourse Maintenance Services TENDERS are due to be returned on 30th January 2017 which are to be reviewed by the Evaluation Panel. North Lincolnshire Council Procurement are leading on procurement on behalf of the Board.

4.2 LDA 1991 (as amended) S23 and S66 Consents

16 consent applications have been commented upon between October 2016 and 24 January 2017.

5. Finance

Recommendations:

- To note the information contained in this report
- To approve the Risk Register
- To approve the Board Estimate for the Year Ending 31 March 2018

5.1 Rating Report

Details of the Rates and Special Levies issued and payments received up to and including 18th January 2017:-

	£	£
Balance Brought forward at 1 April 2016		742.28
2016/2017 Drainage Rates and Special Levies		
Drainage Rates		77,991.82
Special Levies		
Bassetlaw District Council	9,942.00	
Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council	632,933.00	
North Lincolnshire Council	12,498.00	655,373.00
Total Drainage Rates Due		734,107.10
Less Paid: -		
Drainage Rates		76,223.57
Special Levies		
Bassetlaw District Council	9,942.00	
Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council	632,933.00	
North Lincolnshire Council	12,498.00	655,373.00
Total Drainage Rates Paid		731,596.57
Paid Refund		4.75
Balance Outstanding as at 18th January 2017		2,515.28

5.2 Audit

5.2.1 Internal Audit Review Meeting

The minutes of the meeting can be viewed at Appendix B.

5.2.2 Risk Register

Register requires Member review and formal approval. Available at Appendix C.

ESTIMATES FOR THE YEAR ENDING 31ST MARCH 2018						
Capital Reserve Account						
2016/17					2017/18	
Approved Estimate		Estimated Out-Turn			Estimate	
£	£	£	£		£	£
<u>INCOME</u>						
		360		Wikewell PS Proposed access	-	
		3,513		Wikewell PS Telemetry Refurbishment	-	
		28,143		Catchment Modelling - Contribution	98,429	
-	-	-	32,016	Interest	-	98,429
<u>EXPENDITURE</u>						
2,000		-		Telemetry - Total Catchment	-	
2,000		-		CCTV - Pumping Stations	-	
1,500		1,500		Asset Management	-	
5,000		5,000		Website Design	-	
-		28,143		Catchment Modelling	156,857	
-		1,000		Research & Development	-	
1,000		-		ICT Equipment & Software	-	
2,000		400		Wikewell PS Proposed Access		
-		3,904		Wikewell PS Telemetry Refurbishment	-	
33,300		-		Pumping Station Refurbishment	33,300	
2,000	48,800	-	39,947	Remote Weedscreens	-	190,157
	(48,800)		(7,931)	Surplus - (Deficit)		(91,728)
	62,180		123,811	Balance Brought Forward		140,880
	25,000		25,000	Transfer From Revenue Account		25,000
	38,380		140,880	Balance Carried Forward		74,152

5.4 Five Year Budget Estimate

Doncaster East IDB 5 yr Budget Estimate Plan	0	1	2	3	4	5
Income & Expenditure Account	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
	Estimated Out-Turn					
	£	£	£	£	£	£
Income						
Drainage Rates	77,992	77,909	78,729	79,549	80,369	82,009
Special Levies	655,372	655,372	662,271	669,170	676,068	689,866
Grant WLMP	13,284	15,000	-	-	-	-
Contribution to Pumping stations	53,995	57,430	59,153	60,927	62,755	64,638
Other Contributions	10,879	10,650	10,970	11,299	11,638	11,987
New and Improvement Works	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other recoverable items	42,930	42,165	43,430	44,733	46,075	47,457
Bank Interest	1,800	2,000	1,800	1,800	1,800	1,800
Total Income	856,252	860,526	856,352	867,478	878,705	897,757
Expenditure						
Environment Agency Precept	218,880	225,000	231,750	238,703	245,864	253,239
Administration Costs	147,710	149,835	154,330	158,960	163,729	168,641
Capital Works	-	-	-	-	-	-
Drain Maintenance	229,900	235,500	242,565	249,842	257,337	265,057
Maintenance of Pumping Stations	104,850	111,500	114,845	118,290	121,839	125,494
SSSi WLMPs	13,284	15,000	-	-	-	-
Other Expenditure	3,119	-	-	-	-	-
Loan Repayments:-	85,191	85,191	85,191	85,191	85,191	85,191
New Loans	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Expenditure	802,934	822,026	828,681	850,986	873,960	897,623
Surplus/(Deficit)	53,318	38,500	27,671	16,492	4,746	134
Balance Brought Forward	366,144	394,462	407,963	418,634	425,126	429,871
Transfer to Cap Res Acc	25,000	25,000	17,000	10,000	-	40,000
Balance Carried Forward	394,462	407,963	418,634	425,126	429,871	390,006
Capital Reserve Account	140,880	74,152	31,152	37,652	32,652	62,652
Commuted Sum Accounts	75,900	76,200	76,500	76,800	77,100	77,400
Penny Rate in £	4.75p	4.75p	4.80p	4.85p	4.90p	5.00p
Penny Rate £154,375	49.13%	49.63%	50.52%	49.96%	49.19%	43.45%

	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
	Estimated Out-Turn					
Capital Reserve Account	£	£	£	£	£	£
Income						
Interest	-	-	-	-	-	-
Wikewell PS proposed access	360	-	-	-	-	-
Wikewell PS Telemetry Refurbishment	3,513					
Catchment Modelling- Contribution	28,143	98,429	-	-	-	-
Total Income	32,016	98,429	-	-	-	-
Expenditure						
Asset Inspections	-	-	-	-	5,000	5,000
Asset Management	1,500	-	-	1,500	-	-
Research & Development	1,000	-	-	-	-	-
Website Design	5,000	-	-	-	-	5,000
ICT Equipment & Software	-	-	-	2,000	-	-
Catchment Modelling	28,143	156,857	-	-	-	-
Wikewell PS Proposed Access	400	-	-	-	-	-
Wikewell PS Telemetry Refurbishment	3,904					
Pumping Station Refurbishment	-	33,300	60,000	-	-	-
Total Income	39,947	190,157	60,000	3,500	5,000	10,000
Surplus/(Deficit)	(7,931)	(91,729)	(60,000)	(3,500)	(5,000)	(10,000)
Balance Brought Forward	123,811	140,880	74,152	31,152	37,652	32,652
Transfer from Revenue	25,000	25,000	17,000	10,000	-	40,000
Balance Carried Forward	140,880	74,152	31,152	37,652	32,652	62,652

5.5 List of Payments

At their meeting on 9 December 2016, the Finance Committee considered schedules of payments made since the previous meeting.

The Committee noted that no cheques at all were reported.

The Committee approved the schedule of payments made directly from the current account. These totalled £86,052.36, of which £32,370.54 were approved by the Clerk and Engineer alone.

Additionally, the committee approved payments made directly from the Thorne Moors WLMP bank account totalling £148,628.66, none of which were approved by the Clerk and Engineer alone.

6. Health & Safety Report

6.1 Board Employees

6.1.1 Accidents and Incidents

Employees have not reported any accidents or incidents since the last meeting.

The effectiveness of the current system has now been confirmed.

7. Representation

Management has represented the Board within the following fora:

Environmental	Water Level Management	Other
Humberhead Levels Steering Group	Humber Flood Risk Management Steering Group	ADA Technical & Environment Committee
Humberhead Levels Partnership Group	Isle of Axholme Implementation Group	ADA Policy & Finance Committee
River Torne Catchment Partnership	South Yorkshire Flood Risk Management Group	
River Idle Catchment Partnership		
EA/ADA Eel Liaison Group		

8. APPENDIX A: Working Party notes

MEETING NOTES

Date: 12 January 2017

Working Party: Reconstitution and Code of Conduct Sanctions

Members appointed: Chris McGuinness, Peter Horne, Martin Oldknow, Peter Cornish, Karen Winnard, Geoff Parker, Lee Garrett

9.30. Apologies: Peter Horne, Roni Chapman

Attending: Chris McGuinness, Karen Winnard, Geoff Parker, Martin Oldknow, Peter Cornish

CMcG advised of general feeling Board needs to be smaller. Noted difficulty in hearing discussions. PC agreed, however issue with the room and not valid reason for reconstitution. MO agreed need for smaller Board to facilitate better and speedier decision making.

Discussions took place on why Board comprised 25 members in 2012. Reasons associated with achieving amalgamation, Boards with larger annual value had more than one member, associated with area dominated by agriculture. To achieve amalgamation was a compromise and agreement was reached for 12 elected members to be appointed to Board therefore bare majority DMBC would require 13 members.

CMcG noted after boundary commission far fewer councillors therefore council member availability difficult to achieve. KW noted council representatives seat was to represent council tax payers. AB advised charging authority nominated seat was to decide what was required for Board to function, not what was required politically, further advising this subject discussed extensively at recent ADA Committee meeting.

GP noted Board work well and had natural wastage through age and other commitments, suggesting Board Membership was diverse. He expressed concerns about the level of attendance required at Committees if size of Board reduced and decisions being made by few people. CMcG noted irony is size of Board means DMBC cannot always fill with appropriate representation to achieve bare majority.

Discussion about optimum size of a Board being 7, every 1 member over 7 decreased decision making efficiency by 10%. MO advised could not reduce membership to very small number, but may be able to achieve a position of say 13 or 15. PC advised at some meetings Board achieved perhaps 17 attendees. MO agreed noting Council representation being the party likely to fail. PC thought current meeting room not conducive to meetings, that different representatives don't mix well within the seating, each occupying a place grouping.

Discussion as to whether Board obliged to become one district now, rate was same across all districts now. AB checked, it was confirmed not obliged to become one district, 7 districts could be retained if Board wished. CMcG suggested Board required one representative from each District will retain local knowledge. PC noted Board was required to look at policy and strategy but agreed on occasions the local knowledge was crucial. PC suggested Board could co-opt or invite outside parties onto committees, with no voting power but who could bring expertise to the meeting. MO advised committees of 5 members would require 3 attendees to be quorate. GP noted difficulty of getting new landowners to sit on Board, similar to difficulties experienced by Council. Lack of enthusiasm from younger generation who did not feel same level of responsibility. AB advised common throughout industry, not specific to this Board. All agreed the Board required a spread of representation but 25 members was not sustainable. All agreed the importance of retaining one member from each of former amalgamating Boards, i.e. one from each District plus bare majority representation from Doncaster MBC which would deliver a Board of 15.

PC advised Isle of Axholme & North Notts had 25 members and it worked well. MO suggested it not only a question of numbers but whether those members contributed to the meetings. General agreement to that observation.

AB advised on following discussion about process of reconstitution. Difficult to estimate timescale but following Board agreement supported with associated Minutes, EA would be contacted who had responsibility to put scheme to Defra. Quite specific wording involved. Defra had to agree through Ministerial approval and it was Defra that placed advertisements etc. With Board agreement and knowing who to approach within EA, process could be handled relatively quickly but would still take number of months.

10.00am Lee Garrett attended.

CMcG advised LG Board could be very much smaller, currently often operated around 17 people. Two elected vacancies, 2 nominated vacancies and always at least a couple of apologies at meetings. 15 appeared to be the correct number, allowing retention of local knowledge from 1 representative of each District. PC advised DE IDB had fast turnover of nominated members and it took time for an understanding of Board function to be achieved. At IoA and North Notts some Councillors had been IDB members for considerable number of years and very good understanding of function which had a positive effect at Board meetings. MO felt council representatives brought better governance into Boards. PC agreed.

MO confirmed Board requirement for fewer members but to essential to retain the knowledge base; a smaller Board would encourage others to learn about other parts of the Board District.

GP felt provided each District was given the opportunity to be represented, a smaller number will be a good working Board. PC thought 15 may mean fewer members attend and decisions would be made by too small a number. Noted that was purpose of defining membership required to be quorate in standing orders. MO advised annual Audit Report advised attendance by DMBC is inappropriate and affects decision making processes.

AB advised number of members currently standing within each District. Members noted number range was:

- Hatfield Chase 3
- Finningley 2
- Armthorpe & West Moor 2
- Potteric Carr 2
- Tween Bridge 1
- Tickhill 1
- Armthorpe 1

It was noted the current vacancies following election were 1 on Finningley and 1 Armthorpe.

PC confirmed understanding of what Board trying to do in reducing membership but Board had some very large decisions to make in the near future and wondered if this was the correct course of action - to try to reconstitute now or should the Board be concentrating on those important issues on the horizon and park reconstitution issue for now? MO thought Board would be better able to reach agreement on those vitally important decisions would be easier with a smaller number of Members giving an opinion.

LG agreed the knowledge elected land owners and some appointed members have is second to none. New officer members are sometimes limited in input at Board meetings whilst Board function remains new to them therefore there was a balance to be struck between input and attendance. CMcG agreed advising for election purposes it was essential to retain the 7 districts to retain the spread of local knowledge, it would not be useful for the Board to be dominated by members with knowledge of one district.

Members noted the importance of being able to co-opt or invite others to attend for purpose of informed discussion and expertise at committees but with non-voting powers. AB advised Board could invite whomever it wished to provide advice. LDA 1991 also provides for co-option. Agreed there would be further investigation into co-opting in future.

Members agreed important to list reasons why Board was looking at reconstitution:

- Improve governance through appropriate balance of member attendance
- Ensure being quorate reflected appropriate balance member attendance
- Acknowledgement it was not easy to fill elected or nominated seats, evidenced by the current vacancies and regular non-attendances
- Fewer people make for better and more effective decision making
- In retaining district identity achieved local knowledge input

Recommendation to Board

- Agree reconstitution of Board to total 7 elected members
- Agree elected members will each represent one District
- Total Board membership will be 15

9. APPENDIX B: Meeting of the Internal Audit Review Panel

Held at JBA Consulting, Epsom House,
Monday, 28 November 2016

Present:	Mr Adrian Black	Scunthorpe & Gainsborough WMB
	Mr David Hinchcliffe	Black Drain Drainage Board
	Mr Peter Horne	Doncaster East IDB
	Mrs Veronica Chapman	Doncaster East IDB
	Mr Christopher Day	Ancholme IDB
	Mr Martin Oldknow	Black Drain DB/Doncaster East IDB
	Mrs Gillian Ivey	Danvm Drainage Commissioners
	Mr Andy Cane	Brodericks GBC

In Attendance on behalf of JBA Consulting:

Mr Craig Benson (Senior Financial Officer to the Shire Group of IDBs)
Mr Mark Joynes (Financial Officer to the Shire Group of IDBs)

1. Introductions and Apologies for Absence

The members of the panel briefly introduced themselves. Apologies for Absence were received from Cllr CA Harp and from Cllr R Sutherland.

2. Minutes of the Last Meeting/Matters Arising

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

3. Risk Register – New Format

The finance officer gave a brief update of the changes applied to the register since the last meeting. A section had been added specifically identifying what the undesirable events are and the risks associated with them. Also, the finance officers explained the proposal to maintain a separate register for every drainage authority, with each register tailored to the needs and circumstances of that client. The panel discussed the following items with regard to the format.

Individual Registers

Andy Cane suggested the current register is fairly general and it would be a good thing for each authority to have its own register. Gillian Ivey agreed and said each drainage authority has its own risks and circumstances. Craig Benson gave several examples of risks faced by individual clients that were particular to that client.

Live Document

The panel noted the document was now fairly unwieldy and discussed whether some of the older entries that have since been resolved be removed. The officers pointed out each Board needs to be aware of all the risks it faces and the control measures they have in place, to facilitate review.

Register of Members' Interests

Adrian Black enquired how often the register is updated. Craig Benson said members should advise Shire Group officers whenever there are any changes so the register may be updated. He further suggested a reminder could be included in the boards' meeting papers every year.

4. Risk Register – Items Discussed

In addition to the general format the panel discussed several specific items.

Declarations of Interest

GI suggested a sentence be added all Boards' meeting papers reminding them of the requirement to declare any interests. AB suggested correspondence should be sent to all members periodically requesting they check their details are up-to-date. AC asked how often members actually declared an interest during meetings and offered to leave the room. He was informed it did indeed happen although it is somewhat rare.

ACTION – Consider Issuing emails to members

Policies on Public Awareness

GI said that Danvm Drainage Commissioners strongly felt that the website did not very much help the public become more aware of Drainage Boards. She pointed out the search engine Google pointed the Shire Group home page rather than individual drainage authorities. Furthermore, she said they could do more to put things into the public arena and raise public awareness of Drainage Boards and their activities. CB pointed several recent events included ADA shows, their regional branches, the Lincolnshire Show and the Danvm Drainage Commissioners recent display at Bentley Park. Peter Horne asked whether it was the management team's responsibility to raise awareness. After a brief discussion regarding contractual arrangements CB said the team should take the lead, mentioning possible visits to local schools, explaining the importance of flood protection, giving flume demonstrations and so on.

5. Internal Auditor's Report

The internal auditor reviewed the work undertaken on the 2015/16 accounts. In general, the internal auditor was satisfied with how things are running and said there were no major concerns. The panel discussed the following points:

Decision Making

AC said this issue is never an easy one but the attendance of members and the split between elected and nominated members should always be borne in mind. MO said some boards should consider reducing reconstituting to reduce the number of members. PH said Doncaster East IDB would look carefully at this option and also that local authorities tend to nominate council officers, who tend not to get involved. GI said Danvm DC generally did well in this regard with all 13 nominated members attending the meetings on some occasions. AC reaffirmed attendance should reflect the 'plus-one' make-up of the Board's constitution. CB suggested if a Board has a majority of one, they should consider reconstitution. DH said he preferred councillors as they are better aware they are representing the drainage board and not the local authority that appointed them, and that officers may have different agendas.

Reserves Policy

GI pointed out that Danvm DC have now in fact adopted a reserves policy. AC was agreeable to amend his report. CB pointed out all Shire Group members have a reserves policy, with Goole Fields District DB being the sole exception.

Assessment of Control Environment

PH drew attention the internal auditor's frequent use of the phrase 'fairly robust', and said if the auditor couldn't provide any concrete suggestions on how to improve matters, an unqualified 'robust' would be more appropriate. AC said this was a mere wording issue, and acknowledged risk could never be entirely eliminated. He agreed to use the phrase 'robust' in future.

6. External Auditor's Report

The Annual Returns were reviewed by the panel and more specifically the External Auditors' comments. The following matters were discussed.

Ongoing Audit of Danvm Drainage Commissioners

CD asked for confirmation that the external auditors had all their required materials by July. CB confirmed so, and the audit should be complete by 30 September 2016. CB further explained that the external auditor should've been in contact and advised the Board to advertise that the audit was still ongoing. CD strongly expressed the view that this was not acceptable. CB agreed and said the officers would send an email on behalf of the panel to this effect. CB also gave the panel a brief description of the details of the change of regime. AC said auditors need to work to deadlines, 30 June in his case and 30 September for the external audit.

ACTION –Contact BDO on behalf of the panel by email

7. Any Other Business

Budget Process & Scope of Internal Audit

Craig Benson informed the panel he had looked at the budget process with the internal auditor. CD enquired about the scope of the audit. CB said the process was set down in legislation and the initial discussions took place in March. AC said the scope had to be flexible to allow for any necessary investigation. CB reminded the panel any specific risks could now be added to the risk register.

8. Date of Next Meeting and Close of Meeting

The next meeting of the panel will be held on Monday, 27 November 2017 at 10.00am at JBA Consulting, Epsom House, Redhouse Interchange, Doncaster, DN6 7FE.

CD thanked the internal auditor for all the work done and the finance officers thanked the members for attending. The meeting closed at approximately 10:50am.

10. APPENDIX C: Risk Register

A copy of the updated Risk Register can be found over the following pages. The Board is requested to review and approve the document.

Item	Grade	Impact	Likelihood	Ref	Risks	Mitigation and Action Required	Last Reviewed
Governance - Members & Management							
Question 1 - Does the Board Lack Direction?							
1. a)	B	High	Low	1.1	Disunity in Board with conflicting aims & objectives. External bodies and the wider public lack understanding of the Board's aims & objectives. Internal/external disputes cannot be resolved through lack of adopted policies.	Each board has a policy statement on Flood Protection and Water Level Management. These fall short of full Strategic Plan. All Boards have Biodiversity Action Plans. ADA standard model policies utilized to adopt an application. By default the constitution follows the provisions laid down in the Land Drainage Acts.	16/11/2016
1. b)	B	High	Low	1.2	Board lacks sufficient funds to meet its obligations.	Budgets follow sound logical principles. Approved by each IDB.	16/11/2016
1. c)	B	High	Low	1.3	Officer's unaware they have exceeded, budget, become overdrawn or that there are other, material errors in the accounting records. Inefficient, dangerous operational practises occur and continue unaddressed.	Daily, weekly, Monthly and Quarterly totals considered by Financial Officers on an ongoing basis that these are in accordance in general terms with budget. Evidence of budget monitoring approved by IDBs. Budget review document signed each month with comments.	16/11/2016
1. d)	B	High	Low	1.4	Board members and other funding partners unaware of problems set out above. Said problems continue unaddressed.	Operational performance considered and updated at Board meetings as appropriate. Ratepayers know Board members. (Names of all Board members are available on the Shire Group website) Feedback to board of praise /criticism via member. Complaints procedure documented and available on website.	16/11/2016
Members/Officials							
Question 2 - Do officials/members lack relevant skills or commitments?							
2. a)	D	Low	Low	2.1	Board members/officials lack suitable knowledge and experience. Members/officials lack ability to make objective decisions and act in the Board's long-term interest. Recruitment process is not transparent to all.	Land Drainage Act provides for election of members every 3rd Year. Generally recruitment is via word of mouth from existing members and landowners who have been affected by the boards' policies in order to represent their interests. Format of the nomination papers is prescribed by the LDA 1991 and copies are available on the website.	16/11/2016
2. b)	D C	Low Low	Low High	2.2	Unsuitable members (see above) appointed to the Board Local Authority appoints unsuitable members to the Board.	Qualifications for membership laid down by LDA 1991. See reverse side of nomination paper. Council to nominate people as they consider appropriate	16/11/2016

Item	Grade	Impact	Likelihood	Ref	Risks	Mitigation and Action Required	Last Reviewed
2. c)	C	Low	High	2.3	Members/officials lack understanding of the Board's objectives, latest legislative requirement and latest developments in the industry.	Ian Benn is a member of the ADA Technical & Environmental Committee. He attends a forum of local Clerks approx. 3 times per year together with The Association of Drainage Authorities annual conference. Regular updates from Association of Drainage Authorities. All updates reported to members in their meeting papers. Training seminars on legislation, responsibilities, ethics, etc. are being delivered. Comprehensive modular training scheme to be added to the website (target date 31.3.2017)	16/11/2016
Question 3 - Does the Board lack appropriate composition?							
3. a)	B	High	Low	3.1	No clear framework of the operations in the organisation. Members/officials do not understand their own roles & responsibilities.	Composition of the Board set out in DLA. Standing Orders and Financial Regulations renewed are reviewed and renewed. To be approved by DEFRA.	16/11/2016
3. b)	D	Low	Low	3.2	A member's interest are in conflict with those of the Board. Board are unaware of any such potential conflicts.	Minutes and agenda thereto states Board Members are advised to declare a pecuniary or non pecuniary interest on any item in the agenda. Register of Members' Interest compiled and kept up-to-date.	16/11/2016
3. c)	D	Low	Low	3.3	Members / officials meetings have taken place. Decisions of the Board go unrecorded.	LDA and Clerk to arrange programme of meetings. Agenda for meeting set by Clerk and Chairman. Minutes of meetings scrutinised & approved by Board.	16/11/2016
3. d)	B	High	Low		As 3 b) above.	As 3 b) above.	16/11/2016
3. e)	D	Low	Low		Reviewers not certain of legality of expense payments made to members.	Not for Board meetings, conferences only, as per LDA.	16/11/2016
3. f)	D	Low	Low		Board exposed to risk of fraud.	No remuneration policy in place. Boards may pay a chairman's honorarium at their discretion, subject to ministerial approval.	16/11/2016
Management							
Question 4 - Is There an Adequate & Informed Organisational Structure?							
4. a)	D	Low	Low		See 2. c) above.	See 2. c) above. Management are involved in the preparation of training modules and attend the seminars, or indeed deliver them.	16/11/2016
4. b)	D	Low	Low		Lack of a clear chain of command. Officers uncertain of the responsibilities and level of authority. Organisational structure difficult to review.	In general on website. Further, more detailed documents setting out team structure, individual roles, etc. on JBA records. To be added to the website (target date 31.3.2017)	16/11/2016
4. c)	D	Low	Low		Staff problems and organisational anomalies not addressed.	JBA procedures. IDB Division established in line with DEFRA requirements.	16/11/2016
4. d)	D	Low	Low		Conflicts of interest not detected and not addressed.	JBA procedures. IDB Division established in line with DEFRA requirements.	16/11/2016

Item	Grade	Impact	Likelihood	Ref	Risks	Mitigation and Action Required	Last Reviewed
4. e) Is there a competence framework?	B	High	Low		Assessment of staff members ability to fulfil their roles is difficult, and the results harder to justify.	Prescriptive Job Descriptions written for each team member. These are in progress. (reviewed annually). Detailed descriptions setting out roles & requirements included in tender documentation.	16/11/2016
Question 5 - Is there a lack of succession planning? Can experience and skills be lost, and corporate contract/operational impact be lost?							
5. a) Is there succession planning?	B	High	Low	13.1	Orderly transitions not adequately planned for and disruptions/delays occur as a result.	Good balance of knowledge and skills appropriately segregated. Procedures being documented.	16/11/2016
5. b) Are there appropriate notice periods for changeover?	B	High	Low	13.1	Insufficient time to plan for transitions causes disruption.	All IDB Division Staff have a permanent contract with JBA Consulting. Employees with over two years' service are required to give three months' notice in writing.	16/11/2016
5. c) Are there training programs in place?	B	High	Low		Staff lack the knowledge and appropriate training to fulfil their roles.	Ongoing on the job training of key staff occurring.	16/11/2016
Question 6 - Is the reporting process adequate?							
6. a) Is there timely and accurate project reporting?	D	Low	Low		Management, stakeholders and other interested parties not aware potentially problematic issues.	Progress on capital schemes is reported regularly at Board meetings.	16/11/2016
6. b) Is there timely and accurate financial reporting?	D	Low	Low		Members and management not made aware on problematic or otherwise important issues in a timely manner.	Estimates Jan/Feb, Accounts May/June.	16/11/2016
6. c) Is there a budget setting process?	D	Low	Low		Board lacks sufficient funds to meets its obligations.	Yes. Laid down by LDA. Budgets set every Jan/Feb	16/11/2016
6. d) Is there proper project assessment?	D	Low	Low		Lack of due project assessment may allow problems to arise again in future schemes.	Grant-aided scheme - PAB Approval. Non grant-aided - reported to the board.	16/11/2016
6. e) Is there regular contact between board and management?	D	Low	Low		Board members unaware of relevant issues, whether operational, financial, administrative or environmental. Board members unable to set policy as required.	Regular Board meetings.	16/11/2016
Operational Risk							
Question 7 - Are there any risks associated with the provision of services?							
7. a) Is there a quality control procedure?	D	Low	Low		Services rendered do not adhere to relevant professional standards.	No quality control procedure but officers are ISO 9001 accredited.	16/11/2016
7. b) Is there a complaints procedure?	B	High	Low		No opportunity for dissatisfied parties to air grievances, nor any opportunity for the Board address them and correct any problems where necessary.	Website provides clear instructions on how to make complaints. All complaints reported to the Board in the meeting papers.	16/11/2016
7. c) Is there a policy to raise public awareness and profile?	D	Low	Low		General public unaware of the roles & responsibilities of drainage authorities, or even of their existence.	Website - Shire Group of Internal Drainage Boards.	16/11/2016
Question 8 - Is there a risk of supplier dependency?							
8. a) Are there procedures for obtaining quotations/periodic review of suppliers' charges?	B	High	Low	8.1	Unsuitable goods/services ordered by persons lacking suitable knowledge & experience, resulting in financial burden.	Levels of authority for ordering goods & services clearly set out in Board's financial regulations. Requirement for suitable number of quotations set out in same.	16/11/2016

Item	Grade	Impact	Likelihood	Ref	Risks	Mitigation and Action Required	Last Reviewed
8. b)	D	Low	Low		Contractors appointed lacking suitable training, knowledge, competence and experience.	JBA carry out all quality assurance on all contractors. Approved contractor list circulated as appropriate and approved by the board. List of the Board's approved contractors on Health & Safety website.	16/11/2016
8. c)	B	High	Low	8.1	Inadequate level of service rendered and/or unnecessary delays.	JBA administers all tendering processes and timing.	16/11/2016
Question 9 - Is there a risk that capital resources are under utilised?							
9. a)	B	High	Low	8.2	Problems not detected and corrected in a timely manner.	Asset Management program in place.	16/11/2016
9. b)	D	Low	Low	8.2	As above.	Repairs undertaken as required and approved at board meeting and general review to consider replacement option.	16/11/2016
9. c)	B	High	Low	8.2	Board unable implement necessary replacement of capital items.	JBA prepare and update for each meeting a 5 year capital programme for IDBs.	16/11/2016
9. d)	B	High	Low	8.2	Security issues not detected and corrected in a timely manner.	Boards with plant have secure depots. Site staff bring any potential security issues to the officers' attentions immediately. Intruder alerts detected automatically and reported immediately through the telemetry system.	16/11/2016
9. e)	B	High	Low	8.2	Board has inadequately level of cover. Board is paying for unnecessary insurance cover.	Towergate Insurance annually review all eight Board policies. IDB supplied with details.	16/11/2016
Question - 10 Is there a risk of employment disputes due to injury, unfair dismissal, equal opportunities, in appropriate training etc., or a high staff turnover?							
10. a)	D	Low	Low	10.1	New staff appointed who lack relevant training, competence, etc.	Interview questionnaires used.	16/11/2016
10. b)	B	High	Low	10.2	Employee dishonesty with regard to qualifications and previous experience may go undetected.	Written references and copies of relevant certificates obtained when new employees are engaged.	16/11/2016
10. c)	B	High	Low	10.3	Discrimination (e.g. by age, gender, race, religion or belief, sexual orientation, disability) may occur in the recruitment process and go undetected. Favouritism and nepotism may likewise occur.	No formal policy in place. Abide by current statute.	16/11/2016
10. d)	D	Low	Low		Opportunities to strengthen links with workforce misses. Also, to avert future disputes & generally improve workplace satisfaction missed.	6-monthly review for new starters. Annual appraisal process for workforce.	16/11/2016
10. d)	D	Low	Low	10.4	Training needs and career development goals of individuals not determined.	Schedule of training needs via the asset manager.	16/11/2016
10. f)	D	Low	Low	10.4	Health and safety needs of individuals not assessed. Accidents and illnesses that should be easily preventable occur.	As above.	16/11/2016
10. g)	D	Low	Low	10.5	No clarity as to each employees roles and responsibilities.	Job specifications in place for recent appointments.	16/11/2016
10. h)	B	High	Low		Employees' remuneration is not appropriate for their level of experience and their current roles and responsibilities. Workplace dissatisfaction through inadequate pay.	Rates increased in accordance with Association of Drainage Authority guidelines. Training and working conditions as 10 e) above.	16/11/2016

Item	Grade	Impact	Likelihood	Ref	Risks	Mitigation and Action Required	Last Reviewed
10. i) Are there contracts of employment?	B	High	Low	10.6	Employees uncertain of the details of their roles and what is expected of them.	Contracts of employment in place.	16/11/2016
Question 11 - Are there risks of loss of information and continuity?							
11. a) Is there a disaster recovery plan	B	High	Low	11.1	Business IT infrastructure destroyed by fire, vandalism, etc. Severe disruptions to operational effectiveness.	Backup tapes <u>kept off site</u> .	16/11/2016
11. b) Is there a policy of taking and sharing data off site?	B	High	Low	11.1	Major disruption to operational effectiveness as a result of significant loss of data.	As 11. a) above.	16/11/2016
11. c) Is there Insurance cover? Is it regularly reviewed?	B	High	Low		As 9. e) above.	see 9. e) above.	16/11/2016
Question 12 - Is there a risk of lack of awareness of procedures and policies?							
12. a) Is there a proper documentation of procedures and policies?	B	High	Low	12.1	Confusion or disagreements not quickly resolved. Uncertainty over requirements and expected standards.	Recommend that policies be documented at the earliest opportunity. All adopted policy documents available on website. Procedures are in progress <u>(target date 31.3.2017)</u>	16/11/2016
D							
Financial Risks							
Question 13 - Is there a risk of loss of control through an inadequate budget process?							
13. a) Is there a budget linked to planning and objectives?	B	High	Low		As 1. b) above.	See 1. b) above. 5-year or 25-year budget forecasts presented at Board meetings.	16/11/2016
13. b) Is the budget regularly reviewed and monitored?	B	High	Low		As 1. c) above.	See 1. c) above.	16/11/2016
13. c) Is there a monitored and adequate skill base to interpret the information?	B	High	Low		Staff, members or other reviewers do not understand the implications of the forecasts they are presented with.	Team members both experienced and suitably qualified.	16/11/2016
13. d) Is there an indication of major dependencies on income sources?	B	High	Low		Board left in financial disarray should such an income stream suddenly cease for any reason.	Highlights requirements of DEFRA Grants and/or Public Works Loans (Capital works).	16/11/2016
Question 14 - Is there a risk of lack of liquidity due to inadequate reserves?							
14. a) Is there a reserves policy linked to business plans and identified risks?	B	High	Low		Board lacks adequate funds to fulfil its statutory obligations. Board unable to remain solvent following a major undesirable event.	The Board have a reserve policy in place, and take it into consideration when setting the budget every year.	16/11/2016
14. b) Is there a regular review of the reserves policy?	B	High	Low		Reserve policy fall out-of-date and are no longer adequate to meet the requirements of the Board.	Policies reviewed periodically, typically 3 or 5 years.	16/11/2016
14. c) Is there a fair reflection of the financial integrity of the Boards reserves?	B	High	Low		Actuality of the Board's financial perform leaves them in a position in breach of their reserves policy.	Presentation of balances within accounts is consistent with associated effects on stated reserves. Recommend review of presentation of Balance Sheet in conjunction with Reserves Policy. <u>This is ongoing.</u>	16/11/2016
External Risks / Compliance with the Law							
Question 15 - Is there a risk associated with non-compliance with the law or other external factors?							
15. a) Is there a policy of review of the legal requirements extending to the organisation/professional opinion sought re:							
• Employment Law?	B	High	Low		Board in breach of its statutory obligations.	Equal Opportunities policies in existence.	16/11/2016
• Human Rights Legislation?					Same	All applicable law complied with.	

Item		Grade	Impact	Likelihood	Ref	Risks Same Same	Mitigation and Action Required Ian Benn/Craig Benson Health & Safety Advisors. Disciplinary Procedures.	Last Reviewed
15. b)	Is there a policy for monitoring and reporting grant funders' conditions? • Health & Safety? • Criminal Acts?	B	High	Low		Actual costs may exceed budgeted, opportunities to take corrective action missed.	Depends on the scheme. Monitored generally by the project manager.	16/11/2016
Speciifc Board Risks								
Question 16 - Are there any specific Board Risks?								
16. a)	Is there a major ratepayer whose none payment would significantly impact on the Board activities? • Drainage Rate Payer • Special Levy paying council	B	High	Low		Board left with shortfall in reserves Board unable to pay Creditors Cashflow problems Change in % of Board membership	Reserve Policy and long term planning same same Board awareness.	19/12/2016
16. b)	Is there an over reliance on borrowing monies to fund capital replacement?	B	High	Low		Facility to borrow money may not be available. Restrictions placed on the level of annual loan repayments as a percentage of Rates and Special Levies Instigate a council referendum if rate increase is more than 2%.	Increase in drainage rates to build funds specifically for capital replacement. Depreciate asset and set aside funds annual to replace at end of life. Source other funding possibilities such as Grants, Local Enterprise Partnerships	16/12/2016
16. c)	Environment Agency withdrawal of maintenance on main river and tidal systems	A	High	High		Board's maintenance operations reliant upon EA systems Agricultural land taken for flood storage thereby reducing drainage rate income of Board	Board consider carrying out work on main river at own cost. Reduce works on ordinary watercourses	19/12/2016
16. d)	Major Development in Board's District	B	Low	High		Increase in Special Levy on Council Change in % split of membership of Board.	Council made aware of impact of development on Special Levy. Board made aware of changes to Board membership	19/12/2016
16. e)	Third Party Contributions Cease	B	Low	High		Third parties seek to remove their commitment to fund shared assets	Review existing arrangements and opportunities to update all agreements.	19/12/2016
16. f)	Failure of Board Asset	B	Low	High		Failure of asset adversely affects the conveyance of water through the Board's District	Board to instigate a proactive inspection regime to mitigate against unplanned failures.	19/12/2016



Shire

Group of IDBs

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
Doncaster
Edinburgh
Haywards Heath
Limerick
Newcastle upon Tyne
Newport
Northallerton
Saltaire
Skipton
Tadcaster
Wallingford
Warrington

