

**POLICY AND RESOURCES CABINET COMMITTEE**

**Wednesday, 3rd March, 2021**

**10.00 am**

**online**





## AGENDA

### POLICY AND RESOURCES CABINET COMMITTEE

**Wednesday, 3 March 2021, at 10.00 am  
online**

Ask for: **Theresa Grayell**  
Telephone: **03000 416172**

#### **Membership (15)**

- Conservative (12): Mr B J Sweetland (Chairman), Mr R A Marsh (Vice-Chairman), Mr M A C Balfour, Mr P V Barrington-King, Mr P Bartlett, Mr T Bond, Mr N J D Chard, Mr G Cooke, Mrs M E Crabtree, Mr P W A Lake, Mr D Murphy and Mr H Rayner
- Liberal Democrat (2): Mr R H Bird and Mrs T Dean, MBE
- Labour (1) Mr D Farrell

#### **UNRESTRICTED ITEMS**

*(During these items the meeting is likely to be open to the public)*

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Apologies and Substitutes
- 3 Declarations of Interest by Members in items on the Agenda
- 4 Minutes of the meeting held on 14 January 2021 (Pages 1 - 8)
- 5 Covid-19 Financial Monitoring (Pages 9 - 28)
- 6 Strategic and Corporate Services Performance Dashboard (Pages 29 - 42)
- 7 Review of KCC Company Ownership Governance (Pages 43 - 44)
- 8 Risk Management: Strategic and Corporate Services (Pages 45 - 72)
- 9 Kent Estates Partnership and the One Public Estate Programme (Pages 73 - 78)

10 Work Programme (Pages 79 - 84)

11 Meeting Dates for 2021/22 - for information

The Cabinet Committee is asked to note that the following dates have been reserved for its meetings in 2021/22.

10 June 2021

1 September 2021

9 November 2021

21 January 2022 – 2.00 pm

23 March 2022

10 June 2022

*All meetings start at 10.00 am, except in January 2022.*

12 Cyber Security Annual Report (Pages 85 - 98)

**Motion to exclude the press and public for exempt business**

That, under Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

Paragraph 3 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)

**EXEMPT ITEMS**

*(at the time of preparing the agenda, the only exempt content was the appendix to item 12.  
If the committee wishes to refer to this content during debate, that part of the meeting will be closed to the press and public)*

Benjamin Watts  
General Counsel  
03000 416814

**Tuesday, 23 February 2021**

This page is intentionally left blank

**KENT COUNTY COUNCIL**

---

**POLICY AND RESOURCES CABINET COMMITTEE**

MINUTES of a meeting of the Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee held in the online on Thursday, 14 January 2021

PRESENT: Mr B J Sweetland (Chairman), Mr M A C Balfour, Mr P V Barrington-King, Mr P Bartlett, Mr R H Bird, Mr T Bond, Mr N J D Chard, Mr G Cooke, Mrs M E Crabtree, Mrs T Dean, MBE, Mr D Farrell and Mr H Rayner

ALSO PRESENT: Mr P J Oakford, Mr P M Hill, OBE, Mr E E C Hotson, Mr R L H Long, TD and Miss D Morton

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr B Watts (General Counsel), Ms Z Cooke (Corporate Director of Finance), Mrs R Spore (Director of Infrastructure), Canon P Bruinvels (Kent County Council Civilian-Military Liaison Adviser and Military Expert), Ms D Exall (Strategic Relationship Adviser), Ms L Jackson (Policy Manager), Mr J Sanderson (Head of Property Operations), Mr D Shipton (Head of Finance Policy, Planning and Strategy), Mr D Whittle (Director of Strategy, Policy, Relationships and Corporate Assurance), Miss T A Grayell (Democratic Services Officer) and Ms E Kennedy (Democratic Services Officer)

**UNRESTRICTED ITEMS****250. Apologies and Substitutes**

*(Item 2)*

Apologies for absence had been received from Mr D Murphy and the Head of Paid Service, Mr D Cockburn.

**251. Declarations of Interest by Members in items on the Agenda**

*(Item 3)*

There were no declarations of interest.

**252. Minutes of the meeting held on 6 November 2020**

*(Item 4)*

1. Mr D Farrell asked why a briefing note about various property issues following on from the November meeting, which had been emailed to the committee, was marked 'confidential', and if any of the information in it could be made public. Mr Watts undertook to look into this and advise Mr Farrell.
2. It was RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 6 November 2020 are correctly recorded and that a paper copy be signed by the Chairman when this can be done safely.

**253. Annual Report on the Implementation of the Armed Forces Covenant in Kent**  
(Item 5)

1. Cabinet Member for Education and Skills, and Armed Forces Champion, Mr R H Long, introduced the report and thanked the officer team for their work. Canon Bruinvels then set out the scope of the covenant, the joint working arrangements between the County Council and the Army and the team's priorities for 2021. He advised the committee that the Armed Forces Bill would be placed before parliament shortly. The covenant was also concerned with the welfare of the children of service personnel, of which there were currently 1,200 in Kent, and the 77,000 veterans and ex-service personnel in Kent. Canon Bruinvels responded to comments and questions from the committee, including the following:-

- a) children of service personnel were known to perform well at school. Asked if the County Council could do any more to support them by increasing the service pupil premium, he urged any Member who was a school governor to check that this was being spent to the best advantage. It would be helpful if a good practice guide to using service pupil premium could be produced;
- b) the service pupil passport was a Kent scheme which recorded the academic performance of children of service personnel so their academic record could travel with them to their next posting;
- c) asked for reassurance that army veterans were receiving the care they needed to help them cope during the pandemic, he advised that, although many clubs had had to close due to the current restrictions, the Armed Forces charity, the Soldiers, Sailors, Airmen and Families Association (SSAFA) was working with veterans online. However, many veterans did not have access to online facilities and SSAFA was not able to make house calls; and
- d) the Royal British Legion had a high profile in the Maidstone area and did much good work locally. Its 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary in 2021 was expected to be marked by virtual activities. Canon Bruinvels advised that the Legion and SSAFA worked closely together to support veterans.

2. The Chairman thanked the team for all the work they undertook on behalf of the County Council and thanked Canon Bruinvels for attending and answering the committee's questions.

3. It was RESOLVED that work to deliver the Armed Forces Covenant in Kent be noted and welcomed and the County Council's commitment to this work be endorsed.

**254. Draft Capital Programme 2021-24 and Revenue Budget 2021-22**  
(Item 6)

1. The Cabinet Member for Finance, Mr P J Oakford, introduced the report and advised that, as in previous years, Cabinet Committees were being asked to discuss and comment on the budget before it was considered by the full Council. Ms Cooke

and Mr Shipton then summarised the report and detailed the national and local context in which this year's budget had been set and the measures taken by the County Council to manage the impact of these.

2. Mr Oakford, Ms Cooke and Mr Shipton then responded to comments and questions from the committee, including the following:-

- a) the work which had gone into preparing the budget was commended and officers were thanked for their time and diligence;
- a) asked about funding being made available to improve broadband in Kent, now that so many more people needed to work from home, Ms Cooke advised that broadband improvement was being addressed jointly by the Growth, Environment and Transport and Strategic Corporate Services directorates. On behalf of Mr M Whiting, Cabinet Member for Economic Development, Mr Oakford undertook to provide Members with a simple guide to helping Kent residents to address any broadband issues;
- b) asked what percentage of the Council's budget was taken up by staff costs, Mr Shipton advised that salaries and pensions for directly-employed staff made up only about 20% of the total budget. Ms Cooke added that staff costs represented a smaller percentage of the budget than previously as the Council had moved gradually to being a commissioning body; many former County Council staff were now employed by arm's length trading companies. Mr Oakford added that the staff employed by the Council's trading companies had no impact on the Council's wage bill;
- c) asking about increasing reserves and using these to address residents' service needs, Mr Oakford advised that the situation this year with reserves was difficult and unprecedented. The County Council had to plan for financial resilience to ensure that its programmed services and improvements could be retained. Ms Cooke advised that reserves were currently at a low but adequate level. The short- and long-term impacts of the end of the pandemic upon service demands were difficult to predict, but there were a number of financial risks, for example, fewer care home places had been taken up during the pandemic but the budget needed to take account of a potential increase in demand once the pandemic had ended;
- d) concern was expressed about the nature and ongoing impact of Council Tax upon the Council's budget, representing around 70% of the Council's income. Council Tax was calculated on the value of a person's property, taking no account of the ability to pay. The economic impacts of the pandemic had brought into sharper focus households with reduced incomes who had been struggling to pay Council Tax; and
- e) lack of long-term funding for adult social care was also a significant concern, and the Government's promised white paper on the subject was still awaited. Mr Oakford advised that the County Council had previously increased its share of Council Tax by 3%, when this was permitted with the sole aim of supporting the increasing costs of delivering adult social care services in the county. The Government's long-term plans for funding adult social care were not yet known. Mr Shipton advised that the County Council, in line with many other

local authorities, included the issues of Council Tax and adult social care costs every year in its response to the Government's budget consultation, but no Government response had yet been received.

3. The Chairman paid tribute to the way in which the County Council's staff had risen to the many challenges raised by the pandemic and recorded his thanks and appreciation.

4. It was RESOLVED that:-

a) the draft capital and revenue budgets, including the responses to the budget consultation, be noted; and

b) Members' comments on the draft capital and revenue budget be reported to the Cabinet and full County Council when they consider the draft budget, on 25th January 2021 and 11th February 2021, respectively.

## **255. Update on Civil Society Strategy and Support to the Voluntary Sector during covid-19**

*(Item 7)*

1. The Cabinet Member for Community and Regulatory Services, Mr M Hill, introduced the report and highlighted the excellent response of the voluntary sector in supporting the people of Kent, despite the loss of income it faced as a result of the pandemic. A new Strategic Partnership Board had been established and would meet for the first time shortly. Ms Jackson added that a consultation on a draft Civil Society Strategy had been undertaken pre covid-19 and finished in April 2020, however further development of the strategy had been suspended due the pandemic but would now be revised.

2. Mr Hill, Mr Oakford and the officer team responded to comments and questions from the committee, including the following:-

a) the new Strategic Partnership Board would meet monthly and report to the Cabinet Committee every six months. Its memberships would include the chair of the VCS recovery cell put in place as part of covid recovery arrangements and representatives of the County Council, district councils and the NHS . Mr Hill undertook to share the new Board's terms of reference with the Cabinet Committee once these had been agreed at its first meeting;

b) crowdfunding was welcomed as a good proposal and should involve experienced existing organisations as well as new ones. Asked if Members would be able to participate in workshops about crowdfunding, so they could help local residents to understand the process, Ms Jackson undertook to involve them in the communications and engagement;

c) asked about Kent Savers, which aimed to avoid families using doorstep lenders, Ms Cooke advised that this sought to identify households which needed immediate financial help;

- d) many voluntary organisations were supported by the County Council by means of subsidised leases and sponsored property arrangements, and the County Council needed to be sensitive to their financial difficulties, if and when these arrangements needed to be reviewed. Mr Hill advised that he tried to ensure they were offered the best deal possible. Mr Oakford added that he hoped to be able to increase funding available to local bodies via community and Members' grants in future years, depending on future budget circumstances;
  - e) asked for clarification of match funding in relation to Crowdfunding, if the County Council would always meet match funding commitments and if this funding would have any conditions, Mr Hill undertook to look into this and report back to the Cabinet Committee. Ms Jackson stated that there would be a broad set of outcomes against the fund to identify projects that it would support but these would not be overly prescriptive. Mr Whittle added that details of crowdfunding arrangements could be shared with the committee when ready, either before or at its next meeting;
  - f) asked to comment on the financial standing and viability of some of the larger charities and hospices in Kent, in relation to whatever support the County Council could give them, Mr Hill advised that hospices were covered by a specific Government grant but the new board could look into financial risks and sustainability in the voluntary sector. Details about hospice funding could be shared with the committee, along with an update on the impact of the second wave of the pandemic;
  - g) asked about the scope to survey voluntary sector organisations to assess their financial standing, Mr Whittle advised that the Kent Community Foundation may have suitable information which the County Council could access and the Partnership Board would look at this;
  - h) asked who would decide how to spend the £1.7m emergency assistance fund, and how the additional funds mentioned in paragraph 2.4 of the report had been allocated, Ms Cooke advised that allocation of the emergency assistance fund was a decision for the Leader of the County Council, taking views from voluntary sector organisations and district councils. The additional funding had been allocated to districts to help local families in need. The County Council would be able to monitor how this funding had been spent and share this information with the Cabinet Committee; and
  - i) voluntary sector organisations worked very closely with the health and social care sectors, and Members working with these sectors needed to be included in, and kept up to date with, the information requested by earlier speakers. Ms Jackson undertook to ensure that other Members and committees were briefed on the issues raised.
3. It was RESOLVED that the information set out in the report and in response to questions and comments be noted, including the further information requested for future meetings of the committee.

## **256. Facilities Management Procurement Update**

*(Item 8)*

1. Mr Sanderson introduced the report and he and Ms Spore responded to comments and questions from the committee, including the following:-

- a) the revised presentation of the latest report was welcomed;
- b) asked about potential risks of contracting with one large provider, and if contracts for smaller providers would use social value to help to support economic recovery, Mr Sanderson advised that the main contract would be split into individual functions which would be covered by a number of smaller suppliers. This would allow the County Council to retain more control. The small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) taking up the smaller contracts were local to Kent so their use would indeed support local economic recovery. Ms Spore added that social value was one of the evaluation criteria and confirmed that SMEs would be actively engaged to encourage them to take part in the tendering process; and
- c) asked about the structure and length of contracts, Ms Spore advised that one large and a number of small contracts allowed the County Council to spread risk as well as attract a range of local providers, and this model made the most of changes which had arisen in the market since contracts were last let. It would be easier to re-let a contract if any one provider failed to perform satisfactorily.

2. It was RESOLVED that progress on the Facilities Management Procurement be noted.

## **257. Construction Partnership Commission**

*(Item 9)*

1. Ms Spore introduced the report and summarised the key points and the rationale and process for identifying the preferred option. Ms Spore and Mr Clark responded to comments and questions from the committee, including the following:-

- a) concern was expressed that the reduced number of contractors would limit the scope for good competition. Ms Spore advised that all seven contractors had to be Kent companies and would be invited to tender for each contract, although not all were expected to do so, due to the cost of preparing each tender. It was expected that the bulk of contracts would be taken up by two or three main contractors, who would have an incentive to deliver good value. Mr Clark added that the new arrangement offered good opportunities for bidders to add social value;
- a) other government frameworks could be used, for example, the Department for Education's framework for delivering education projects; and
- b) asked about how the award of contracts on a rotation basis would allow the County Council to achieve value for money, Mr Clark advised that quantity surveyors would check the market rates to ensure that best prices were being charged. If the tender did not represent the best rate, the contract

would not be awarded. Ms Spore added that benchmarking was very important and that value for money was not solely about price but included social value.

2. It was RESOLVED that the preferred option and procurement timetable be noted, and a further report be submitted to the committee's March meeting.

### **258. Work Programme**

*(Item 10)*

It was RESOLVED that, with the addition of items about the following:

- the role of the Governance and Audit Committee and
  - a review of County Council's trading companies,
- the committee's work programme for 2021 be noted

### **259. Motion to exclude the press and public for exempt business**

It was RESOLVED that, under Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

**EXEMPT ITEMS** (open access to minutes)

### **260. Total Facilities Management Bi-annual Review**

*(Item 11)*

1. Mr Clark introduced the report and advised that performance and customer satisfaction had both improved since the change in contractor. There were no questions.
2. It was RESOLVED that the current performance of Total Facilities Management contractors be noted.

This page is intentionally left blank

From: Peter Oakford, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance, Corporate & Traded Services

Zena Cooke, Corporate Director - Finance

To: Policy & Resources Cabinet Committee – 3 March 2021

Subject: Covid-19 Financial Monitoring

Key decision: No

Classification: Unrestricted

Past Pathway of Paper: N/A

Future Pathway of Paper: N/A

**Summary:**

The attached report provides an update on the Covid-19 grants KCC has received to date and monitoring of expenditure from the grants.

**Recommendations:**

The Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee is asked to NOTE this report.

**Contact details**

Report Author(s)

- Dave Shipton (Head of Finance Policy, Planning and Strategy)
- 03000 419418
- [dave.shipton@kent.gov.uk](mailto:dave.shipton@kent.gov.uk)

Relevant Corporate Director:

- Zena Cooke
- 03000 416854
- [zena.cooke@kent.gov.uk](mailto:zena.cooke@kent.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank

# Covid-19 Monitoring

	Sctn	Page
Summary	1	2
Background	2	3
Schedule of Covid-19 Grants	3	5
Covid-19 Monitoring Return	4	7
Contain Outbreak Management Fund	5	8
Helping Hands Scheme	6	10
Appendices		
Details of Grant Allocations	A	11
Key Decisions	B	16

---

Relevant Director	Corporate Director Finance, Zena Cooke
Report author(s)	Head of Finance Policy Planning and Strategy, Dave Shipton
Circulated to	
Classification	Unrestricted

---

## Contact details

---

Head of Finance Policy, Planning and Strategy Dave Shipton 03000 419 418 [dave.shipton@kent.gov.uk](mailto:dave.shipton@kent.gov.uk)  
Corporate Director of Finance Zena Cooke 03000 419 205 [zena.cooke@kent.gov.uk](mailto:zena.cooke@kent.gov.uk)

---

---

**Summary**

<p>£184.4m additional grant provided by central government to support responding to Covid-19</p>	<p>These additional grants have come from a number of departmental announcements during the year. The main emergency grant from the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) has come in four tranches between March to October and is un-ringfenced (can be used for purposes determined locally in response to or recovery from the pandemic). Other grants have been specific grants (can only be used for purposes defined by government). Virtually all the grants have been allocated on a formulaic basis or with a few based on claims for costs incurred (including income losses).</p>
<p>Latest January Covid-19 return shows a £21.8m deficit</p>	<p>KCC submits regular monitoring returns to the MHCLG. KCC's returns show a reasonable degree of consistency throughout the year although some of the earlier forecasts have been revised downwards and some have subsequently been funded by specific grants. KCC forecasts are slightly higher than the average for other county councils but are not an outlier.</p>
<p>MHCLG returns differ from KCC budget monitoring</p>	<p>The returns include all forecast additional spending and income losses incurred as a result of the pandemic. The forecast includes contingency provisions not included in KCC budget monitoring reports. The return does not include the one-off underspends on the Council's core budget due to Covid-19 restrictions. Consequently, the MHCLG return shows a higher net impact than KCC budget monitoring.</p>
<p>Public Health grants</p>	<p>A total of £25.3m has been made available to support public health response to containing the outbreak. This includes £6.3m Test and Trace Support Service Support Grant paid in June, £12.7m from Contain Outbreak Management Fund (COMF) in response to the November national lockdown, and £6.3m from COMF in response to the tier 3 restrictions in December. Further monthly tranches of COMF will be made available throughout the remainder of the financial year whilst Covid-19 restrictions remain in place.</p>
<p>Helping Hands Scheme</p>	<p>The Council has recently agreed a further package of £16m funded from recent tranches of Covid-19 emergency grants to help families, businesses and communities impacted by the most recent national lockdown and restrictions. The scheme will also help households struggling to pay Council Tax bills for 2021-22</p>

---

2.1 Since the start of the Covid-19 pandemic the government has provided significant additional financial assistance to support the response. The November Spending Review identified that in total the Government has spent over £280bn in response to the pandemic. Of that, £113bn will have been provided during 2020-21 to support public services including NHS, local government, transport and employment support.

2.2 Nearly £6.8bn has been made available to help local authorities in England respond to the impacts of Covid-19 in 2020-21. This is in addition to £1.6bn made available in 2019-20. Additional financial support will continue to be available to public health local authorities during Covid-19 restrictions through the Contain Outbreak Management Fund (£0.9bn) and for loss of income from sales fees and charges.

2.3 As soon as the pandemic was announced KCC finance put arrangements in place to capture information about the additional costs the Council would incur. Initially there was very little guidance on the expectations on local authorities. The Government did issue three Procurement Policy Notes (PPN) although these related to suspending aspects of procurement procedure rather than guidance on the type of expenditure the government anticipated local authorities would incur. The Council produced local guidance on the expenditure and income to be captured. This included:

- Additional costs incurred in response to the initial emergency e.g. temporary mortuary, procurement of PPE, etc.
- Additional costs to support market sustainability e.g. payments to support social care providers in meeting Covid-19 related additional costs, payments to home to school transport providers even though no service has been provided due to closures, etc.
- Future demand increases e.g. adult social care where the Council has to assume responsibility following hospital discharges, children's social care due to increased demand following the easing of lockdown restrictions etc.
- Delays in delivering savings
- Loss of income
- Workforce pressures associated with demand increases

2.4 The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) has asked local councils to provide a monthly return setting out estimates of the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic. Initially this return was used by MHCLG to inform the allocation of additional tranches of the un-ringfenced emergency grant. The returns have evolved over time and include spending from specific grants as well as local spending decisions.

2.5 KCC's returns have identified actual and forecast costs to date. The forecasts have assumed that ring-fenced grants are spent in full in 2020-21 (with any unspent sums rolled forward to 2021-22).

3.1 Table 1 shows the latest amounts allocated from all the various grants provided by government departments in response to the pandemic. This table includes the December and January instalments of Contain Outbreak Management Fund for Kent and January instalment of grant for Clinically Extremely Vulnerable individuals. These grants were not received in time for the January MCLG submission which consequently included £7.2m less than table 1. This will be included in the February submission

Table 1	National	KCC	Dept	
<b>Un-ringfenced</b>				
Emergency Grant tranche 1	1,600	39.0	MHCLG	Formula
Emergency Grant tranches 2-4	3,100	55.9	MHCLG	Formula
<b>Social Care Ringfenced</b>				
Infection Control tranche 1	600	18.9	DHSC	Formula
Infection Control tranche 2	546	16.6	DHSC	Formula
Rapid testing	149	4.7	DHSC	Formula
Workforce capacity	120	3.1	MCHLG	Formula
<b>Public Health Ringfenced</b>				
Contain Outbreak Management Fund (to 2nd December)	485	12.7	DHSC	Formula
Test & Trace	300	6.3	DHSC	Formula
Contain Outbreak Management Fund (December)	900	6.3	DHSC	Formula
Contain Outbreak Management Fund (January)		6.3	DHSC	Formula
Clinically Extremely Vulnerable (tranche 1 - November)	32	0.9	MHCLG	Formula
Clinically Extremely Vulnerable (tranche 2 - January)	40	1.4	MHCLG	Formula
<b>Other Ringfenced</b>				
<i>Upper/Single tier</i>				
Winter Support Grant Scheme	170	4.5	DWP	Est of Costs
Additional Home to School Transport	99	4.5	DfT	Formula
Local Authority Emergency Assistance Grant for Food and Essential Supplies	63	1.7	DEFRA	Formula
Active Travel (tranche 1 revenue)	40	0.5	DfT	Bid
Active Travel (tranche 1 capital)		1.1		
<i>Lower/single tier</i>				
Community Champions Fund	24		MHCLG/ DHSC	60 councils
Compliance and Enforcement Grant	30		MHCLG	Formula
Reopening High Streets Safely	50		MCHLG	Formula/claims
Provisional Rough Sleeping Emergency	3		MHCLG	
Next Steps Accommodation Programme	105		MHCLG	Bids
<b>Total 2020-21</b>	<b>6,855</b>	<b>145.4</b>		
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>8,455</b>	<b>184.4</b>		

---

3.2 Appendix A provides more detail about how the main grants have been allocated. The vast majority have been shared out to all authorities based on formulae. Some are subject to bids and some based on actual claims. The first tranche of the un-ringfenced emergency grant was received at the end of March 2020 and included in the 2019-20 accounts. Only £1.7m of this was spent/applied to income losses in the last weeks of 2019-20 in the immediate aftermath of the pandemic. The remaining £37.3m was held in a Covid-19 reserve to support further spending/income losses in 2020-21. Use of this reserve was included in the 2020-21 budget amendment approved by full Council in September.

3.3 Table 1 reflects the grants reported in the MHCLG monitoring returns. The MHCLG returns include the revenue element of phase 1 of the Active Travel Grant. Funding from this grant was brought forward in response to the pandemic. KCC has received revenue grant of £470k and capital grant of £1,130k from tranche 1 of this grant. The MHCLG also includes expenditure to support clients discharged from hospital funded by income from Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs).

3.4 Un-ringfenced grants can be used for any purpose to support the authority's response to the pandemic. Specific grants can only be used for prescribed purposes determined by government under the conditions for grant. The governance arrangements for decisions on spending grants are set out in Appendix B.

---

### Covid-19 Monitoring – Key Numbers from January Submission

---

£94.9m	Un-ringfenced additional emergency grant funding received MHCLG in 2019-20 and 2020-21
£80.7m	Ringfenced additional grants such as Care Homes Infection Control, Test and Trace, Contain Outbreak Management Fund, and Covid-19 Winter Grant Scheme from Department for Health and Social Care (DHSC)
£5.1m	Additional income from Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) for hospital discharges into social care
<b>£180.7m</b>	<b>Total additional funding</b>
£174.5m	Forecast additional spending in 2019-20 and 2020-21 full year and delayed savings in 2020-21
£28.0m	Forecast loss of income in 2019-20 and 2020-21 full year
<b>£202.5m</b>	<b>Total change in KCC spend and income</b>
<b>£21.8m</b>	<b>Net shortfall</b>

---

4.1 The latest return was submitted on 1<sup>st</sup> February. This return included actual spending and income losses and commitments recorded on the Covid-19 monitoring system up to January, together with forecasts for the remainder of the year. The Covid-19 monitoring captures the additional impact on the Council of the Covid-19 response since the start of the pandemic. It does not identify whether the Council already had budget provision for any of the expenditure e.g. continuity payments to suppliers. The forecast includes contingent sums for future potential spending/income losses. The returns do not include any underspends due to Covid-19. For these reasons the return differs from the Council's overall budget monitoring reports. The returns assume all ring-fenced grants are spent in full.

4.2 The latest return continues to show an increased shortfall between the grants and impact on spending/income losses compared to the December return as it included assumed additional spending from the tranche 4 grant not included in previous returns. The main areas of additional spending include the following:

- Adult social care – additional payments to providers supporting KCC clients equivalent to two weeks' worth of care agreed early in the pandemic to help meet additional impact of staff costs and travel/PPE purchases; procurement of KCC stock of PPE to provide free of charge to providers/KCC staff, forecasts for additional placements and assessment costs for clients discharged from hospitals, investment in digital technology to reduce face to face assessments; additional payments to all registered providers (including those with non-KCC clients) later in the year as prescribed from infection control grant
- Children's services – forecast demand for additional placements and assessment costs due to the impact on vulnerable families from sustained lockdown and school closures
- Education – continuity payments to home to school transport providers during the initial lockdown to ensure providers could remain in business for when schools reopened; provision of additional mobile classrooms due to delays in building projects
- Public transport – continuity payments to providers to ensure they remain in business when transport use returns

- Environment – establishment of a temporary mortuary facility, setting up on-line arrangements for accessing Household Waste sites, support payments for districts for the impact on kerbside collections
- Other – delays to savings plans and assumed spending to provide additional support to residents and households severely impacted by Covid-19 restrictions and not in receipt of support from central government

4.3 Main income losses come from sales, fees and charges (Kent Travel Saver, Registration and libraries, community learnings, and adult social care day centres), commercial income (dividends from wholly owned companies), and other (investment income from interest and equity funds).

4.4 Table 2 shows a high-level summary of each month's submission

Grant Allocated & Impact	Monthly return									
	Jan £m	Dec £m	Nov £m	Oct £m	Sept £m	July £m	June £m	May £m	April £m	
Emergency Grant	95.0	95.0	95.0	95.0	77.3	77.3	66.9	66.9	39.0	
Social Care funded by CCGs	5.1	5.1	5.1	5.1	3.2	5.8	1.6			
Other Grants	80.7	59.0	41.8	25.2	25.2					
<b>Total forecasts</b>										
Additional spending	174.5	142.0	128.6	115.1	112.3	92.8	96.6	100.4	106.1	
Income losses	28.0	21.7	22.2	22.1	23.2	23.0	21.0	17.1	19.3	
	202.5	163.8	150.8	137.2	135.5	115.9	117.6	117.5	125.5	
Less grant notified	(180.7)	(159.0)	(141.9)	(125.2)	(105.6)	(83.0)	(68.5)	(66.9)	(39.0)	
<b>Forecast shortfall from Grant</b>	<b>(21.8)</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>8.9</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>29.9</b>	<b>32.8</b>	<b>49.1</b>	<b>50.5</b>	<b>86.5</b>	

4.5 Table 3 shows the main components of the additional spending and income losses based on the broad service headings used by MHCLG.

Spending & Income Losses	Monthly return									
	Jan £m	Dec £m	Nov £m	Oct £m	Sept £m	July £m	June £m	May £m	April £m	
<b>Additional Spending</b>										
Adult Social Care	81.0	77.0	79.4	66.0	62.7	44.2	45.1	49.8	56.6	
Children's Services	4.6	5.2	6.3	6.6	6.4	7.2	8.1	8.1	6.0	
Education	11.3	10.7	14.0	14.3	13.5	17.4	17.8	15.9	10.1	
Highways & Transport	4.5	4.7	3.7	3.6	5.2	5.2	4.7	4.3	16.0	
Public Health Specific Grants	25.3	19.0	6.3	6.3	6.3	-	-	-		
Public Health	8.3	8.3	1.0	0.9	1.1	0.8	0.7	0.7	1.0	
Cultural & Related	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.5	0.2	-	0.2	0.2	-	
Environment & Regulatory	6.1	5.1	3.6	3.5	3.3	3.3	3.5	4.3	11.7	
Finance & Corporate	5.3	4.4	4.2	4.1	4.0	4.0	7.2	8.6	4.8	
Other	27.6	10.2	9.7	9.3	9.7	10.8	9.2	8.5		
<b>Total</b>	<b>174.5</b>	<b>145.1</b>	<b>128.6</b>	<b>115.1</b>	<b>112.3</b>	<b>92.8</b>	<b>96.6</b>	<b>100.4</b>	<b>106.1</b>	
<b>Income losses</b>										
Sales Fees and Charges									8.5	
Highways and Transport	6.0	4.4	4.6	4.6	5.8	5.6	3.8	2.9	-	
Cultural and Related	3.3	3.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	-	
Other	9.9	5.4	5.3	5.2	4.8	5.4	5.0	3.7	-	
<b>Sub Total Sales Fees and Charges</b>	<b>19.2</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>13.3</b>	<b>13.1</b>	<b>14.2</b>	<b>13.9</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>6.8</b>	<b>8.5</b>	
Commercial Income	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	6.0	5.0	5.0	
Other Income	4.8	4.8	4.9	5.1	5.1	5.1	6.1	5.3	5.8	
<b>Total</b>	<b>28.0</b>	<b>21.7</b>	<b>22.2</b>	<b>22.1</b>	<b>23.2</b>	<b>23.0</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>17.1</b>	<b>19.3</b>	

5.1 Local authorities initially received additional funding between June and October from Contain Outbreak Management Fund (COMF) monies depending on the level of local restrictions. This granted targeted local authorities under Areas of Enhanced Support and Areas of Intervention £34.6 million in total.

5.2 Further payments totalling £123.7m were made in October following the move to local Covid-19 alert levels, to support proactive containment and intervention measures. Once again, these payments were targeted to individual areas according to the level of restrictions. Kent did not receive any targeted funding from these two initial allocations.

5.3 Following the introduction of national restrictions on 5 November, the COMF committed to paying all local authorities up to £8 per head of population (although this was inclusive of the funds already provided in early distributions). In total this provided a further £326.6m, taking the total payments from COMF to just under £485m (Kent's share £12.7m) as shown in table 1 previously. This was in addition to the £300m allocated to local authorities in June for Test and Trace Service Support Grant (Kent's share £6.3m).

5.4 The Covid-19 Winter Plan published on 23 November included provision for COMF to be increased to provide monthly payments to local authorities facing higher restrictions until the end of the financial year:

- upper tier local authorities in Tier 3 to receive funding of £4 per head of population per month
- upper tier local authorities in Tier 2 to receive funding of £2 per head of population per month
- authorities in Tier 1 would not be eligible for additional monthly funding
- local authorities that moved into local Covid-19 alert level: Very High prior to the implementation of national restrictions on 5 November would be eligible for a top-up payment from the fund, in recognition of the extended time those areas have been under higher restrictions

5.5 The December payment to Kent for tier 4 categorisation amounted to £6.3m and is included in table 1. Following the introduction of national restrictions from January all councils will receive £4 per head of population per month until restrictions are lifted. The amounts in this report do not include any of these further payments from January at this stage although these will be subject to same delegation and scrutiny arrangements set out below.

5.6 In line with the Cabinet Member decision, the Council established a Test & Trace Grant Monitoring Group (TTGMG) to oversee the spending of the £6.3 million Local Authority Test and Trace Service Support Grant, in accordance with the funding framework that set out the categories of eligible spend and grant terms and conditions. This group comprises the Director of Public Health, Corporate Director of Finance and Strategic Commissioner along with support from other public health, commissioning and finance officers.

---

5.7 The Director of Public Health has delegated authority for the spending of the public health Covid-19 grants and as such is accountable for all decision making. The TTGMG provides a scrutiny and assurance function to ensure transparent and consistent decision making. The TTMGMG is now known as the Covid-19 Finance Monitoring Group (CFMG) and its terms of reference have been extended to include all COMF allocations to ensure consistency for all decisions regarding the use of Covid-19 public health monies.

5.8 The November COMF payments were paid to upper tier authorities in two tier areas although it was expected that local areas would develop intervention strategies in partnership with lower tier district councils. In Kent it was agreed to make an initial allocation to Kent districts of £4m as part of this partnership, although further tranches could be available to support particular agreed local initiatives.

5.9 To date £6m of further activities (in addition to the £4m for districts) have been endorsed to be committed from COMF and a further £4.2m is pending final approval.

5.10 A further public health grant is to be provided to fund the programme of testing of asymptomatic residents in order to help prevent the spread of the virus. The funding is being used to operate twenty-four testing centres across Kent with capacity for one million tests. Based on the latest estimates this grant will be approximately £14m.

6.1 The Council has agreed to allocate £10million of emergency grant funding to be made available to help Kent’s most vulnerable households and businesses hardest hit by the pandemic. The Helping Hands Scheme will include a package of support ranging from assisting just-managing families with utility bills, to helping struggling businesses, to tackling digital poverty and match-funding crowdfunded community projects providing vital local assistance. This builds on the support to individuals and suppliers of council services under previous decisions to respond to the pandemic using the additional Covid-19 grants summarised in the monitoring returns.

6.2 The scheme is the latest initiative to help people and businesses in Kent most impacted by the recent national lockdown. The scheme will be funded by the most recent tranche of Covid-19 Emergency Grant and where applicable the Contain Outbreak Management Fund.

6.3 The Helping Hands Scheme will be developed by KCC services working in partnership with district and borough councils, and other key partners including voluntary and community organisations (including Kent Community Foundation), utility companies, business networks (including the Chamber of Commerce), and schools and colleges.

6.4 The Council has also agreed that a further £6million of Covid-19 Emergency Grant be made available through The Helping Hands Scheme to help Kent’s households struggling to pay their Council Tax for 2021-22. Under this scheme all existing Council Tax Reduction Scheme (CTRS) working-age households will automatically have their 2021-22 Council Tax bill reduced by £50 (or by the total Council Tax due if this is less than £50). The reductions will be applied by district and borough councils. New claimants eligible for CTRS throughout the year will also receive the additional reduction to their Council Tax bills.

6.5 To complement the additional Council Tax reductions one-off funding will also be given to every Kent district council to boost their Council Tax Hardship Funds. This will enable the districts to provide additional support towards paying Council Tax bills for those households who have been seriously impacted by the pandemic and have suffered a loss in income or a change in their financial circumstances, such as furlough, or redundancy.

6.6 The indicative allocation of the £16m Helping Hands scheme is set out in the table below:

Support for low-income individuals and households and those in financial crisis	£4.0m
Support for businesses and the self-employed	£3.0m
Tackling digital poverty	£2.5m
Match-funding for crowdfunded community projects	£0.5m
Council tax support for low income households	£3.6m
Additional council tax hardship funds	£2.4m

## Details of Grant Allocations

### 1. Covid-19 Emergency Grant

The Government has used different formulae to allocate each tranche of the Covid-19 emergency. The methodologies from tranche 2 onwards were informed by the impact identified through the MHCLG monitoring returns.

#### ***Covid-19 Emergency Grant Tranche 1 £1.6bn – March 2020***

Just under 87% of the total grant (£1.39bn out of a total of £1.6bn) was allocated to local authorities with social care responsibilities (upper tier and single tier councils) using the adult social care relative needs formula (RNF). The RNF is the same as that used in the Formula Grant calculations prior to 2013-14.

The remaining 13% (£0.21bn) was allocated using the total settlement funding assessment for 2013-14 (a measure of spending needs on all council services). This was allocated to all councils (upper tier, single tier, lower tier and Fire & Rescue authorities).

KCC's allocation was £39.012m (2.44% of the total).

#### ***Covid-19 Emergency Grant Tranche 2 £1.6bn – May 2020***

This tranche was allocated according to 2020-21 total population projection for each authority area. In two tier areas 65% was allocated to upper tier (62% for those areas with separate Fire & Rescue authorities with 3% allocated to the fire authority) and 35% to lower tier. In single tier areas with separate Fire & Rescue authorities, 97% went to the local authority and 3% to the fire authority. In London 96% went to boroughs and 4% to the Greater London Authority. The allocations for fire authorities were reduced by pro rata share of £6m to create a fire contingency fund.

KCC's allocation was £27.934m (1.75% of the total).

#### ***Covid-19 Emergency Grant Tranche 3 £0.5bn – July 2020***

£6m from this tranche was top-sliced to be allocated to those authorities with additional Covid-19 costs to support Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children (UASC).

The remainder of this tranche £494m was allocated via a new formula taking account of population forecasts weighted for area costs and deprivation. Area cost weightings are based on those proposed for the Foundation Formula through the Fair Funding Review (not yet implemented), these take account of accessibility to services (based on measures of population sparsity and density) and remoteness as well as differences in labour and premises costs. Deprivation weightings are based on average Index of Deprivation (IMD) for the local authority area. Tranche 3 included no allocations for Fire & Rescue authorities.

The split in two tier areas is 79:21 between upper and lower tiers.

KCC's allocation was £10.312m (2.09% of the total).

### ***Covid-19 Emergency Grant Tranche 4 £1.0bn – October 2020***

£100m of this tranche was top-sliced to compensate for income losses on local authority leisure centres.

The remaining £0.9bn was added to previous allocations from tranches 1-3 excluding the allocations to Isles of Scilly (including a share of tranche 4 based on the isles population as a proportion of total population), Fire & Rescue authorities and Greater London Authority. The total local authority shares of tranches 1 to 4 of £4.553bn were re-allocated using the same population/area cost/deprivation formula as tranche 3 to calculate a notional revised total allocation. This resulted in some authorities receiving no additional funding from tranche 4 and some authorities receiving a fixed £100k minimum as their tranche 4 allocation. Effectively this means for most authorities the total share of tranches 1 to 4 is determined according to population estimate weighted according to area costs and relative deprivation.

KCC's allocation from tranche 4 was £17.701m (1.9%). This took the Council's total share from tranches 1 to 4 to £94.959m (2.1% of the total)

### **2. Adult Social Care Infection Control Fund**

#### ***Tranche 1 £0.6bn – June 2020***

The allocation shares for each local authority are calculated according to the number of registered care home beds in each local authority area (upper tier and single tier only) weighted by an area cost adjustment. The area cost adjustment reflects differences in wages and prices in different local authorities.

The government expected that care homes should receive a payment for the number of registered beds, representing 75% of the total funding. The remaining 25% can be paid to care homes or domiciliary care providers and support wider workforce resilience as determined by each local authority.

KCC's allocation was £18.878m (3.15% of the total).

#### ***Tranche 2 £0.546bn – September 2020***

71% of the grant (£387.5m) is allocated on the basis of the number of care home beds, and 29% (£158.5m) is allocated on the basis of users supported by community care providers. The allocations for each local authority for care homes proportion is calculated according to the number of registered care home beds in each local authority area weighted by an area cost adjustment.

The government expected that care homes should receive a payment for the number of registered beds, and community care providers for the number of community care users, representing 80% of the total funding. The remaining 20% can be paid to care homes or domiciliary care providers and support wider workforce resilience as determined by each local authority.

KCC's allocation was £16.653m (3.05% of the total).

### 3. Adult Social Care Rapid Testing Fund

#### **£0.149bn – January 2021**

The allocation shares for each local authority are calculated according to the number of care home beds and the potential numbers of users of residential alcohol and drug services in each local authority (upper and single tier) weighted by an area cost adjustment. The area cost adjustment reflects differences in wages and prices in different local authorities

The government expected that care homes should receive a payment for the number of registered beds and residential alcohol and drug services beds, representing 80% of the total funding. The remaining 20% is available for local authorities' discretionary use to support the care sector to operationally deliver Lateral Flow Device (LFD) testing.

KCC's allocation was £4.686m (3.14% of the total).

### 4. Adult Social Care Workforce Capacity Fund

#### **£0.120bn – January 2021**

Each authority's allocation is determined using the Adult Social Care RNF

This funding enables local authorities to deliver measures to supplement and strengthen adult social care staff capacity to ensure that safe and continuous care is achieved to deliver the following outcomes:

- maintain care provision and continuity of care for recipients where pressing workforce shortages may put this at risk
- support providers to restrict staff movement in all but exceptional circumstances, which is critical for managing the risk of outbreaks and infection in care homes
- support safe and timely hospital discharges to a range of care environments, including domiciliary care, to prevent or address delays as a result of workforce shortages
- enable care providers to care for new service users where the need arises

KCC is passporting 89% of the overall grant to all CQC registered providers and the remainder is going to support the Design Learning Centre and KICA (Trade Association) who support the whole market in recruitment, training and development.

KCC's allocation was £3.082m (2.57% of the total).

### 5. Test & Trace Service Support Grant

#### **£0.3bn – June 2020**

Each authority's allocation is determined pro rata to the local authority Public Health Grant 2020-21.

KCC's allocation was £6.311m (2.1% of the total).

## 6. Covid-19 Winter Support Grant Scheme

### **£0.170bn – November 2020**

Each authority's allocation is based on estimated costs. The grant is made available to support those most in need with the cost of food, energy (heating, cooking, lighting), water bills (including sewerage) and other essentials. The grant must be spent by 31<sup>st</sup> March 2021, 80% on families with children and 80% on food and fuel costs.

KCC's allocation was £4.504m (2.65% of the total).

## 7. Local Authority Emergency Assistance Grant for Food and Essential Supplies

### **£0.063bn – July 2020**

Each authority's allocation is determined according to the population of each local authority, weighted by a function of the English Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD).

KCC's allocation was £1.669m (2.65% of the total).

## 8. Clinically Extremely Vulnerable (CEV) Funding

### **Tranche 1 £0.032bn – November 2020**

Allocated to upper tier councils (county councils and single tier authorities) to support the clinically extremely vulnerable during second national lockdown. It will be used to provide support, such as access to food deliveries and signposting to local support of befriending services, to the most at risk and enable them to stay at home as much as possible.

KCC's allocation was £0.891m (2.78% of the total).

### **Tranche 2 (general) £0.040bn – January 2021**

Allocated to all upper tier councils (county councils and single tier authorities) on updated January CEV patient count.

KCC's allocation is £0.899m (2.84% of the total).

### **Tranche 2 (targeted) £0.9bn – January 2021**

Allocated to upper tier authority areas which entered Tier 4 where Shielding guidance had been introduced prior to 5th January.

KCC's allocation is £0.508m (5.79% of the total).

KCC's total share of tranche 2 CEV is £1.408m (3.84% of the total).

## 9. Contain Outbreak Management Fund

### **Areas of Enhanced Support and Areas of Intervention £0.035bn – June 2020**

Targeted to particular areas. KCC received no allocation from this distribution.

### **Local Covid-19 alert level payments £0.124bn – October 2020**

Following the move to local Covid-19 alert levels, targeted local authorities were eligible for payments from the Contain Outbreak Management Fund to support proactive containment and intervention measures. KCC received no allocation from this distribution.

### **National Restriction Payments £0.326bn - November 2020**

Following the introduction of second National Lockdown allocated to all single tier and upper tier authorities as £8 per head of estimated population.

KCC's allocation was £12.652m (3.87% of the total).

### **Tier Restriction Payments – December 2020**

Following the introduction of the tiering system allocated to all single tier and upper tier authorities as £4 per head of estimated population in tier 3 and £2 per head in tier 2.

KCC's allocation was £6.326m.

### **National Restriction Payments – January 2021**

Following the introduction of third National Lockdown allocated to all single tier and upper tier authorities as £4 per head of estimated population.

KCC's allocation was £6.326m.

## 10. Emergency Active Travel Fund

### **Part of £225m – June 2020**

Local authorities (including combined authorities) were invited to submit bids to improve cycling and walking facilities. Tranche 1 supports the installation of temporary projects for the Covid-19 pandemic. Authorities received either 100%, 75%, 50% or 25% of their bids based on the extent to which they aligned with the criteria. Tranche 1 allocations amounted to £39.840m including capital and revenue elements.

KCC's allocation was £1.6m (£1.13m capital, £0.47m revenue) amounting to 4% of the total. KCC's capital is 100% of the amount requested.

**Key Decisions**

<b>Decision Number</b>	<b>Decision Title</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Link</b>
20/00035	The emergency purchase of bulk Personal Protective Equipment (PPE)	up to £2m	<a href="#">20/00035 - The emergency purchase of bulk Personal Protective Equipment (PPE)</a>
20/00034	Procurement of Temporary Body Storage Facilities	£11m	<a href="#">20/00034 - Procurement of Temporary Body Storage Facilities</a>
20/00041	Support for Community Based Wellbeing Providers	£3.4m	<a href="#">20/00041 - Support for Community Based Wellbeing Providers</a>
20/00042	Integrated Digital Assistive Technology Solution	£1,477,980	<a href="#">20/00042 - Integrated Digital Assistive Technology Solution</a>
20/00044	Covid-19 Block Beds for Older Persons Residential and Nursing	£2,494,828	<a href="#">20/00044 Title: Covid-19 Block Beds for Older Persons Residential and Nursing</a>
20/00049	Additional Payments to Adult Social Care Providers	£13m	<a href="#">20/00049 - Additional Payments to Adult Social Care Providers</a>
20/00050	Continued bulk purchase of Personal Protective Equipment (PPE)	£3m additional funding (resulting in £5m total for additional PPE purchasing programme)	<a href="#">20/00050 - Continued bulk purchase of Personal Protective Equipment (PPE)</a>
20/00056	Capital Construction Programme - Delay costs to projects as a result of Covid-19	up to £7.89m of additional funds	<a href="#">20/00056 - Capital Construction Programme - Delay costs to projects as a result of COVID-19</a>
20/00061	Infection Control Fund	£18.88m	<a href="#">20/00061 - Infection Control Fund</a>
20/00060	Adjustments to the Kent Test and Secondary Co-ordinated Admissions scheme as a result of Covid-19 restrictions	£170k estimated	<a href="#">20/00060 - Adjustments to the Kent Test and Secondary Co-ordinated Admissions scheme as a result of COVID-19 restrictions</a>
20/00067	Infection Control Fund - wider social care market support	£4.72m	<a href="#">20/00067 - Infection Control Fund - wider social care market support</a>
20/00093	Local Authority Emergency Assistance Grant for Food and Essential Supplies	£1.67m	<a href="#">20/00093 - Local Authority Emergency Assistance Grant for Food and Essential</a>

			<a href="#">Supplies</a>
20/00106	Infection Control Fund (Round 2)	£16.653m	<a href="#">20/00106 - Infection Control Fund (Round 2)</a>
20/00095	Local Authority Test and Trace Service support grant and Containment Outbreak Management Fund	T&T: £6,311,400; COMF: £12,652,440 (Nov 2020); £6,326,220 (Dec 2020); £6,326,220 (Jan 2021)	<a href="#">20/00095 - Local Authority Test and Trace Service support grant and associated outbreak management</a>
20/00110	Covid-19 Winter Grant Scheme	£4.5m	<a href="#">20/00110 - COVID Winter Grant Scheme</a>
20/00111	Funding for support to Clinically Extremely Vulnerable	£891,000 (Nov 2020); £1,407,609 (Jan 2021)	<a href="#">20/00111 - Funding for support to Clinically Extremely Vulnerable</a>
21/0024	Covid-19 Emergency Grant Funding the Helping Hands Support scheme for Residents and Businesses	£10m	<a href="#">21/0024 - COVID Emergency Grant Funding the Helping Hands Support scheme for Residents and Businesses</a>
21/00031	Council Tax Hardship Relief Support Scheme	£6m	<a href="#">21/00031 - Council Tax Hardship Relief Support Scheme</a>

This page is intentionally left blank

From: Roger Gough, Leader of the Council

Peter Oakford, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance,  
Corporate and Traded Services

Shellina Prendergast, Cabinet Member for Communications,  
Engagement and People

David Cockburn, Corporate Director for Strategic and Corporate  
Services

To: Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee – 3 March 2021

Subject: Strategic and Corporate Services Performance Dashboard

Classification: Unrestricted

**Summary:**

The Strategic and Corporate Services Performance Dashboard shows progress made against targets set for Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)

18 of the 25 KPIs achieved latest targets and were RAG rated Green, 2 were below target but did achieve the floor standard (Amber) and 4 did not achieve the floor standard (Red), 1 KPI is currently suspended due to Coronavirus.

**Recommendation(s):**

The Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee is asked to NOTE the performance position for Strategic and Corporate Services.

**1. Introduction**

1.1. Part of the role of Cabinet Committees is to review the performance of the functions of the Council that fall within the remit of the Committee. To support this role Performance Dashboards are regularly reported to each Cabinet Committee throughout the year, and this is the second report for the 2020/21 financial year.

**2. Performance Dashboard**

2.1. The current Strategic and Corporate Services Performance dashboard provides results up to the end of January 2021, or the latest available month and is attached in Appendix 1.

2.2. The Dashboard provides a progress report on performance against target for the 25 Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for 2020/21. The Dashboard also includes a range of activity indicators which help give context to the KPIs.

2.3. KPIs are presented with RAG (Red/Amber/Green) alerts to show progress against targets. Details of how the alerts are generated are outlined in the Guidance Notes, included with the Dashboard in Appendix 1.

2.4. Of the 25 KPIs, the latest RAG status is as follows:

- 18 are rated Green – the target was achieved or exceeded;
- 2 are rated Amber – performance achieved or exceeded the expected floor standard but did not meet the target for Green;
- 4 are rated Red – performance did not meet the expected floor standard:
  - CS04b: Out of hours calls to Contact Point answered
  - CS07: Complaints responded to in timescale
  - GL02: Freedom of Information Act requests completed within 20 working days.
  - GL03: Data Protection Act Subject Access requests completed within statutory timescales.
- 1 is currently suspended due to Coronavirus and has no RAG rating.

### **3. Recommendation(s)**

The Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee is asked to NOTE the performance position for Strategic and Corporate Services

### **4. Contact details**

Report Author: Rachel Kennard  
Chief Analyst  
Strategy, Policy, Relationships & Corporate Assurance  
03000 414527  
[rachel.kennard@kent.gov.uk](mailto:rachel.kennard@kent.gov.uk)

Relevant Director: David Whittle  
Director of Strategy, Policy, Relationships & Corporate Assurance  
03000 416833  
[david.whittle@kent.gov.uk](mailto:david.whittle@kent.gov.uk)

# **Strategic and Corporate Services Performance Dashboard**

## **Financial Year 2020/21**

### **Results up to January 2021**

Page 31

**Produced by Strategic Commissioning - Performance & Analytics**

**Publication Date: February 2021**



## Guidance Notes

### Key Performance Indicators

All Key Performance Indicators are provided with RAG (Red/Amber/Green) ratings.

RAG ratings are based on Targets and Floor Standards brought before the Cabinet Committee in July 2020.

Where relevant, RAG ratings are given for both the latest month and year to date (YTD).

### RAG Ratings

<b>GREEN</b>	Target has been achieved
<b>AMBER</b>	Floor Standard* achieved but Target has not been met
<b>RED</b>	Floor Standard* has not been achieved

\*Floor Standards are the minimum performance expected and if not achieved must result in management action

### Activity Indicators

Activity Indicators representing demand levels are also included in the report. They are not given a RAG rating, instead where appropriate, they are tracked within an expected range represented by Upper and Lower Thresholds. The Alert provided for Activity Indicators is whether results are within the expected range or not. Results can either be in expected range (**Yes**) or they could be **Above** or **Below**. Expected activity thresholds are based on previous years' trends.

When activity indicators do not have expected thresholds they are shown in the report to provide context for the Key Performance Indicators. In such cases the activity indicators are simply shown with comparison to activity for the previous year.

## Key Performance Indicator Summary

People and Communications	Latest RAG	YTD RAG
CS01: Callers who rate the advisors in Contact Point as good	GREEN	GREEN
CS04a: Daytime calls to Contact Point answered	AMBER	GREEN
CS04b: Out of hours calls to Contact Point answered	RED	AMBER
CS06a: Daytime calls achieving 85% of quality scorecard	GREEN	GREEN
CS06b: Out of hours calls achieving 85% of quality scorecard	GREEN	GREEN
CS07: Complaints responded to in timescale	RED	AMBER
HR25: Completed corporate themed Health and Safety audits	Audits suspended	
HR09: Training evaluated by participants as having delivered stated learning outcomes	GREEN	GREEN

Governance and Law	Latest RAG	YTD RAG
GL01: Council and Committee papers published at least five days before meetings	GREEN	AMBER
GL02: Freedom of Information Act requests completed within 20 working days	RED	RED
GL03: Data Protection Act Subject Access requests completed within statutory timescales	RED	RED

Finance	Latest RAG	YTD RAG
FN01: Pension correspondence processed within 15 working days	GREEN	GREEN
FN02: Retirement benefits paid within 20 working days of all paperwork received	GREEN	GREEN
FN07: Invoices received by Accounts Payable within 30 days of KCC received date	GREEN	AMBER
FN11: Financial assessments fully completed within 15 days of referral	GREEN	GREEN
FN05: Sundry debt due to KCC which is under 60 days old	GREEN	n/a
FN06: Sundry debt due to KCC outstanding over 6 months old	GREEN	n/a
FN08: Invoices received on time by Accounts Payable processed within 30 days	GREEN	GREEN

Infrastructure	Latest RAG	YTD RAG
ICT01: Calls to ICT Help Desk resolved at the first point of contact	GREEN	GREEN
ICT02: Positive feedback rating with the ICT help desk	AMBER	AMBER
ICT03: Working hours where Kent Public Sector Network is available to staff	GREEN	GREEN
ICT04: Working hours where ICT Services available to staff	GREEN	GREEN
ICT05: Working hours where email is available to staff	GREEN	GREEN
PI01: Rent due to KCC outstanding over 60 days	GREEN	n/a
PI04: Reactive tasks completed in Service Level Agreement standards	GREEN	GREEN

<b>Service Area</b>	<b>Director</b>	<b>Cabinet Member</b>	<b>Delivery by:</b>
People & Communications	Amanda Beer	Shellina Prendergast	Agilisys

### Key Performance Indicators

Ref	Indicator description	Aug 20	Sep 20	Oct 20	Nov 20	Dec 20	Month RAG	Year to Date	YTD RAG	Target	Floor
CS01	Percentage of callers who rate the advisors in Contact Point as good	97%	96%	97%	96%	97%	GREEN	97%	GREEN	97%	90%
CS04a	Percentage of daytime calls to Contact Point answered	97%	96%	96%	95%	93%	AMBER	97%	GREEN	95%	90%
CS04b	Percentage of out of hours calls to Contact Point answered	92%	97%	88%	91%	89%	RED	94%	AMBER	95%	90%
CS06a	Percentage of daytime calls achieving 85% of quality scorecard	76%	74%	77%	78%	77%	GREEN	77%	GREEN	70%	65%
CS06b	Percentage of out of hours calls achieving 85% of quality scorecard	72%	77%	77%	71%	74%	GREEN	74%	GREEN	70%	65%

Page 34

CS04a&b – Calls answered also dropped to 1 percentage point below target, with December being a particularly challenging month. Very high call volumes were experienced by the out of hours service on several occasions, including during adverse weather on 4<sup>th</sup> December and Storm Bella on 27<sup>th</sup>-28<sup>th</sup> December. Answer rates were also affected by the implementation of the Kent Local Tracing Partnership for Covid-19 test and trace calls.

### Activity Indicators

Ref	Indicator description	Aug 20	Sep 20	Oct 20	Nov 20	Dec 20	Year to Date	In expected range?	Expected Activity		Previous YTD
									Upper	Lower	
CS08	Number of calls answered by Contact Point	42,563	50,127	42,614	38,162	30,670	351,155	Yes	434,402	297,661	405,809

Service Area	Director	Cabinet Member	Delivery by:
People & Communications	Amanda Beer	Shellina Prendergast	People & Communications

### Key Performance Indicators - Quarterly

Ref	Indicator description	Dec 19	Mar 20	Jun 20	Sep 20	Dec 20	RAG	Year to Date	YTD RAG	Target	Floor
CS07	Percentage of complaints responded to in timescale	82%	82%	83%	84%	78%	RED	82%	AMBER	85%	80%
HR25	Percentage of corporate themed Health and Safety audits sent in 7days	Audits suspended due to Covid-19								90%	85%

CS07 - The quarter to September saw a significant increase in the volume of complaints received following the lifting of lockdown restrictions. Responding to these complaints had a knock-on effect in the following quarter to December, with significantly high workloads remaining for teams. The volume of cases coupled with complexity of some complaints and staff availability has resulted in difficulties meeting the target. Delays were most common in Adult Social Care and Children's Services where impacts from prioritising front-line work during the pandemic would have had an impact. A temporary complaints policy is being reinstated from January to advise customers that there could be delays to responding to their complaints or they may be temporarily put on hold.

Page 35

### Key Performance Indicators - Monthly

Ref	Indicator description	Aug 20	Sep 20	Oct 20	Nov 20	Dec 20	Month RAG	Year to Date	YTD RAG	Target	Floor
HR09	Training evaluated by participants as having delivered stated learning outcomes	99%	100%	98%	100%	100%	GREEN	100%	GREEN	95%	85%

### Activity Indicators

Ref	Indicator description	Aug 20	Sep 20	Oct 20	Nov 20	Dec 20	Year to Date	In expected range?	Expected Activity		Previous YTD
									Upper	Lower	
CS12	Number of visits to the KCC website, kent.gov (000s)	752.8	786.5	820.2	849.4	851.3	6,716	Above	3,970	3,410	4,312

CS12 – Visits to the KCC website continue to increase well above expected levels. Pages relating to Coronavirus have had a high volume of visits, especially pages relating to cases in Kent which gets a significant amount of repeat traffic. House Waste Recycling Centre pages also continue to be much visited, with content accessed including what can be recycled, where it can be done, and how to book a visit.

Service Area	Director	Cabinet Member	Delivery by:
People & Communications	Amanda Beer	Shellina Prendergast	People & Communications

### Activity Indicators

Ref	Indicator description	Sep 20	Oct 20	Nov 20	Dec 20	Jan 21	In expected range?	Expected Range		Prev. Yr same month
								Upper	Lower	
HR12	Number of current change activities being supported	71	82	78	78	81	Yes	80	70	92
HR13	Total number of e-learning training programmes completed (YTD)	34,530	39,491	43,908	47,769	52,642	Below	125,000	100,000	50,405
HR16	Number of registered users of Kent Rewards	24,473	25,579	24,587	24,587	24,590	Above	23,650	23,150	23,995
HR21	Number of current people management cases being supported	92	93	93	96	93	Above	80	70	95
HR23	Percentage of staff who have completed all 3 mandatory learning events	71%	73%	73%	75%	75%	Below	90	80	92%

Page 36

HR12 - Change activity is driven by demand from the wider business and will fluctuate from month to month. Some change activities will span more than one month and vary significantly in complexity, requiring different levels of resource and work to be carried out.

HR13 – Whilst the total number of e-learning training programmes completed is below the expected range, it has continued to rise and is higher than at the same time last year. Courses continue to be accessible to the workforce through the Delta learning platform.

HR16 - The number of registered users for Kent Rewards is higher than expected due to increases in communication and engagement initiatives, which have helped to highlight how Kent Rewards can be used to access Childcare Vouchers, Cycle2Work schemes and Health and Wellbeing initiatives.

HR21 - Case activity is driven by requests from Managers and fluctuates from month to month. The high level indicates that managers are taking a robust approach and managing cases through the appropriate channels with HR support and advice.

HR23 – The mandatory training alert reminders sent from Delta were turned off earlier in the year due to Coronavirus, which has impacted overall compliance. The alerts were turned back on for both managers and their staff in November 20 which has led to an increase in the last two months. Managers are also able to monitor mandatory training compliance for their staff, using a live mandatory training dashboard within Delta.

Service Area	Director	Cabinet Member	Delivery by:
Finance	Zena Cooke	Peter Oakford	Finance

### Key Performance Indicators

Ref	Indicator description	Aug 20	Sep 20	Oct 20	Nov 20	Dec 20	Month RAG	Year to Date	YTD RAG	Target	Floor
FN01	Pension correspondence processed within 15 working days	99%	99%	99%	99%	98%	GREEN	99%	GREEN	98%	95%
FN02	Retirement benefits paid within 20 working days of all paperwork received	97%	79%	94%	96%	97%	GREEN	94%	GREEN	90%	85%
FN07	Invoices received by Accounts Payable within 30 days of KCC received date	79%	78%	87%	82%	91%	GREEN	82%	AMBER	85%	80%
FN11	Percentage of financial assessments completed within 15 days of referral	97%	92%	95%	91%	100%	GREEN	92%	GREEN	90%	85%

Page 37

FN07 - Extensive work has been undertaken to improve the performance of this KPI including the development of the Late Payment Dashboard to inform Directorate Management teams and enable corrective action to be taken. The monthly performance has achieved target in 2 out of the last 3 months and Year to Date performance is improving as a result.

### Activity Indicators

Ref	Indicator description	Aug 20	Sep 20	Oct 20	Nov 20	Dec 20	Year to date	Previous year YTD
FN01b	Number of pension correspondences processed	407	519	422	389	321	3,335	3,267
FN02b	Number of retirement benefits paid	99	224	267	210	204	1,775	1,982
FN07b	Number of invoices received by KCC	6,995	8,323	8,425	8,895	9,180	75,381	85,495
FN11b	Number of financial assessments received	417	680	750	867	625	5,743	4,429

Service Area	Director	Cabinet Member	Delivery by:
Finance	Zena Cooke	Peter Oakford	Cantium Business Services

### Key Performance Indicators

Ref	Indicator description	Aug 20	Sep 20	Oct 20	Nov 20	Dec 20	Month RAG	Year to Date	YTD RAG	Target	Floor
FN05	Percentage of sundry debt due to KCC which is under 60 days old	68%	57%	53%	86%	86%	GREEN	n/a		75%	57%
FN06	Percentage of sundry debt due to KCC outstanding over 6 months old	15%	14%	16%	11%	11%	GREEN	n/a		15%	20%
FN08	Percentage of invoices received on time by Accounts Payable processed within 30 days	98%	98%	98%	99%	99%	GREEN	98%	GREEN	97%	94%

### Activity Indicators

Ref	Indicator description	Aug 20	Sep 20	Oct 20	Nov 20	Dec 20	Previous Year
FN05b	Value of debt due to KCC (£000s)	26,057	27,747	21,979	29,086	28,907	28,964

Service Area	Director	Cabinet Member	Delivery by:
Governance and Law	Ben Watts	Peter Oakford / Shellina Prendergast	Governance and Law

### Key Performance Indicators

Ref	Indicator description	Aug 20	Sep 20	Oct 20	Nov 20	Dec 20	Month RAG	Year to Date	YTD RAG	Target	Floor
GL01	Council and Committee papers published at least five clear days before meetings	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	GREEN	99%	AMBER	100%	96%
GL02	Freedom of Information Act requests completed within 20 working days	82%	82%	80%	81%	77%	RED	78%	RED	92%	90%
GL03	Data Protection Act Subject Access requests completed within timescales	55%	68%	52%	61%	63%	RED	68%	RED	90%	85%

### Activity Indicators

Ref	Indicator description	Aug 20	Sep 20	Oct 20	Nov 20	Dec 20	Year to date	In expected range?	Expected Activity		Previous YTD
									Upper	Lower	
GL01b	Committee meetings	1	21	6	20	5	80		N/a		119
GL02b	Freedom of Information requests	121	158	174	184	138	1,264	Below	1,761	1,571	1,598
GL03b	Data Protection Act Subject Access requests	40	44	46	36	38	308	Below	377	322	383

GL01 – Papers for the Cabinet meeting on 29 June did not have 5 clear days' notice due to this meeting being agreed at short notice following a Scrutiny Committee Request for Review of Decision 20/00017 (Recommissioning of Early Help Services) which needed to be determined by Cabinet. This was the only item at that meeting.

GL02 & GL03 – Performance for both Freedom of Information (FOI) and Subject Access Requests (SAR) continues to be affected by Coronavirus, the need for services to prioritise frontline service delivery and the complexity of some requests, particularly those related to social care. For SARs specifically, these have been impacted by lack of access to office facilities, including paper records which are required for some requests.

Service Area	Director	Cabinet Member	Delivery by:
Infrastructure - ICT	Rebecca Spore	Peter Oakford	Cantium Business Services

### Key Performance Indicators

Ref	Indicator description	Sep 20	Oct 20	Nov 20	Dec 20	Jan 21	Month RAG	Year to Date	YTD RAG	Target	Floor
ICT01	Calls to ICT Help Desk resolved at the first point of contact	78%	71%	72%	73%	75%	GREEN	75%	GREEN	70%	65%
ICT02	Positive feedback rating with the ICT help desk	90%	94%	94%	96%	94%	AMBER	94%	AMBER	95%	90%
ICT03	Working hours where Kent Public Sector Network is available to staff	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	GREEN	100%	GREEN	99.8%	99.0%
ICT04	Working hours where ICT Services are available to staff	99.4%	100%	100%	99.7%	100%	GREEN	99.9%	GREEN	99.0%	98.0%
ICT05	Working hours where email is available to staff	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	GREEN	100%	GREEN	99.0%	98.0%

Page 40

### Activity Indicators

Ref	Indicator description	Sep 20	Oct 20	Nov 20	Dec 20	Jan 21	Year to date	Previous YTD
ICT01b	Calls to ICT Help Desk	7,780	6,421	5,656	4,583	5,184	54,876	74,356
ICT02b	Feedback responses provided for ICT Help Desk	1,052	1,097	870	424	450	5,450	2,934

ICT02 – Positive feedback ratings for the ICT helpdesk have improved recently, but not always hitting the challenging target for a Green rating. Feedback is now easier to give, shown by the increase in staff giving their responses compared to the previous year.

ICT01b – The lower number of calls to the Help Desk compared to the previous year is likely to reflect the increased number of ways users can interact with ICT services, including Service Now, online chat, as well as fewer calls relating to office-based issues such as printing, scanning and other devices.

Service Area	Director	Cabinet Member	Delivery by:
Infrastructure - Property	Rebecca Spore	Peter Oakford	Infrastructure

### Key Performance Indicators

Ref	Indicator description	Aug 20	Sep 20	Oct 20	Nov 20	Dec 20	Month RAG	Target	Floor
PI01	Percentage of rent due to KCC outstanding over 60 days (including rent deferment invoices)	2.6%	3.3%	2.0%	1.8%	2.5%	GREEN	5%	15%

### Activity Indicator

Ref	Indicator description	Aug 20	Sep 20	Oct 20	Nov 20	Dec 20	Year to date	Previous YTD
PI01b	Total rent invoiced (£000s)	861.5	453.3	15.7	591.1	105.4	2,650	2,762
PI03c	Capital receipts banked (£000s)	-	-	-	20	680	5,350	6,820

Service Area	Director	Cabinet Member	Delivery by:
Infrastructure - Property	Rebecca Spore	Peter Oakford	Kier, Amey, and Skanska

### Key Performance Indicators

Ref	Indicator description	Aug 20	Sep 20	Oct 20	Nov 20	Dec 20	Month RAG	Year to Date	YTD RAG	Target	Floor
PI04	Percentage of reactive tasks completed within Service Level Agreement standards	86%	95%	95%	97%	96%	GREEN	92%	GREEN	90%	80%

### Activity Indicator

Ref	Indicator description	Aug 20	Sep 20	Oct 20	Nov 20	Dec 20	Year to date	Previous YTD
PI04b	Number of reactive tasks responded to	683	1014	1099	921	878	6,994	10,123

**From: Peter Oakford, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance,  
Corporate and Traded Services**

**Ben Watts, General Counsel**

**To: Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee – 3 March 2021**

**Subject: Review of KCC Company Ownership Governance**

**Classification: Unrestricted**

**Past Pathway of Paper: N/A**

**Future Pathway of Paper: N/A**

**Electoral Division: N/A**

- 
- 1 Members were provided with a briefing regarding the current performance of the Kent County Council wholly owned companies on 5 January 2021. The Governance and Audit Committee then discussed the future role of that Committee in the oversight and scrutiny of these companies on 21 January 2021. In light of discussions with Members, it is important that this Committee is provided with an update.
  - 2 As part of clarifying the responsibilities, it is proposed that a formal yet simple delineation be put in place between the roles of Governance and Audit Committee and the Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee. Moving forward, the Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee will only deal with the commissioning implications of the companies or to comply with the constitutional requirement ahead of any key decision relating to the companies. These arrangements reflect our existing governance and no changes are required.
  - 3 The refreshed role of Governance and Audit Committee is to have the collective oversight of financial performance (through the annual reports) but also to receive ongoing assurance and information to enable the effective scrutiny of the executive decision-making around shareholder strategy and understand the financial implications (currently positive) on the Council's finances.

**Recommendation(s):**

The Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee is asked to NOTE the update regarding the review of KCC Company Ownership Governance.

**Contact details:**

Ben Watts

[benjamin.watts@kent.gov.uk](mailto:benjamin.watts@kent.gov.uk)

03000 416814

This page is intentionally left blank

From: Roger Gough, Leader of the Council  
David Cockburn, Corporate Director for Strategic and Corporate Services

To: Policy & Resources Cabinet Committee – 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2021

Subject: **Risk Management: Strategic and Corporate Services**

Classification: **Unrestricted**

**Past Pathway of Paper:** None

**Future Pathway of Paper:** None

**Electoral Division:** All

**Summary:** This paper presents the strategic risks relating to the Strategic and Corporate Services directorate, in addition to the risks featuring on the Corporate Risk Register for which the Corporate Directors are the designated ‘Risk Owners’.

**Recommendation(s):**

The Cabinet Committee is asked to consider and comment on the risks presented.

**1. Introduction**

- 1.1 Risk management is a key element of the Council’s Internal Control Framework and the requirement to maintain risk registers ensures that potential risks that may prevent the Authority from achieving its objectives are identified and controlled. The process of developing the registers is therefore important in underpinning service delivery planning, performance management and operating standards. Risks outlined in risk registers are taken into account in the development of the Internal Audit programme for the year.
- 1.2 Directorate risks are reported to Cabinet Committees annually and contain strategic or cross-cutting risks that potentially affect several functions across the Strategic and Corporate Services directorate, and often have wider potential interdependencies with other services across the Council and external parties.
- 1.3 Strategic and Corporate Services Directors also lead or coordinate mitigating actions in conjunction with other Directors across the organisation to manage risks featuring on the Corporate Risk Register. The Directors in the Strategic and Corporate Services directorate are designated ‘Risk Owners’ (along with the rest of the Corporate Management Team) for several corporate risks.

- 1.4 The majority of these risks, or at least aspects of them, will have been discussed in depth at relevant Cabinet Committee(s) throughout the year, demonstrating that risk considerations are embedded within core business.
- 1.5 A standard reporting format is used to facilitate the gathering of consistent risk information and a 5x5 matrix is used to rank the scale of risk in terms of likelihood of occurrence and impact. Firstly, the current level of risk is assessed, taking into account any controls already in place to mitigate the risk. If the current level of risk is deemed unacceptable, a 'target' risk level is set and further mitigating actions introduced, with the aim of reducing the risk to a tolerable and realistic level. If the current level of risk is acceptable, the target risk level will match the current rating.
- 1.6 The numeric score in itself is less significant than its importance in enabling categorisation of risks and prioritisation of any management action. Further information on KCC risk management methodologies can be found in the risk management guide on the 'KNet' intranet site.

**2. Strategic and Corporate Services (ST) directorate led Corporate risks**

- 2.1 The Coronavirus pandemic has had a fundamental impact on KCC's risk profile over the past year, leading to an increase in the majority of corporate risks, including those below. Staff from across the Strategic and Corporate Services directorate have been playing key roles in Covid-19 response and recovery, in cross-KCC forums, as well as multi-agency settings. This is in addition to intensive preparation for EU Transition in the county and severe weather events during the winter.
- 2.2 The Strategic and Corporate Services directorate currently leads on seven corporate risks. A brief summary, including changes over the past year, are outlined below, with more detail contained in the risk register attached at appendix 1.

Risk No.	Risk Title	Current Risk Rating	Target Risk Rating
CRR0009	Future financial and operating environment for local government	High (25)	High (16)
<p>This risk underpins many of the risks on the corporate risk register and was raised to the maximum level due to the continued uncertainty regarding local government funding and other national policy agendas and the difficulties this presents for financial planning and assumptions. The impact of COVID-19 has exacerbated the already challenging financial future for local authorities, leading to enormous uncertainty and an unprecedented challenge for the Council in preparing its budget for the medium term. Responding to the pandemic has required a huge increase in spending and has come at the same time as</p>			

<p>reductions in income from council tax, business rates and funding generated by the authority's own services, all of which have been affected by the pandemic. The costs relating to the impact of the latest national lockdown and wave of infections also need to be taken into account in this environment, as well as the extreme pressure on services and increased levels of financial hardship for residents and businesses. These factors and the associated risks were presented to County Council for debate.</p>			
CRR0014	Cyber-attack threats and their implications	High (20)	High (16)
<p>The risk had briefly been raised to the maximum rating at the start of the coronavirus pandemic and remains high due to the continuing significant volumes of attempted attacks across the sector and inherent risks of increased cyber-attacks during emergencies such as this. Continued improvements have been made to KCC's ICT security infrastructure over the past nine months, with more work planned in the months ahead. The Authority's Technology Strategy continues the endorsement of a move to the "Cloud" in order to increase resilience.</p>			
CRR0039	Information Governance	High (20)	Medium (12)
<p>The risk rating increased back in the summer of 2020 at the start of the pandemic due to the increased threats presented by the changes / adaptations required to facilitate more remote working at scale in a short period of time. Additional messages are regularly being communicated to staff to raise awareness and warn of increased information governance threats and incidents and signposting to guidance. An audit of information governance arrangements in the context of a mainly remote workplace is in progress, and any issues raised will be responded to by management.</p>			
CRR0045	Maintaining effective governance and decision-making in a challenging financial and operating environment	Medium (10)	Low (5)
<p>The risk has been revised to reflect the uncertain and challenging environment that the Council is operating in; any learning opportunities presenting themselves from governance issues across the local government sector and areas for development highlighted in the previous years' Annual Governance Statement, which emphasises the importance of continually reviewing governance arrangements. This includes mitigations such as reviewing the future role of the Governance and Audit Committee to ensure it effectively discharges its functions in line with best practice.</p>			

CRR0048	Maintenance and modernisation of KCC Estate	High (16)	Medium (12)
<p>The risk relates in part to the ability to produce and deliver an affordable capital programme in the current environment, which could mean insufficient funds to undertake the required maintenance. There may be an opportunity to accelerate certain projects in light of the increased speed of adoption of virtual solutions to service delivery, although realising some of the benefits from these may be more medium-term.</p>			
CRR0049	Fraud and Error	High (16)	Low (6)
<p>The risk rating is high due to the fraud threat posed during emergency situations being higher than at other times. Covid-19 related fraud risk assessments have been drafted by KCC's Counter-Fraud Team for review by services and awareness raising messages are being delivered across the organisation. An exercise has been undertaken to review urgent payments made to suppliers under Procurement Policy Notices (PPN) to help maintain continuity of business during the coronavirus pandemic.</p> <p>It is important to note that the risk rating does not necessarily relate to staff fraud/error, but other factors such as cyber-fraud, fraud within the supply chain and 'scams' against the Council and Kent residents.</p>			
CRR0051	Maintaining or Improving workforce health, wellbeing and productivity throughout Coronavirus response and recovery	High (16)	Medium (12)
<p>The majority of the workforce has been working remotely for almost a year and a Work and Wellbeing "pulse check" survey in the autumn of 2020 indicated that our staff continue to show tremendous resilience in adapting to new working practices, finding innovative ways to engage with service users and residents, whilst continuing to deliver services. However, there are increasing wellbeing concerns for public and service user facing staff, particularly in areas of high infection rates, during a challenging winter period. The national 'lockdown' restrictions announced by the Government on 4<sup>th</sup> January 2021 have meant that a significant proportion of the workforce are once again balancing childcare or other caring responsibilities with working from home. The Corporate Management Team will ensure continual engagement with staff to monitor the situation and respond appropriately, putting in place further interventions as necessary to supplement pre-existing support to aid health and wellbeing. A 3<sup>rd</sup> staff survey has been conducted and the results are being analysed.</p>			

- 2.3 A previous corporate risk relating to financial, governance, reputational and service delivery risks associated with KCC's Local Authority Trading Companies is being revised to reflect the evolving context and will be managed at the Strategic & Corporate Services directorate level. This risk was initially

added to the register several years ago as the individual companies were being formed. Since then, holding company arrangements have been implemented. Recent reports issued in relation to Croydon Council and Nottingham City Council provide learning opportunities, although it is worth noting that there are significant differences in the types and structure of companies and how they are funded, and many of the recommendations made are already reflected in our existing arrangements or are mitigated by the nature of companies wholly owned by KCC and our investment in them. A Holding Company Transformation project is being scoped as part of the KCC Strategic Reset Programme.

### 3. Strategic and Corporate Services (ST) directorate risk profile

3.1 There is currently one directorate risk featured on the Strategic and Corporate Services directorate risk register, rated as high risk. The directorate register is underpinned by risk registers for each division that are considered for escalation in accordance with KCC’s Risk Management Policy.

ST0023	Workforce capacity across the directorate, capability and wellbeing	High (16)	Medium (12)
<p>This risk provides a Strategic &amp; Corporate Services view of the KCC corporate risk, which has been adapted and given a narrower scope, focusing specifically on capacity to maintain day-to-day delivery while also supporting service changes across the Authority. Similar to the corporate workforce risk outlined above and in appendix 1, the risk rating has been raised due to implications of the coronavirus pandemic. As mitigation, resource requirements are reviewed regularly in light of projected workloads and project-based approaches are adopted and resource mapping takes place as required in order to aid capacity planning. In addition, as part of the KCC Strategic Reset Programme, expected resource requirements of corporate services from major change activity are being highlighted to enable conversations regarding what support can realistically be offered within timescales.</p>			

### 4. Key Divisional Risks

4.1 Underpinning the corporate and directorate risks, there are a number of divisional risks across the ST directorate, typically of a more operational nature, for which the Directorate Management Team have regular oversight, such as:

- Compliance with legislative duties and associated requirements e.g. Freedom of Information Act; Equality Act 2010 duties or internal standards.
- Dependencies on ICT systems.

- Resource availability in individual divisions to discharge their functions in a timely fashion.
- Ensuring effective relationships with our partners.
- Embedding and continual improvement of multi-agency safeguarding arrangements as a result of *Working Together* statutory guidance.
- Addressing safety risks.
- Supply chain failures.

## 5. Recommendation

### **Recommendation:**

The Policy & Resources Cabinet Committee is asked to consider and comment on the risks presented.

## 6. Background Documents

- 6.1 KCC Risk Management Policy and associated risk management toolkit on KNet intranet site. <https://kentcountycouncil.sharepoint.com/sites/KNet>

## 7. Contact details

*Report Author:*

*Mark Scrivener*

[Mark.scrivener@kent.gov.uk](mailto:Mark.scrivener@kent.gov.uk)

### **Relevant Director:**

David Whittle

[David.whittle@kent.gov.uk](mailto:David.whittle@kent.gov.uk)



## APPENDIX 1

# Strategic and Corporate Services Led Corporate Risks

FOR PRESENTATION TO POLICY & RESOURCES CABINET COMMITTEE – 3<sup>rd</sup> MARCH 2021

## ST-led Corporate Risks - Summary Risk Profile

Low = 1-6
Medium = 8-15
High =16-25

Risk No.	Risk Title	Current Risk Rating	Target Risk Rating	Direction of Travel since March 2020
CRR0009	Future financial and operating environment for local government	High (25)	High (16)	↑
CRR0014	Cyber-attack threats and their implications	High (20)	High (16)	↑
CRR0039	Information Governance	High (20)	Medium (12)	↑
CRR0048	Maintenance and Modernisation of KCC Estate	High (16)	Medium (12)	↔
CRR0049	Fraud and Error	High (16)	Low (6)	↑
CRR0051	Maintaining or Improving workforce health, wellbeing and productivity throughout Coronavirus response and recovery	High (16)	Medium (12)	NEW
CRR0045	Maintaining effective governance and decision-making in a challenging financial and operating environment	Medium (10)	Low (5)	REVISED

NB: Current & Target risk ratings: The 'current' risk rating refers to the current level of risk taking into account any mitigating controls already in place. The 'target' rating represents what is deemed to be a realistic level of risk to be achieved once any additional actions have been put in place. On some occasions the aim will be to contain risk at current level.

The overall risk score is derived from multiplying the likelihood and impact scores.

Likelihood & Impact Scales					
<b>Likelihood</b>	Very Unlikely (1)	Unlikely (2)	Possible (3)	Likely (4)	Very Likely (5)
<b>Impact</b>	Minor (1)	Moderate (2)	Significant (3)	Serious (4)	Major (5)

<b>Risk ID</b>	<b>CRR0009</b>	<b>Risk Title</b>	<b>Future financial and operating environment for Local Government</b>			
<b>Source / Cause of risk</b>	<b>Risk Event</b>	<b>Consequence</b>	<b>Risk Owner (s)</b>	<b>Current Likelihood</b>	<b>Current Impact</b>	
Financial, economic and societal impacts of Coronavirus pandemic and uncertainty regarding associated funding, exacerbating an already uncertain financial and operating environment, including lack of funding settlement beyond 2021-22 in the absence of three-year Spending Review.	Additional costs, income losses and delays to savings plans incurred as a result of the Coronavirus pandemic are not reimbursed in full.	Unsustainable financial situation requiring significant levels of savings or ultimately resulting in s114 notice.	On behalf of CMT:  Zena Cooke, Corporate Director Finance (Section 151 Officer)	V. Likely (5)	Major (5)	
The uncertainty also applies to services funded via ring-fenced specific grants. Of particular concern is the special educational needs and disability (SEND) provision funded by the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG). The high needs block of DSG has not kept pace with the substantial increase in demand for SEND (see CRR0044) resulting in deficit accruing on DSG spending.	Additional unfunded spending demands and continued real-terms funding reductions threaten the financial sustainability of KCC, its partners and service providers.	Potential for partner or provider failure – including sufficiency gaps in provision.		<b>Target Residual Likelihood</b>	<b>Target Residual Impact</b>	
The uncertainty also applies to capital expenditure funded by grants. In particular, the Basic Need grant is insufficient to provide the number of school places identified in the commissioning plan, so the authority may not have capacity to incur additional borrowing costs to make up for the shortfall.	In order to set a balanced budget the council is likely to have to continue to make significant year on year savings. Quality of KCC commissioned / delivered services suffers as financial situation continues to worsen.	Reduction in resident satisfaction and reputational damage.	<b>Responsible Cabinet Member(s):</b> All Cabinet Members	Likely (4)	Serious (4)	
	Delays and uncertainty surrounding Spending / Fair Funding reviews impacts on KCC's medium term financial planning.					

<b>Control Title</b>	<b>Control Owner</b>	
Robust budgeting and financial planning in place via Medium Term Financial Planning (MTFP) process, including stakeholder consultation.	Zena Cooke, Corporate Director Finance (Section 151 Officer)	
Processes in place for monitoring delivery of savings and budget as a whole, including identification of and monitoring of management action.	Zena Cooke, Corporate Director Finance (Section 151 Officer)	
KCC Quarterly Performance Report monitors key performance and activity information for KCC commissioned or delivered services. Regularly reported to Cabinet.	Rachel Kennard, Chief Analyst	
Financial analysis conducted after each budget statement by the Chancellor.	Dave Shipton, Head of Finance (Policy, Strategy and Planning)	
Engagement with County Councils Network, Society of County Treasurers, other local authorities and Government of potential opportunities and issues around devolution and public reform.	David Whittle, Director SPRCA	
Continued engagement with Government for a fair Basic Need allocation to meet the demand for school places.	David Adams, Director Education	
Continued engagement with Government regarding High Needs funding concerns.	Dave Shipton, Head of Finance (Policy, Strategy and Planning) / Matt Dunkley, Corporate Director CYPE	
Fundamental review of both the revenue budget and capital programme, involving major recast, has been completed. In-year gap dealt with.	Zena Cooke, Corporate Director Finance (Section 151 Officer)	
KCC Interim Strategic Plan and Strategic Reset Framework developed, outlining how the Council will operate in future, taking into account implications of the Coronavirus pandemic.	David Whittle, Director SPRCA	
Ensuring evidence of any additional KCC spend required to cover impacts relating to the end of the UK/EU Transition period is captured e.g., new burdens imposed.	Dave Shipton, Head of Finance (Policy, Strategy and Planning)	
<b>Action Title</b>	<b>Action Owner</b>	<b>Planned Completion Date</b>
Work proactively with Government regarding how the new business rate retention scheme can be most effectively implemented.	Dave Shipton, Head of Finance (Policy, Strategy and Planning)	TBC
Engage with Government for a fair-funding needs formula for Grant distribution and tariffs/top ups under business rate retention	Dave Shipton, Head of Finance (Policy, Strategy and Planning)	TBC

Ensure appropriate response to next Government Spending Review.	Dave Shipton, Head of Finance (Policy, Strategy and Planning)	Autumn 2021
Assess impact of and respond to Government plans for the future of social care.	Richard Smith, Corporate Director ASCH	TBC

<b>Risk ID</b>	<b>CRR0014</b>	<b>Risk Title</b>	<b>Cyber-attack threats and their implications</b>			
<b>Source / Cause of Risk</b>	<b>Risk Event</b>	<b>Consequence</b>	<b>Risk Owner(s)</b>	<b>Current Likelihood</b>	<b>Current Impact</b>	
<p>The Council has a duty to protect personal and other sensitive data that it holds on its staff, service users and residents of Kent.</p> <p>KCC repels a high number of cyber-attacks on a daily basis, although organisations across all sectors are experiencing an increasing threat in recent times, exacerbated by the Coronavirus pandemic, and must ensure that all reasonable methods are employed to mitigate them (within resource constraints), both in terms of prevention and preparedness of response in the event of any successful attack.</p> <p>KCC's ICT Strategy will move the Authority's technology to cloud based services. It is important to harness these new capabilities in terms of both IT security and resilience, whilst emerging threats are understood and managed.</p> <p>In information terms the other factor is human. Technology can only provide a level of protection. Our staff must have a strong awareness of their responsibilities in terms of IT and information security.</p>	<p>Successful cyber-attack (e.g., 'phishing' scam) leading to loss or unauthorised access to sensitive business data.</p> <p>Significant business interruption caused by a successful attack.</p>	<p>Data Protection breach and consequent Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) sanction.</p> <p>Damages claims.</p> <p>Reputational Damage.</p> <p>Potential significant impact on business interruption if systems require shutdown until magnitude of issue is investigated.</p>	<p>Rebecca Spore, Director Infrastructure</p> <p>Ben Watts, General Counsel and KCC Data Protection Officer</p> <p>Amanda Beer, Corporate Director People and Communications</p> <p><b>Responsible Cabinet Member(s):</b></p> <p>Peter Oakford, Finance, Corporate and Traded Services</p> <p>Shellina Prendergast, Communications, Engagement and People</p> <p>Roger Gough,</p>	<p>Likely (4)</p> <p><b>Target Residual Likelihood</b></p> <p>Likely (4)</p>	<p>Major (5)</p> <p><b>Target Residual Impact</b></p> <p>Serious (4)</p>	

Control Title	Control Owner
Systems are configured in line with best practice security controls proportionate to the business information being handled. Systems are risk assessed and reviewed to ensure compliance is maintained	Kathy Stevens, ICT Compliance and Risk Manager
Staff are required to abide by IT policies that set out the required behaviour of staff in the use of the technology provided. These policies are reviewed on an annual basis for appropriateness	Kathy Stevens, ICT Compliance and Risk Manager
Continual awareness raising of key risks amongst the workforce and manager oversight	Internal Communications function / Rebecca Spore, Director Infrastructure / All Managers
Electronic Communications User Policy, Virus reporting procedure and social media guidelines in place	Andrew Cole, Head of ICT Strategy and Commissioning
External reviews of the Authority's security compliance are carried out to maintain accreditation and confirm best practice is applied	Kathy Stevens, ICT Compliance and Risk Manager
Persistent monitoring of threats, network behaviours and data transfers to seek out possible breaches and take necessary action	Kathy Stevens, ICT Compliance and Risk Manager
Data Protection and Information Governance training is mandatory and requires staff to refresh periodically. Progress rates monitored regularly	Ben Watts, General Counsel
Further training introduced relating to cyber-crime, cyber security and social engineering to raise staff awareness and knowledge	Kathy Stevens, Compliance and Risk Manager
Messages to encourage increased awareness of information security amongst staff are being communicated to align with key implementation milestones of the ICT Transformation Programme	Diane Trollope, Head of Engagement and Consultation
Procedures to address data breaches from KCC 'client side' perspective are covered within the Infrastructure business continuity plan	Kathy Stevens, ICT Compliance and Risk Manager
Monthly updated remediation plans produced for the Director of Infrastructure and Senior Information Risk Owner. Quarterly reporting to the Directorate Management Team	Kathy Stevens, ICT Compliance and Risk Manager
A Cyber incident response and management policy has been developed which strengthens the	Kathy Stevens, ICT

responsibilities and accountabilities across the Authority	Compliance and Risk Manager	
Changes and additions to security controls remains an on-going theme as the Authority updates and embraces new technologies.	Andrew Cole, Head of ICT Strategy and Commissioning	
Additional messages warning staff of cyber threats are being sent out regularly	Diane Trollope, Service Manager OD and Engagement.	
Service Partners / Providers liaised with to ensure clarity regarding support available and respective responsibilities to address data breaches should they occur.	Kathy Stevens, ICT Compliance and Risk Manager	
<b>Action Title</b>	<b>Action Owner</b>	<b>Planned Completion Date</b>
Procedure for incident management being reviewed and updated and responses to liaison picked up under action plan.	Kathy Stevens, ICT Compliance and Risk Manager	June 2021 (Review)
Implementation of action plan in response to findings of independent cyber-security and resilience review	Andrew Cole, Head of ICT Strategy and Commissioning	TBC
Utilise new licensing agreement with Microsoft to enhance the security of KCC's infrastructure. Working on implementation and rollout.	Andrew Cole, Head of ICT Strategy and Commissioning	February 2021 (Review)

Risk ID	CRR0039	Risk Title	Information Governance			
<b>Source / Cause of risk</b>	<b>Risk Event</b>	<b>Consequence</b>	<b>Risk Owner(s)</b>	<b>Current Likelihood</b>	<b>Current Impact</b>	
<p>The Council is required to maintain the confidentiality, integrity and proper use, including disposal of data under the Data Protection Act 2018, which is particularly challenging given the volume of information handled by the authority on a daily basis.</p> <p>General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) came into effect that have introduced significantly increased obligations on all data controllers, including the Council.</p> <p>The Coronavirus pandemic introduces new risks e.g. staff adapting to new ways of working and increasing information security threats.</p> <p>There is insufficient resource available to undertake comprehensive oversight / assurance activity that provides assurance on compliance with existing information governance standards.</p> <p>There is a critical dependency on one of the Council's Local Authority Trading Companies (CBS) to support Information Governance compliance for the KCC systems and network.</p>	<p>Failure to embed the appropriate processes and procedures to meet regulations.</p> <p>Information security incidents (caused by both human error and / or system compromise) resulting in loss of personal data or breach of privacy / confidentiality.</p> <p>Council accreditation for access to government and partner ICT data, systems and network is withdrawn.</p> <p>Cantium Business Solutions prioritises commercial work or does not undertake information governance compliance work in an appropriate and timely fashion.</p>	<p>Information Commissioner's Office sanction (e.g. undertaking, assessment, improvement, enforcement or monetary penalty notice issued against the Authority).</p> <p>Serious breaches under GDPR could attract a fine of €20m.</p> <p>Increased risk of litigation.</p> <p>Reputational damage.</p>	<p>Ben Watts, General Counsel and Data Protection Officer in collaboration with David Whittle, Senior Information Risk Owner</p> <p><b>Responsible Cabinet Member(s):</b></p> <p>Roger Gough, Leader</p> <p>Shellina Prendergast, Communications, Engagement and People</p>	<p>V. Likely (5)</p> <p><b>Target Residual Likelihood</b></p> <p>Possible (3)</p>	<p>Serious (4)</p> <p><b>Target Residual Impact</b></p> <p>Serious (4)</p>	

KCC services' requirement for non-standard systems creates vulnerabilities.	
<b>Control Title</b>	<b>Control Owner</b>
Data Protection Officer in place to act as designated contact with the Information Commissioner's Office.	Ben Watts, General Counsel
Caldicott Guardian appointed with support to undertake the role.	Richard Smith, Corporate Director ASCH
Senior Information Risk Owner for the Council appointed with training and support to undertake the role.	David Whittle, Director SPRCA
Corporate Information Governance group to allow for effective management of information governance risks and issues between the DPO, SIRO and Caldicott Guardian.	Ben Watts, General Counsel
Management Guide / Operating Modules on Information Governance in place, highlighting key policies and procedures.	Caroline Dodge, Team Leader Information Resilience & Transparency
A number of policies and procedures are in place including KCC Information Governance Policy; Information Governance Management Framework; Information Security Policy; Data Protection Policy; Freedom of Information Policy; and Environmental Information Regulations Policy all in place and reviewed regularly.	Ben Watts, General Counsel
Staff are required to complete mandatory training on Information Governance and Data Protection and refresh their knowledge every two years as a minimum	Ben Watts, General Counsel / Amanda Beer, Corporate Director People and Communications
ICT Commissioning function has necessary working / contractual relationship with the Cantium Business Solutions to require support on KCC ICT compliance and audit.	Rebecca Spore, Director of Infrastructure
Information Resilience and Transparency team in place, providing business information governance support.	Caroline Dodge, Team Leader Information Resilience & Transparency
Cross Directorate Information Governance Working Group in place	Michael Thomas-Sam, Strategic Business Advisor
Privacy notices as well as procedures/protocols for investigating and reporting data breaches reviewed and updated.	Caroline Dodge, Team Leader Information Resilience & Transparency

Action Title	Action Owner	Planned Completion Date
Review methods of recording data breaches and identification / analysis of trends. Information Governance escalation report to CMT re breaches, behaviours and remedies.	Ben Watts, General Counsel	TBC
Utilise new licensing agreement with Microsoft to enhance the security of KCC's infrastructure. Working on implementation and rollout. (Cross reference to CRR0014)	Andrew Cole, Head of ICT Strategy and Commissioning	February 2021 (review)
Working from Home Information Governance audit implementation of recommendations	Ben Watts, General Counsel / David Whittle, Director SPRCA	March 2021

<b>Risk ID</b>	<b>CRR0045</b>	<b>Risk Title</b>	<b>Maintaining effective governance and decision making in a challenging financial and operating environment for local government</b>			
<b>Source / Cause of risk</b>	<b>Risk Event</b>	<b>Consequence</b>	<b>Risk Owner(s)</b>	<b>Current Likelihood</b>	<b>Current Impact</b>	
<p>The continuation of a challenging financial and operating environment for Local Government (see risk CRR0009), plus policy and economic implications of the Coronavirus pandemic will require difficult policy decisions to be made in a timely manner, which requires continued effective governance and decision making as well as robust internal control mechanisms. Examples from other local authorities have shown the impact that ineffective decision making can have on financial resilience.</p> <p>There is a recognised need for the organisation to continually and fundamentally review its governance in light of this exceptional environment.</p>	<p>Officers fail in their duty to provide robust professional advice needed by Members to effectively discharge their political leadership role.</p>	<p>Decisions challenged under judicial review on the appropriateness of the decision-making within KCC.</p>	<p>David Cockburn, Head of Paid Service</p>	<p>Unlikely (2)</p>	<p>Major (5)</p>	
	<p>Members are unwilling or unable to agree necessary policy (service) decisions to deliver a legally balanced budget and sustainable medium-term financial plan (MTFP).</p>	<p>Monitoring Officer / Head of Paid Service statutory report to Council.</p>	<p>Zena Cooke, Corporate Director Finance (s151 Officer)</p>	<p><b>Target Residual Likelihood</b></p> <p>Very Unlikely (1)</p>	<p><b>Target Residual Impact</b></p> <p>Major (5)</p>	
	<p>Members agree a budget requiring unrealistic and undeliverable efficiency savings leading to significant in-year overspends.</p>	<p>Reputational damage to the Council.</p> <p>S114 Notice issued by the S151 Officer.</p> <p>Adverse opinion from the Council's External Auditor.</p>	<p>Ben Watts, General Counsel</p> <p><b>Responsible Cabinet Members:</b></p> <p>Roger Gough, Leader of the Council</p> <p>Peter Oakford, Cabinet Member for Corporate and Traded Services</p>			

Control Title	Control Owner
Interim Strategic Plan agreed by County Council and published setting out the immediate objectives for the coming year as the Council and community looks to recover from the Coronavirus pandemic.	Roger Gough, Leader of the Council
2021-22 Budget and Medium-Term Financial Plan agreed by Full Council and support/briefing provided for all political groups by officers on budget development options	Zena Cooke, Corporate Director Finance (Section 151 Officer)
Key and significant decision-making process in place for Executive decisions and appropriately published Forward Plan of Executive Decisions	Ben Watts, General Counsel
Transformation plans and/or business cases for strategic change underpinning MTFP shared with non-executive members through Cabinet Committees as part of the executive decision-making arrangements	David Cockburn, Head of Paid Service
Member and Officer Codes of Conduct in place and robustly monitored and enforced	Ben Watts, General Counsel
Effective internal audit arrangements in place and robust monitoring arrangements for the delivery of internal audit recommendations to Governance & Audit Committee	Zena Cooke, Corporate Director Finance (Section 151 Officer)
Appropriately detailed and timely financial monitoring reports considered by Cabinet and Cabinet Committees	Zena Cooke, Corporate Director Finance (Section 151 Officer)
Appropriate officer development and training programme in place and overseen by CMT	Amanda Beer, Corporate Director People and Communities
Appropriate and effective corporate risk management procedures in place for the Council	David Whittle, Director SPRCA
Informal governance arrangements authorised by the KCC Constitution have been published on KNet as a practical guide for how officers work with elected Members to help them support effective decision making for our service users, residents and communities.	David Whittle, Director SPRCA

Operating standards for KCC officers that support KCC's constitution published on KNet, signposting officers to essential policy information and additional guidance on specific topics, to help officers discharge their responsibilities effectively.	David Whittle, Director SPRCA
Annual Governance Statement (AGS) arrangements in place with returns made across both senior and statutory officers.	Ben Watts, General Counsel
Democratic Services appropriately resourced to support effective Committee governance and scrutiny arrangements	Ben Watts, General Counsel
Member development and training programme in place and overseen by Selection and Member Services Committee	Ben Watts, General Counsel
Provision for Chief Officers to seek written direction from Executive Members within the KCC Constitution	Ben Watts, General Counsel
Appropriate performance reporting of service and corporate performance to Cabinet, Cabinet Committee and Full Council	David Cockburn, Head of Paid Service
Learning opportunities being captured from other local authority governance failures considered by Governance & Audit Committee, as part of consideration of the future role of that Committee.	Ben Watts, General Counsel

<b>Action Title</b>	<b>Action Owner</b>	<b>Planned Completion Date</b>
Proposals being developed for review of future role of the Governance & Audit Committee	Ben Watts, General Counsel	April 2021

<b>Risk ID</b>	<b>CRR0048</b>	<b>Risk Title</b>	<b>Maintenance and modernisation of KCC Estate</b>			
<b>Source / Cause of risk</b>	<b>Risk Event</b>	<b>Consequence</b>	<b>Risk Owner</b>	<b>Current Likelihood</b>	<b>Current Impact</b>	
While there has been significant investment in parts of our estate over time, there will never be enough funding available to satisfy all aspirations relating to modernisation of our estate. It is becoming increasingly challenging to ensure that all of our property assets are maintained to a sufficient standard, so that they are safe and fit-for-purpose. As parts of our estate age (e.g. some of our schools and our corporate headquarters), maintenance and / or modernisation costs will increase, and will be sub-optimal in terms of our environmental footprint and supporting new working practices. Ongoing investment to maintain and modernise our estate continues to compete with the other priorities to protect frontline services from effects of public sector funding restraint. Property asset considerations need to be viewed as part of a strategic picture alongside technology and people strategies and the appetite for change tested. The Coronavirus pandemic has	Lack of affordable capital programme, meaning insufficient investment in KCC estate to ensure it remains safe and fit-for-purpose.	Business interruption due to increasing level of reactive / emergency repairs required, or parts of the estate decommissioned (in whole or partially) if deemed unsafe.  Adverse impact on achievement of environmental targets.  Adverse impact on opportunities to rethink current working practices and adopt new ways of working.  Impact on staff morale and productivity.  Financial and Reputational loss.	On behalf of CMT:  Rebecca Spore, Director of Infrastructure  <b>Responsible Cabinet Member(s):</b>  Peter Oakford, Finance, Corporate and Traded Services	Likely (4)  <b>Target Residual Likelihood</b>  Possible (3)	Serious (4)  <b>Target Residual Impact</b>  Serious (4)	

accelerated the pace of change to working practices, while also having adverse impact the council's capital programme.		
<b>Control Title</b>	<b>Control Owner</b>	
Future Service Models work reviews how service strategies align with use of assets and potential for changes.	Barbara Cooper, Corporate Director GET	
Safety factors associated with our assets are given priority during the budget setting process.	Zena Cooke, Corporate Director Finance (Section 151 Officer)	
An annual programme of planned preventative maintenance is undertaken at KCC sites by the relevant Facilities Management contract partners.	Tony Carty, Infrastructure Commissioning	
Property commissioning function takes a 'hands on' approach to building compliance management.	Tony Carty, Infrastructure Commissioning	
<b>Action Title</b>	<b>Action Owner</b>	<b>Planned Completion Date</b>
Revisit KCC's Property Asset Strategy, reviewing the principles and ensuring an effective locality offer matched to need, in the context of financial constraints.	Rebecca Spore, Director of Infrastructure	TBC
Complete condition survey programme of both KCC maintained schools and corporate buildings.	James Sanderson, Head of Property Operations	April 2022
Ten-year lifecycle programme, commissioned and underway.	James Sanderson, Head of Property Operations	April 2022

<b>Risk ID</b>	<b>CRR0049</b>	<b>Risk Title</b>	<b>Fraud and Error</b>			
<b>Source / Cause of risk</b>	<b>Risk Event</b>	<b>Consequence</b>	<b>Risk Owner</b>	<b>Current Likelihood</b>	<b>Current Impact</b>	
As with any organisation, there is an inherent risk of fraud and/or error that must be acknowledged and proactively managed.  The fraud threat posed during emergency situations is higher than at other times, and all public bodies should be attuned to the risks facing their organisations and the public sector.  It is critical that management implements a sound system of internal control and demonstrates commitment to it at all times, and that investment in fraud prevention and detection technology and resource is sufficient.  This includes ensuring that new emerging fraud/error issues are sufficiently risk assessed.	Failure to prevent or detect significant acts of fraud or error from internal or external sources, in that within any process or activity there are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- false representations are made to make a gain or expose another to a loss</li> <li>- failure to notify a change of circumstances to make a gain or expose another to a loss</li> <li>- abuses their position, in which they are expected to safeguard to make a gain or expose another to a loss.</li> </ul>	Financial loss leading to pressures on budgets that may impact the provision of services to service users and residents  Reputational damage, particularly if the public see others gaining services or money that are not entitled to, leading to resentment by the public against others.	Zena Cooke, Corporate Director Finance (Section 151 Officer)  <b>Responsible Cabinet Member(s):</b>  Peter Oakford, Finance, Corporate and Traded Services	Likely (4)	Serious (4)	
				<b>Target Residual Likelihood</b>	<b>Target Residual Impact</b>	
				Unlikely (2)	Significant (3)	
<b>Control Title</b>			<b>Control Owner</b>			
Anti-fraud and corruption strategy in place and reviewed annually			James Flannery, Counter-Fraud Manager			
Systems of internal control which aim to prevent fraud and increase the likelihood of detection.			Corporate Management Team/Statutory Officers			
Internal Audit includes proactive fraud work in its annual audit plan, identifying potential areas where frauds could take place and checking for fraudulent activity.			Jonathan Idle, Head of Internal Audit			

Training and awareness raising is conducted periodically.	James Flannery, Counter-Fraud Manager / Amanda Beer, Corporate Director People and Communications	
Preventing Bribery Policy in place, presenting a clear and precise framework to understand and implement the arrangements required to comply with the Bribery Act 2010	James Flannery, Counter-Fraud Manager	
Whistleblowing Policy in place for the reporting of suspicions of fraud or financial irregularity.	James Flannery, Counter-Fraud Manager	
KCC is part of the Kent Intelligence Network (KIN), a joint project between 12 district councils, Medway Council, Kent Fire & Rescue and Kent County Council which analyses and data matches financial and personal information to allow fraudulent activity in locally administered services to be detected more proactively within Kent	Nick Scott, Operations Manager, Kent Intelligence Network / James Flannery, Counter-Fraud Manager (KCC lead)	
An agreed Memorandum of Understanding is in effect with partners (District Councils, Police and Fire Service) outlining the minimum standards expected to be applied by collection authorities (District Councils) to address fraud and error relating to council tax and business rates. Additional work jointly funded to identify and investigate high risk cases based on each authority's share of the tax base.	Dave Shipton, Head of Finance (Policy, Strategy and Planning)	
Fraud risk assessments have been developed by the Counter-Fraud team and are being considered by service directorates to aid awareness and facilitate appropriate mitigations.	Directorate Management Teams	
Counter-fraud resources reviewed and increased for 2020-21.	Jonathan Idle, Head of Internal Audit	
<b>Action Title</b>	<b>Action Owner</b>	<b>Planned Completion Date</b>
Review existing arrangements for segregation of duties, with focus on high-risk areas e.g., commissioning/procurement	James Flannery, Counter-Fraud Manager / Interim Strategic Commissioner	March 2021
Counter Fraud Manager to liaise with CMT regarding all new policies, initiatives and strategies to be assessed for the risk of fraud, bribery and corruption through engagement with the Counter Fraud Team.	James Flannery, Counter-Fraud Manager	March 2021

<b>Risk ID</b>	<b>CRR0051</b>	<b>Risk Title Maintaining or Improving workforce health, wellbeing and productivity throughout Coronavirus response and recovery</b>				
<b>Source / Cause of risk</b>	<b>Risk Event</b>	<b>Consequence</b>	<b>Risk Owner</b>	<b>Current Likelihood</b>	<b>Current Impact</b>	
The Coronavirus pandemic has required the council's workforce to substantially adapt the way it operates and delivers services at short notice. This brings with it opportunities to accelerate programmes of change, improve productivity, wellbeing and promote our employer brand, but also, in the short term at least, risks that require close monitoring and management.  Staff across the organisation continue to work under intense operational pressures, with some still balancing caring / childcare responsibilities while working from home.	Lack of managerial capacity and / or capability to deliver in new environment.	Increased absence levels	Corporate Management Team	Possible (4)	Serious (4)	
	Staff mental and physical fatigue due to prolonged period of response and recovery, while adapting to a new working environment.	Impact on productivity (could be positive or negative)	<b>Responsible Cabinet Member(s):</b>  Shellina Prendergast, Communications, Engagement and People	<b>Target Residual Likelihood</b>	<b>Target Residual Impact</b>	
	Lack of depth / resilience of key personnel or teams.			Unlikely (2)	Serious (4)	
<b>Control Title</b>			<b>Control Owner</b>			
Comprehensive resources and tools available for staff to access, including Support Line counselling services, i-resilience tool, mindfulness and wellbeing sessions, tailored to staff groups as appropriate.			Amanda Beer, Corporate Director, People and Communications			
Intranet site contains dedicated Covid-19 area, with latest advice and guidance – including staff FAQs, Keeping Well, Comfort and Safety and Remote Working			Diane Trollope, Service Manager, OD and Engagement			
Working and Wellbeing Survey Comprehensive Covid-19 work and wellbeing staff survey conducted, to build			Diane Trollope, Service			

understanding of current picture and inform future planning and action.	Manager, OD and Engagement	
Health & Safety team support for services, including updated Covid-19 related advice and guidance e.g. with Task Safety Analysis and supporting use of premises safely during response and recovery.	Flavio Walker, Head of Health & Safety	
Regular engagement with recognised trades unions	Paul Royel, Head of HR and OD	
Additional guidance produced for staff on Display Screen Equipment self-assessments when working from home on a semi-permanent basis.	Flavio Walker, Head of Health and Safety	
Promoting even more regular communications between managers and their teams while working remotely via 'Good Conversations' tools etc.	Diane Trollope, Service Manager, OD and Engagement	
KCC's Organisation Design Principles refreshed	Paul Royel, Head of HR and OD	
Refocus on medium-term Organisation Development Plan	Diane Trollope, Service Manager, OD and Engagement	
<b>Action Title</b>	<b>Action Owner</b>	<b>Planned Completion Date</b>
Utilising feedback from the third staff survey, engagement with managers across the organisation to explore solutions and devise next steps	Diane Trollope, Service Manager, OD and Engagement	March 2021
KCC's values, behaviours and culture embedded by managers, linked to KCC Strategic Reset programme.	Diane Trollope, Service Manager, OD and Engagement	March 2021

This page is intentionally left blank

**From:** Peter Oakford, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance,  
Corporate and Traded Services

Rebecca Spore, Director of Infrastructure

**To:** Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee - 3 March 2021

**Subject:** Kent Estates Partnership and the One Public Estate Programme

**Classification:** Unrestricted

**Past Pathway of report:** N/A

**Future Pathway of report:** N/A

**Electoral Division:** All electoral divisions

**Summary:** Kent County Council (KCC) has been a part of One Public Estate (OPE) since the beginning of the initiative in 2013. From September 2014, KCC have been working closely with a range of Kent partners across the public sector, to ensure that opportunities are identified and that benefits are maximised. This paper provides a progress report on the Kent Estates Partnership (KEP) and partnership working.

**Recommendation(s):**

The **Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee** is asked **to note** progress to date and the development of the partnership.

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1 The One Public Estate Programme (OPE) is an established national programme delivered in partnership with the Cabinet Office Government Property Unit (GPU) and the Local Government Association (LGA). It provides practical and technical support and funding to local authorities to deliver ambitious property-focused programmes in collaboration with central government and other public sector partners.
- 1.2 The core objectives of OPE are local growth (homes and jobs), integrated services and efficiencies. The programme acts as a catalyst for driving forward better asset management to support the provision of local services and save taxpayer money. The Kent Estates Partnership (KEP) was formed to support the delivery of the OPE programme in Kent.
- 1.3 In addition to funding for projects, KEP receives support from the OPE Regional Programme Teams to unblock barriers, access to central government departments and agencies and identify opportunities to influence the development of government policy to assist local delivery. The OPE representatives also provide links to senior

central and local government experts and to wider MHCLG and Homes England housing initiatives and funding.

## **2. Recent activities and bid success**

- 2.1 KCC has been a part of the One Public Estate (OPE) programme since the beginning of the initiative in 2013. The Kent Estates Partnership Board was formed in 2016 for the Phase 4 bid. The Partnership has 26 partners with representatives from local authorities (including KCC as a partner), KALC, Health partners with a link to the STP, Kent Universities, Blue Light Services and Central Government. We also work very closely with the Medway OPE partnership, and a representative from each partnership is part of the other's board. This supports cross partnership working between the KEP and Medway.
- 2.2 As a partnership we have updated the e-PIMs system with property data and provided information on land disposals as part of the OPE criteria. We have developed a forum for sharing good practice, through presentations at KEP board meetings and online sharing through the KEP website and Teams collaboration space. We have regular updates from the Kent Environment strategy team which allows the board to support environment strategies as a partnership as well as individually within their own organisations.
- 2.3 KEP has submitted three successful funding bids and received £843,000 in OPE funding for 8 projects plus funding for the creation of a Programme Management Office (PMO) to support the development of the partnership. There has been one round of Land Release Funding (LRF) and KEP was awarded £658,000.
- 2.4 There have been eight successful projects to receive OPE funding:
  - 2.4.1 Dover Discovery Centre – KCC is working with Dover District Council to progress concept designs and feasibility options for an integrated masterplan for the town centre and the transport interchange/cultural hub, which will open the key arterial route between the Market Place/High Street and the proposed transport interchange hub, both key areas of major regeneration in Dover. Potential benefits include capital receipts, creation of jobs and reduced running costs to local authority homes on local authority land released for housing.
  - 2.4.2 Ebbsfleet Grove Road – Ebbsfleet Development Corporation are working with Gravesham Borough Council and KCC to create a new, regenerated, high quality residential quarter, offering a range of tenures and an enhanced, safe and accessible environment, by assembling and consolidating several sites in public and private ownership.
  - 2.4.3 Maidstone Civic Quarter – KCC is working with Maidstone Borough Council to create a new urban quarter including retail, residential and commercial uses in a high-quality setting. KCC, in partnership with Maidstone Borough Council, strategically acquired the former Royal Mail Sorting Office located in Maidstone Town Centre. The vision for this site is for redevelopment into a high-quality mixed-use scheme over approximately 8 acres of public sector

land.

- 2.4.4 Dartford Town Centre – Dartford Borough Council is working with KCC and Health partners to enhance, integrate and complement the public realm improvements planned for the town centre. It is proposed that this development will include the provision of new healthcare facilities to support the growing town centre population and to respond to new models of care.
- 2.4.5 Sittingbourne Civic Quarter – Swale Borough Council led on the project with KCC, Kent Police and NHS Swale CCG to build on the district council's town centre regeneration programme, by taking advantage of an opportunity to combine public and voluntary services in to a 'Civic Quarter'. The aim is to bring together public services to deliver integrated, customer centric services for residents whilst reducing public sector running costs and freeing up land for mixed use development.
- 2.4.6 West Kent Partnership – Sevenoaks District Council is the project lead for three projects in Swanley, Tunbridge Wells and Sevenoaks, working with KCC, Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, and Health Partners of KEP. The project is to enable the creation of Community integrated hubs which enable the release of land, co-location, service integration and improved service delivery.
- 2.4.7 Paddock Wood Community Hub – Paddock Wood Town Council is working with Tunbridge Wells Borough Council and KCC to replace a small community hall with a larger community facility that will provide increased community space, offices, pre-school, car parking and outside space. The project will also deliver additional homes in the community.
- 2.4.8 West Kent Blue Light Hub – Kent Police are working with Kent Fire and Rescue and SECAMB to create a shared space for training, vehicle maintenance, custody facility and operations base in the west of the county.
- 2.5 The PMO has received funding in two rounds which has supported one FTE with the other resources provided by KCC.
- 2.6 There has been one round of LRF funding, this was awarded to Maidstone Borough Council for Housing projects in Union Street and Brunswick Street, Maidstone. The two sites are expected to yield 94 homes in total and the work is due to be complete in 2021.
- 2.7 KEP has submitted a bid for funding in Phase 8 of the OPE programme, with a request for £403,000 for 5 OPE bids and £558,000 for 4 LRF projects. The OPE bid includes projects from Ashford Borough Council, Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council, Dover District Council and Ebbsfleet Development Corporation. Successful OPE funding could support the delivery of £6.4 million in capital receipts, £3.2 million in reduced running costs, land release for 120 homes and 200 new jobs. Maidstone Borough Council and Sevenoaks District Council have submitted bids for LRF funding, and this could support the delivery of 51 new homes. The decision on successful projects is due to be announced in February 2021.

2.8 Phase 8 includes a county wide project to investigate opportunities for shared workspaces. This will bring together local authorities, blue light services, health and universities, to explore their future requirements for office estate. The project will seek ways to rationalise the office estate and reduce environmental impact by reducing commuter journeys and allowing staff to work locally. The options range from hot desking spaces to partners renting space from other partners or offering space for rental. The OPE funding will provide a project management resource to work with all partners to develop options to take forward. This resource may also be able to help identify and take forward future OPE projects for this programme of work. There has been an initial workshop to discuss the idea with the partnership and an initial survey sent to all KEP partners shows a strong interest in moving forward with the project.

### **3. Financial Implications**

- 3.1 KCC is the lead authority for the Kent Estates Partnership, working with the OPE team to track benefits, provide regular reports and manage distribution of funding awards.
- 3.2 Successful OPE funding is received by KCC and managed by the PMO who check that spending matches the activities on the project award, prior to releasing funds to the project lead.
- 3.3 KCC is the lead partner on the Shared Workspace Project and subject to a successful outcome from the bid for funding, a project management resource will be provided to support the KEP Working Group to take this forward.

### **4. Legal implications**

- 4.1 All partners who receive funding through OPE must sign a Memo of Understanding (MOU) with KCC confirming they will meet all OPE criteria. LRF funding is paid directly to the successful project lead.

### **5. Equalities implications**

- 5.1 None

### **6. Other corporate implications**

- 6.1 The KEP PMO are managed within KCC's infrastructure division and work closely with the Property Team.

### **7. Governance**

- 7.1 KCC is the lead authority for the partnership and the S.151 officer is responsible for the sign-off of each funding bid.

7.2 As the lead authority, KCC is responsible for transferring funding to projects on submission of the appropriate invoices. KCC through the PMO is also responsible for providing regular monitoring reports to OPE.

**8. Conclusions**

8.1 The KEP Partnership has made three successful bids for OPE funding and submitted a fourth bid. Working together as a partnership has strengthened links between public sector organisations in Kent. This partnership working has led from collaborations between small groups of partners to the countywide Shared Workspace Project, which has strong support from the whole partnership.

**9. Recommendation(s)**

**Recommendation(s):**  
The **Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee** is asked to **note** progress to date and the development of the partnership.

**10. Background Documents**

10.1 None

**11. Contact Details**

<p>Report Author: Julie Johnson Partnerships and Programme Development Manager</p> <p>Telephone number: 03000 410497 Email address: julie.johnson@kent.gov.uk</p>	<p>Relevant Director: Rebecca Spore Director of Infrastructure</p> <p>Telephone number: 03000 416716 Email address: rebecca.spore@kent.gov.uk</p>
---	---

This page is intentionally left blank

**From:** Peter Oakford, Deputy Leader, Cabinet Member for Finance,  
Corporate and Traded Services

Ben Watts, General Counsel

**To:** Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee – 3 March 2021

**Subject:** **Work Programme 2021/22**

**Classification:** Unrestricted

**Past Pathway of Paper:** None

**Future Pathway of Paper:** Standard item

**Summary:** This report gives details of the proposed work programme for the Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee.

**Recommendation:** The **Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee** is asked to **consider** and **agree** a work programme for 2021/22

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1 The proposed Work Programme has been compiled from items on the Forthcoming Executive Decision List, from actions arising from previous meetings and from topics identified at agenda setting meetings, held 6 weeks before each Cabinet Committee meeting, in accordance with the Constitution, and attended by the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and group spokesmen.
- 1.2 Whilst the Chairman, in consultation with the Cabinet Members, is responsible for the final selection of items for the agenda, this item gives all Members of the Cabinet Committee the opportunity to suggest amendments and additional agenda items where appropriate.

## 2. Terms of Reference

- 2.1 At its meeting held on 27 March 2014, the County Council agreed the following terms of reference for the Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee “To be responsible for those functions that fall within the Strategic and Corporate Services Directorate” and these should also inform the suggestions made by Members for appropriate matters for consideration.

## 3. Work Programme 2021/22

- 3.1 The Cabinet Committee is requested to consider and note the items within the proposed Work Programme, set out in the appendix to this report, and to suggest any additional topics to be considered for inclusion on the agenda of future meetings.
- 3.2 The schedule of commissioning activity that falls within the remit of this Cabinet Committee will be included in the Work Programme and is considered at

agenda setting meetings to support more effective forward agenda planning and allow Members to have oversight of significant services delivery decisions in advance.

- 3.3 When selecting future items, the Cabinet Committee should consider performance monitoring reports. Any 'for information' or briefing items will be sent to Members of the Cabinet Committee separately to the agenda or separate member briefings will be arranged where appropriate.

#### 4. Conclusion

- 4.1 It is important for the Cabinet Committee process that the Committee takes ownership of its work programme to help the Cabinet Members to deliver informed and considered decisions. A regular report will be submitted to each meeting of the Cabinet Committee to give updates on requested topics and to seek suggestions for future items to be considered. This does not preclude Members making requests to the Chairman or the Democratic Services Officer between meetings for consideration.

<p>5. <b>Recommendation:</b> The <b>Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee</b> is asked to <b>consider</b> and <b>agree</b> a work programme for 2021/22</p>
--

#### 6. Background Documents

None.

#### 7. Contact details

Report Author:  
Theresa Grayell  
Democratic Services Officer  
03000 416172  
[theresa.grayell@kent.gov.uk](mailto:theresa.grayell@kent.gov.uk)

Relevant Director:  
Benjamin Watts  
General Counsel  
03000 416814  
[benjamin.watts@kent.gov.uk](mailto:benjamin.watts@kent.gov.uk)

## POLICY & RESOURCES CABINET COMMITTEE - WORK PROGRAMME 2021/22

	Notes/Comments:	Has item been deferred?
<b>Wednesday 3 March 2021</b> (previously 24 March 2021)		
• Covid Financial Update	Zena Cooke/Dave Shipton Standing item	
• Strategic and Corporate Service Directorate Performance Dashboard	Rachel Kennard Standing item – every other month	
• Governance Update	Ben Watts	
• Strategic and Corporate Services Risk Management	Annual report (Mark Scrivener)	
• Meeting Dates for 2021/22 - For Information	Annual Item	
• Work Programme 2021/22	Standing item	
• Kent Estates Partnership (KEP)	Rebecca Spore	
• Cyber Security Annual Report (EXEMPT)	Rebecca Spore & Andy Cole	
<b>Thursday 10 June 2021</b>		
• Covid Financial Update	Zena Cooke/Dave Shipton Standing item	
• Decision No. TBC – Nackington Lane	Key Decision Rebecca Spore	Deferred from Nov 2020
• Decision No. TBC – Proposed freehold acquisition of the school land (Simon Langton for Boys)	Key Decision Rebecca Spore	Deferred from Nov 2020
• Kent Public Services Network (KPSN) Procurement Update		Deferred from Nov 2020
• Invicta Commissioning Update (Exempt)	Bi-annual - added 6 Jan 2021 by Ben Watts, General Counsel	
• Total Refresh Programme	Rebecca Spore	Deferred from March 2021
• Update on Construction Partnership Commission	Requested at January 2020 meeting, to follow on from CPC discussion then.	Deferred from March 2021
• Work Programme 2021/22	Standing item	

<b>1 September 2021</b>		
• Annual Equality and Diversity Report	Annual	
• Contract Management Review Group update (Exempt)	Bi-annual (Michael Bridger)	
• Strategic and Corporate Service Directorate Performance Dashboard	Every other meeting (Rachel Kennard)	
• Work Programme 2021/22		
<b>9 November 2021</b>		
• Work Programme 2021/22		
• Facilities Management Procurement Update	Agreed at P&R CC on 29 July 2020 by Rebecca Spore & J.Sanderson	
<b>21 January 2022</b>		
• Budget and Medium-Term Financial Plan	Annual (Zena Cooke and Dave Shipton)	
• Strategic and Corporate Service Directorate Performance Dashboard	Every other meeting (Rachel Kennard)	
• Work Programme 2021/22		
<b>23 March 2022</b>		
• Risk Management report (with RAG ratings)	Annual report (Mark Scrivener)	
• Work Programme 2021/22		
<b>10 June 2022</b>		
• Strategic and Corporate Service Directorate Performance Dashboard	Every other meeting (Rachel Kennard)	
• Work Programme 2021/22		



This page is intentionally left blank

**From:** Peter Oakford, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance, Corporate and Traded Services  
Rebecca Spore, Director of Infrastructure

**To:** Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee

**Subject:** Cyber Security

**Non-Key/Key decision:** Non-Key Decision

**Classification:** Unrestricted

**Past Pathway of Paper:** Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee - 8 November 2019

**Future Pathway of Paper:** N/A

**Electoral Division:** Affects more than 2 Electoral Divisions

**Summary:** This report updates **The Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee** on the Council's current approach to cyber security and provides an update to the report presented to this Committee on 8 November 2019.

**Recommendation(s):**

The Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee is asked to **note** this report.

## 1. Introduction

1.1 Over the last year there has been a significant change in our working practice as a result of the pandemic. Alongside this we have continued to develop our technical operating model with the implementation of cloud infrastructure and adoption of the Office 365 tool set. To assist staff in the delivery of KCC services whilst coping with changes to their work practices, a number of amendments were made to KCC's systems and new devices and apps to support a more flexible way of working.

## 2. Security Summary

2.1 Cyber activity has continued to increase with organisations seeking to exploit any weakness. There have been several high-profile cases of successful cyber-attacks including the London Borough of Hackney, AMEY and Kent Commercial Services. All of these have had significant impacts on the ability of the organisations to deliver services, in some cases taking months to recover. Our reliance on our systems has never been greater than the present time to support the delivery of the Council's services.

The exempt report sets out the operating background in more detail and the Council's technical security approach.

KCC's early and prompt adoption of the collaborative tools provided through Microsoft's Office365 suite of applications and the migration of many of KCC's business application systems into the cloud-based Azure tenancy, substantially

reduced the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on KCC's ability to deliver its statutory duties and services by enabling staff to continue working during lockdown periods.

KCC's implementation of Microsoft's Security and Compliance suite of applications and services will build upon the Zero Trust and defence in-depth approaches to securing its ICT infrastructure and the information that is processed and stored therein.

Evidence from monitoring activity suggests that KCC cyber defences are performing well. The planned technology roadmap activity will incorporate further cloud-based security tools to strengthen resilience against known cyber threats. In order to ensure a secure infrastructure and mitigate current and emerging cyber threats, continued investment in developing security technology must be maintained.

The Strategic Technology Board continues to manage activities to address the recommendations made by the NCCG's review of KCC's cyber security and resilience.

### 3. Recommendation(s)

**Recommendation(s):**

The Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee is asked to **note** this report.

### 4. Contact Details

<p><b>Report Author:</b> Andrew Cole</p> <p>Head of Technology Strategy and Commissioning</p> <p>Telephone number: 03000 417554 E-mail: <a href="mailto:andrew.cole2@kent.gov.uk">andrew.cole2@kent.gov.uk</a></p>	<p><b>Relevant Director:</b> Rebecca Spore</p> <p>Director of Infrastructure</p> <p>Telephone number: 03000 416716 E-mail: <a href="mailto:rebecca.spore@kent.gov.uk">rebecca.spore@kent.gov.uk</a></p>
--	---

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank