

**South Ayrshire Council**

**Report by Head of Legal and Regulatory Services  
to Audit and Governance Panel  
of 8 November 2023**

---

**Subject: Risk Implications - Panel Reports**

---

**1. Purpose**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to update Members on a review to ascertain if the 'Risk Implications' detailed in Council/ Panel reports are being used successfully.

**2. Recommendation**

**2.1 It is recommended that the Panel:**

**2.1.1 considers the analysis of 'risk implications' in sample Council and Cabinet Reports since January 2023;**

**2.1.2 agrees that the Head of Legal and Regulatory Services reinforces existing guidance to report authors and request that they seek any additional support, if required, from the Service Lead – Risk and Safety; and**

**2.1.3 agrees that the Head of Legal and Regulatory Services reminds Members that ongoing scrutiny of the Risk Implications section of Panel reports will support informed decision making.**

**3. Background**

- 3.1 When considering the Delivering Good Governance Report at Audit and Governance Panel in June 2023, Members made reference to Appendix 1: DGG 2022-23 Year End Assessment which includes the Core Principle F. Managing risks and performance through robust internal control and strong public financial management.

- 3.2 A Member advised that, in the spirit of self-evaluation and in relation to page 15 of Appendix 1, where it stated that 'All Panel and Council reports include 'Risk Implications of Accepting or Rejecting Recommendations'', it would be helpful for a sample of these be reviewed to see if they were being used successfully. The Chief Executive agreed that a review would be undertaken to ascertain the position on this.

- 3.3 Guidance outlining requirements for Panel Reporting is provided to Chief Officers, Service Leads and Report Authors. This includes the mandatory reference to the inclusion of the risk implications of two potential outcomes as follows:

- Risk Implications of Adopting the Recommendations
- Risk Implications of Rejecting the Recommendations

3.4 An extract from this guidance is provided at [Appendix 1](#). This provides detail on the purpose of this inclusion and how consideration of risks to the Council should be addressed by those preparing and approving reports.

#### 4. Proposals

4.1 The review considered reports to full Council or Cabinet since January 2023 and was conducted over two phases.

4.2 Firstly, an analysis was undertaken on the number of reports submitted at each meeting, with data gathered on how many (and what percentage) of those reports indicated the following:

1. There were risk implications relating to the approval of the recommendations.
2. There were risk implications relating to the rejection of the recommendations.

4.2.1 It is worth noting that a number of reports highlight risks on the basis of *both* acceptance and rejection of the recommendations where this applies. This allows Members to consider the balance of risk and supports informed decision making.

4.2.2 The review, by necessity, excluded confidential reports on the basis that they were not available for consideration.

4.2.3 The undernoted table provides data on the number of reports submitted at each meeting, the number and percentage of reports indicating some level of risk if report recommendations were accepted alongside the number and percentage of reports highlighting risks to the organisation if the recommendations were rejected.

Meeting & Date	No. of reports	No. with risks for approval	% of total	No. with risks for rejection	% of total
Cabinet 17/01/2023	9	2	22%	8	89%
Cabinet 15/02/2023	13	2	15%	11	85%
Council 01/03/2023	11	2	18%	8	73%
Cabinet 14/03/2023	6	1	17%	5	83%
Cabinet 25/04/2023	11	1	9%	10	91%
Cabinet 3/05/2023	7	2	29%	5	71%
Cabinet 20/06/2023	18	4	22%	15	83%
Council 29/06/2023	14	1	7%	11	79%
Cabinet 29/08/2023	12	1	8%	12	100%

4.2.4 Accepting the recommendations of reports, would appear to create less risk to the organisation, with an average of 16% indicating the presence of risk should the paper be approved.

- 4.2.5 On average, 84% of Council reports advise of risk to the organisation should the recommendations be rejected.
- 4.2.6 This part of the analysis would support a theory that Officers are proposing projects and initiatives that are aimed at improving the risk profile of the organisation.
- 4.3 The second phase involved more detailed scrutiny of a sample of reports, including one from each of the Council Meetings noted above.
- 4.3.1 An examination was undertaken on the specific risk information provided to Members from each sample report. This was considered alongside the decision Members were recorded as having taken with regards to the recommendations in each report.
- 4.3.2 The review included a discussion with the report author on their view of whether they felt the risk implications they had outlined:
- a Remain valid for the report.
  - B Whether the risk implications on either acceptance or rejection had been queried by Members at consultation phase or via reporting at Council / Cabinet.
  - C Whether any additional risks have arisen as a result of the Council or Cabinet decision which had not been foreseeable at the outset.
- 4.3.3 Finally, the review was concluded with an online check of the webcast of each of the reports selected for the sample to establish if any specific questions had been raised by Members in respect of the risk implications of the decisions they were making.
- 4.3.4 A breakdown of the findings of the second phase of the review is outlined at [Appendix 2](#).
- 4.4 The findings can be summarised as follows:
- On each of the sample reports analysed, report authors confirmed that the risks identified remain valid.
  - Where specific risks were identified in relation to approving a recommendation they were queried by Members prior to approval.
  - Report authors confirmed that no additional risks had arisen following the decisions taken against the recommendations of the reports sampled.
- 4.5 Whilst the findings of the review suggest that 'risk implications' are being considered in an appropriate manner, it can be helpful to reinforce guidance to report authors on a regular basis. To this end, it is proposed that the Head of Legal and Regulatory Services progresses this and request that report authors seek any additional support, if required, from the Service Lead – Risk and Safety. It may also be helpful for the Head of Legal and Regulatory Services to remind Members that ongoing scrutiny of the Risk Implications section of Panel reports will support informed decision making.

## **5. Legal and Procurement Implications**

5.1 The recommendations in this report are consistent with legal requirements.

5.2 There are no procurement implications arising from this report.

## **6. Financial Implications**

6.1 There are no cost implications associated with the recommendations in this report.

## **7. Human Resources Implications**

7.1 There are no human resource implications associated with the recommendations in this report.

## **8. Risk**

### **8.1 *Risk Implications of Adopting the Recommendations***

8.1.1 The management of risk forms the basis of this report. There are no risks in adopting the recommendations.

### **8.2 *Risk Implications of Rejecting the Recommendations***

8.2.1 Rejecting the recommendations may give rise to internal or external criticism.

## **9. Equalities**

9.1 The proposals in this report allow scrutiny of performance. The report does not involve proposals for policies, strategies, procedures, processes, financial decisions and activities (including service delivery), both new and at review, that affect the Council's communities and employees, therefore an equality impact assessment is not required.

## **10. Sustainable Development Implications**

10.1 ***Considering Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)*** - This report does not propose or seek approval for a plan, policy, programme or strategy or document otherwise described which could be considered to constitute a plan, programme, policy or strategy.

## **11. Options Appraisal**

11.1 An options appraisal has not been carried out in relation to the subject matter of this report.

## **12. Link to Council Plan**

12.1 The matters referred to in this report contribute to the delivery of all Council strategic priorities.

### **13. Results of Consultation**

- 13.1 Consultation has taken place with Councillor Martin Dowey, Portfolio Holder for Corporate and Strategic, and the contents of this report reflect any feedback provided.

**Background Papers**     **Report to Audit and Governance Panel of 28 June 2023 – [Delivering Good Governance – 2022/23 Assessment](#)**  
**[Audit and Governance Panel – 28 June 2023 – Minutes](#) (page 4, item 7)**

**Person to Contact**     **Carol Boyd, Service Lead – Risk and Safety**  
**River Terrace**  
**Phone 01292 613090**  
**E-mail [carol.boyd@south-ayrshire.gov.uk](mailto:carol.boyd@south-ayrshire.gov.uk)**

**Date: 31 October 2023**

## South Ayrshire Council - Risk Implications - Panel Reports

*Extract from South Ayrshire Council – Report Template and Guidance Notes:*

Guidance on Risk Implications –

### 8. Risk

- 8.1 The purpose of this section is to assist Members in fulfilling their role in good decision making.
- 8.2 You should identify the risks of which Members should be aware when they are considering adopting the recommendations, or rejecting them, that may affect the achievement of agreed objectives or threaten the assets of the organisation. Such assets include employees, Elected Members, volunteers, property, infrastructure, image or relationships with the public and the ability to perform statutory or voluntary functions.
- 8.3 Risk identification is focused on the key risks against the achievement of Council's objectives. When identifying significant risks, the undernoted categories should be taken into account. This list is not exhaustive and acts as a prompt only, it does, however, ensure that a holistic approach to identification is taken.
- (i) political;
  - (ii) economic;
  - (iii) social;
  - (iv) technological;
  - (iv) legal/ regulatory;
  - (v) environmental;
  - (vi) competitive;
  - (vii) customer /citizen;
  - (ix) managerial/ professional;
  - (x) financial;
  - (xi) health and safety;
  - (xii) partnership/ contractual; and
  - (xiii) physical.
- 8.4 Officers are asked to give consideration to:
- (i) any risks relating to approval of the proposal; and
  - (ii) any risks that might arise if the proposal is rejected.
- 8.5 In any of the above cases, officers should try to address:
- (i) what, if any, the risks are;
  - (ii) how serious they are;

- (iii) what actions have been taken, or will be taken, to mitigate the risk;
- (iv) why no action can be taken to manage the risk, for example, it is out with the Council's control; or
- (v) who is responsible for the risk, when actions will be implemented and how they are monitored.

**NB: Advice should be sought, where appropriate, from the Head of Legal and Regulatory Services or Service Lead – Risk and Safety**

## **8. Risk**

### **8.1 Risk Implications of Adopting the Recommendations**

*Insert one of the following statements:*

8.1.1 New risk(s) has/ have been identified and assessed in line with the Council's risk management process as follows #####. These will be managed within existing operational activities and reference to the status of mitigations will be available through the XXXX Risk Register or the SAC Strategic Risk Register.

**Or**

8.1.1 These risks are out with the control of the Council and will continue to be monitored.

**Or**

8.1.1 There are no risks associated with adopting the recommendations.

### **8.2 Risk Implications of Rejecting the Recommendations**

*Insert one of the following statements:*

8.2.1 The risks associated with rejecting the recommendations are [insert text, where you wish to mention specific risks].

**Or**

8.2.1 There are no risks associated with the rejection of the recommendations.

**Or**

8.2.1 Rejecting the recommendations will have a negative impact on the achievement of the following strategic outcomes within the Service and Improvement Plan for ###service###: ###insert details and also cross refer to the strategic objectives in the Council Plan###.

**Or**

8.2.1 Rejecting the recommendations may impact on the reputation of the Council.

**Or**

8.2.1 Rejecting the recommendations may increase the financial burden on the Council.

***[Delete as applicable]***



South Ayrshire Council - Risk Implications – Panel Reports

Appendix 2

Sample - analysis of reports to Council or Cabinet (January 2023 – August 2023)

1. Council / Cabinet - Date	Risk Implications	Decision	Feedback from Report Author	Webcast Review
Cabinet 17/01/2023	<p><b>Risk implications of adopting the recommendations on the report:</b> None.</p> <p><b>Risk implications of rejecting recommendations on the report:</b> May limit the Council’s ability to achieve Best Value, impact on the reputation of the Council and/ or may give rise to breach of statute, legal challenge or Council liability.</p>	<p><b>Decided:</b> (1) to approve the updated Procurement Strategy for 2023/24, as detailed in Appendix 1 of the report; (2) to agree to publishing the Procurement Strategy for 2023/24 on the South Ayrshire Council website and that a copy be sent to the Scottish Government; and (3) to request that a written briefing be provided to Members giving an update on local spend and Community Wealth Building, and that Members be advised of future supplier engagement events.</p>	<p>a/ Risks identified remain valid for the report. <b>YES</b></p> <p>b/ Whether the risk implications on either acceptance or rejection had been queried by Members at consultation phase or via reporting at Council / Cabinet. <b>NO</b></p> <p>c/ Whether any additional risks have arisen as a result of the Council or Cabinet decision which had not been foreseeable at the outset. <b>NO</b></p>	<p>Report presented by David Alexander. Members were satisfied and comments were positive. Members bulletin followed in February 2023.</p>
<b>Report Title</b>				
Procurement Strategy Update 2023/24				
<b>Report Lead and Person to Contact</b>				
Head of Finance, ICT and Procurement and David Alexander, Service Lead – Procurement.				

2. Council / Cabinet - Date	Risk Implications	Decision	Feedback from Report Author	Webcast Review
Cabinet – 15/02/2023	<p><b>Risk implications of adopting the recommendations:</b> Proceeding with options 3 or 4 would require an application to Planning for a</p>	<p><b>Decided:</b> (a) to note the progress of the Maybole Community Campus; and (b) to request officers to proceed with option 3 – Football Pitch, as</p>	<p>a/ Risks identified remain valid for the report. <b>YES</b> (non-material consent was applied for and granted, therefore risk of accepting</p>	<p>Report presented by Derek Yuille. Members posed a</p>
<b>Report Title</b>				

Maybole Community Campus Update (Pitch Provision)	Non-Material Variation to the Planning Consent. It is understood that this should be successful. <b>Risk implications of rejecting the recommendations</b>	outlined at Paragraph 4.2 in the report with funding from slippage within the Capital Programme.	recommendations did not come to fruition). b/ Whether the risk implications on either acceptance or rejection had been queried by Members at consultation phase or via reporting at Council / Cabinet. <b>YES</b> c/ Whether any additional risks have arisen as a result of the Council or Cabinet decision which had not been foreseeable at the outset. <b>NO</b>	number of questions relating to sports pitch options and these were responded to by Officers.
<b>Report Lead and Person to Contact</b>	Not proceeding with one of these options or proceeding with option 2 to not progress with a 2nd pitch would breach the Planning Condition requiring two outdoor pitches to be available within one year of occupation of the school.			
Depute Chief Executive and Director of Housing, Operations and Development and Derek Yuille, Service Lead – Special Property Projects				

3. Council / Cabinet - date	Risk Implications	Decision	Feedback from Report Author	Webcast Review
Council – 01/03/2023	<b>Risk implications of adopting the recommendations:</b>	<b>Decided:</b>	a/ Risks identified remain valid for the report. <b>YES</b>	Report presented by Jane Bradley and Kevin Anderson.
<b>Report Title</b>	The ongoing risks associated with the delivery of the Council Plan will be managed within existing operational activities and reference to the status of mitigations will be updated through the Strategic Risk and Service Registers.	(a) to approve the Council Plan for 2023-2028 attached as Appendix 1 to the report; and (b) to note that, following approval, service plans based on the agreed outcomes would be developed by each service area and made available for scrutiny by Members at the Council meeting in June 2023	b/ Whether the risk implications on either acceptance or rejection had been queried by Members at consultation phase or via reporting at Council / Cabinet. <b>NO</b>	Members discussed priorities and actions and were satisfied with all aspects.
Council Plan 2023-28	<b>Risk implications of rejecting the recommendations:</b>		c/ Whether any additional risks have arisen as a result of the Council or Cabinet decision which had not been foreseeable at the outset.	
<b>Report Lead and Person to Contact</b>				
Director of Strategic Change and Communities and Kevin Anderson, Service Lead – Policy, Performance and Community Planning.				

	Failure to approve the Council Plan could result in a perceived lack of a clear strategic direction, and that the Council is not seen as maintaining its agreed performance management framework.		<b>NO.</b> (cross reference to ongoing management of strategic planning risk within SAC Strategic Risk Register).	
--	---	--	---	--

4. Council / Cabinet - date	Risk Implications	Decision	Feedback from Report Author	Webcast Review
Cabinet – 14/03/2023	<p><b>Risk implications of adopting the recommendations:</b> There is a risk that the Council will not be able to fund the required action and recovery plan over the next 7 years without financial support from the Scottish Government.</p> <p><b>Risk implications of rejecting the recommendations:</b> There is a risk that in rejecting this proposal the Council will fail to deal with a known health and safety risk within its assets that could have serious or fatal consequences breaching its duty of care. If South Ayrshire Council were found not to have fulfilled its duty</p>	<p><b>Decided:</b> (1) to approve the Ash Dieback Plan at Appendix 1, with year 1 funding coming from the Council’s uncommitted reserves; and (2) to agree that Members lobby CoSLA to fund the full project through the Scottish Government. If the Scottish Government do not agree to fund the remaining work for years 2 to 7 a report will be brought to Cabinet to seek instruction from Members</p>	<p>a/ Risks identified remain valid for the report. <b>YES</b></p> <p>b/ Whether the risk implications on either acceptance or rejection had been queried by Members at consultation phase or via reporting at Council / Cabinet. <b>YES.</b> Risk implications were queried extensively prior to and during Cabinet meeting.</p> <p>c/ Whether any additional risks have arisen as a result of the Council or Cabinet decision which had not been foreseeable at the outset. <b>NO</b></p>	<p>Report presented by Fiona Ross. Risks outlined within both the report and the presentation. Members asked a range of risk related questions. This risk is also managed and monitored via the SAC Strategic Risk Register.</p>
Report Title				
Ash Dieback				
Report Lead and Person to Contact				
Depute Chief Executive and Director of Housing, Operations and Development and Fiona Ross, Service Lead - Neighbourhood Services and Kevin Braidwood, Head of Ayrshire Roads Alliance.				

	of care under the Occupiers' Liability (Scotland) Act 1960, the local authority could be held liable for injury or damage caused as a result.			
--	---	--	--	--

5. Council / Cabinet - date	Risk Implications	Decision	Feedback from Report Author on	Webcast Review
Cabinet – 25/04/2023	<p><b>Risk implications of adopting the recommendations:</b> None.</p> <p><b>Risk implications of rejecting the recommendations:</b> The risks associated with rejecting the recommendations are that staff are not alert to instances where they may be, or could be perceived to be, vulnerable to a conflict of interest which may jeopardise their impartiality, integrity and reputation which may in turn, result in reputational damage. to the Council and be subject to police investigation.</p>	<p><b>Decided:</b> to approve the revised Code of Conduct for Employees, as detailed in Appendix 1 of the report</p>	<p>a/ Risks identified remain valid for the report. <b>YES.</b></p> <p>b/ Whether the risk implications on either acceptance or rejection had been queried by Members at consultation phase or via reporting at Council / Cabinet. <b>NO.</b></p> <p>c/ Whether any additional risks have arisen as a result of the Council or Cabinet decision which had not been foreseeable at the outset. <b>NO.</b></p>	<p>Report presented by Wynne Carlaw. There was a general understanding that the revisions within the Code of Conduct would strengthen the position of the organisation as regards conflict of interest.</p>
<b>Report Title</b>				
Code of Conduct for Employees – Conflict of Interest				
<b>Report Lead and Person to Contact</b>				
Head of Legal and Regulatory Services and Wynne Carlaw, Service Lead – Democratic Governance.				

6. Council / Cabinet - date	Risk Implications	Decision	Feedback from Report Author on	Webcast Review
Cabinet – 23/05/2023		<b>Decided:</b>		

<b>Report Title</b>	<b>Risk Implications of Adopting the Recommendations:</b> Some recommendations may not be feasible. However, feasibility will be fully considered in the business cases that are developed for each asset and recommended action. <b>Risk Implications of Rejecting the Recommendations:</b> The risks with rejecting the recommendations are that the Council is unable to benefit from opportunities, particularly financial, to transform its estate and better meet the needs of residents and the Council.	(1) to approve the strategic recommendations following conclusion of the consultant’s review as shown at Appendix 1 of this report; (2) to authorise that a review of the proposals is carried out for each asset type and validate cashable benefits and costs for the Council to deliver the outline work plan at Appendix 2 of this report; (3) to request that, an update report on progress be provided to Cabinet in June 2024; and (4) to acknowledge that, additional resources will be required to complete the review.	a/ Risks identified remain valid for the report. <b>YES on basis that Officers will return to Cabinet for approval for proposed business cases and risks for each will be subject to further scrutiny.</b> b/ Whether the risk implications on either acceptance or rejection had been queried by Members at consultation phase or via reporting at Council / Cabinet. <b>YES</b> c/ Whether any additional risks had arisen as a result of the Council or Cabinet decision which have not been foreseeable at the outset. <b>NO, but as above, each business case will include further examination of risk for members to consider.</b>	Report presented by Christina Cox and Tom Burns. Members asked a range of questions and provided comment on risk related issues before approving report.
Transforming the Estate				
<b>Report Lead and Person to Contact</b>				
Depute Chief Executive and Director of Housing, Operations and Development and Chris Cox, Assistant Director, Planning and Development; Tom Burns, Service Lead – Asset Management and Community Asset Transfer.				

<b>7. Council / Cabinet - date</b>	<b>Risk Implications</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Feedback from Report Author</b>	<b>Webcast Review</b>
Cabinet – 20/06/2023	<b>Risk implications of adopting the recommendations:</b> There are no risks associated with adopting the recommendations.	<b>Decided:</b> (1) to approve the updated Performance Management Framework as set out in Appendix 1 of the report.	a/ Risks identified remain valid for the report. <b>YES</b> b/ Whether the risk implications on either acceptance or rejection had been queried by Members at	Report presented by Kevin Anderson. Members commended
<b>Report Title</b>				
Performance Management Framework 2023-28				
<b>Report Lead and Person to Contact</b>				

Director of Strategic Change and Communities and Kevin Anderson, Service Lead - Policy, Performance and Community Planning	<b>Risk implications of rejecting the recommendations:</b> The risks associated with rejecting the recommendations are that the Council will not have an agreed PMF in place to monitor performance and improvement.		consultation phase or via reporting at Council / Cabinet. <b>NO</b> c/ Whether any additional risks have arisen as a result of the Council or Cabinet decision which had not been foreseeable at the outset. <b>NO</b>	report. No issues raised regarding risk.
--	---	--	---	--

8. Council / Cabinet - date	Risk Implications	Decision	Feedback from Report Author	Webcast Review
Council – 29/06/2023	<b>Risk implications of adopting the recommendations:</b> There are no risks associated with adopting the recommendations.	<b>Decided: (draft minutes)</b> (1) to note that the review required to be undertaken jointly by the parties to the Integration Scheme, namely South Ayrshire Council and NHS Ayrshire and Arran;	a/ Risks identified remain valid for the report. <b>YES</b>	Report presented by Tim Eltringham.
<b>Report Title</b> Review of South Ayrshire Integration Scheme	<b>Risk implications of rejecting the recommendations:</b> The Integration Scheme is the principal governance document that governs the operation of the South Ayrshire Integration Joint Board and the South Ayrshire Health and Social Care Partnership. It requires to articulate clearly the role not only of the IJB in the integration of health and	(2) to agree that officers proceed with arrangements for the review and joint consultation as described in paragraphs 4.2 and 4.3 of the report; (3) to note that further reports would be provided to Council as the review progressed; and (4) to otherwise note the contents of this report.	b/ Whether the risk implications on either acceptance or rejection had been queried by Members at consultation phase or via reporting at Council / Cabinet. <b>NO</b> c/ Whether any additional risks have arisen as a result of the Council or Cabinet decision which had not been foreseeable at the outset. <b>NO</b>	No issues raised around risk implications. Short discussion on consultees. Report was commended.
<b>Report Lead and Person to Contact</b> Director of Health and Social Care and Sheila Tyeson, Senior Manager – Planning and Performance				

	<p>social care, but the way in which the Board and the Parties – the Council and the NHS Board - will work collaboratively to deliver National and Local Outcomes and Integration Planning Principles as defined by the Public Bodies (Joint Working) (Scotland) Act, 2014, in South Ayrshire. The IJB has included a strategic level risk in its approved Risk Register regarding the strategic objectives of Health and Social Care Integration not being realised under the existing arrangements. This has been rated at 12 (High Risk)</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

9. Council / Cabinet - date	Risk Implications	Decision	Feedback from Report Author	Webcast Review
Cabinet 29/08/2023	<p><b>Risk implications of adopting the recommendations:</b> There are no risks associated with adopting the recommendations.</p>	<p>Decided: (1) to acknowledge the challenges being encountered in terms of recruiting staff to these temporary posts;</p>	<p>a/ Risks identified remain valid for the report. <b>YES</b> – (but recommendations agreed, therefore risk is mitigated).</p>	<p>Report presented by Tim Baulk. Members were satisfied with information</p>
<b>Report Title</b>				
Corporate Support Services Capacity Issues – Update				
<b>Report Lead and Person to Contact</b>				

<p>Joint Report by Head of Finance, ICT and Procurement and Head of Legal and Regulatory Service – author - Tim Baulk, Head of Finance, ICT and Procurement.</p>	<p><b>Risk implications of rejecting the recommendations:</b> There is a risk that Central Support Service functions will be unable to maintain an adequate service provision if the recommendations are rejected</p>	<p>(2) to agree to convert seven temporary posts to permanent posts (per 4.5) immediately and fund from the available reserves until the balance had been expended, and thereafter include the posts in future annual staff budgets; and (3) to request officers to undertake a review of Communications support to be presented to Cabinet in October 2023.</p>	<p>b/ Whether the risk implications on either acceptance or rejection had been queried by Members at consultation phase or via reporting at Council / Cabinet. <b>NO</b> c/ Whether any additional risks have arisen as a result of the Council or Cabinet decision which had not been foreseeable at the outset. <b>NO</b></p>	<p>provided. No questions raised.</p>
--	---	--	---	---------------------------------------

2 October 2023