

Public Document Pack



OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Date: Thursday, 8 March 2018
Time: 6.00 pm
Location: Shimkent Room - Daneshill House,
Danestrete
Contact: Lisa Jerome

Members: Councillors: L Martin-Haugh (Chair), P Bibby CC (Vice-Chair), J Brown, H Burrell, M Downing, A Farquharson, ME Gardner, L Harrington, C Latif, J Lloyd, S Mead, A Mitchell CC and R Parker CC

AGENDA

PART 1

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

2. MINUTES

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 19 February 2018.

Page Nos 3 – 6

3. MEDIA AND COMMUNICATIONS REVIEW

To agree any further recommendations that Scrutiny Members wish to make following the LGA Peer Review feedback on the recent review of SBC Communications.

Page Nos 7 – 18

4. COUNCIL TAX SUPPORT SCHEME

To receive a presentation from the Assistant Director Finance and Estates and the Head of Revenues and Benefits regarding the Council Tax Support Scheme.

5. URGENT PART 1 BUSINESS

To consider any Part 1 business accepted by the Chair as urgent.

6. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

To consider the following motions –

1. That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as described in paragraphs 1 – 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act as amended by Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006.

2. That Members consider the reasons for the following reports being in Part II and determine whether or not maintaining the exemption from disclosure of the information contained therein outweighs the public interest in disclosure.

7. URGENT PART II BUSINESS

To consider any Part II business accepted by the Chair as urgent.

Agenda Published 28 February 2018

STEVENAGE BOROUGH COUNCIL

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MINUTES

Date: Monday, 19 February 2018

Time: 6.00 pm

Place: Shimkent Room - Daneshill House, Danestrete

Present: Councillors: Lin Martin-Haugh (Chair) (Chair), Jim Brown, Michael Downing, Alex Farquharson, Michelle Gardner, Carol Latif, John Lloyd, Sarah Mead, Adam Mitchell CC and Robin Parker CC

Start / End Time: Start Time: 6.00pm
End Time: 7.20pm

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillor Liz Harrington. There were no declarations of interest received from Members.

2 MINUTES - 24 JANUARY 2018

The minutes of the last meeting of the Committee, held on 24 January 2018, were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

NOTE: The version which had been published did not contain details of those Members who had attended, nor did they reflect the start and finish time of the meeting. A revised version, showing all of these details had been produced, published and made available at the meeting for Members.

3 PART 1 DECISIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE

This report had not been circulated to Members five clear days before the meeting nor had it been made available for public inspection. The Chair determined, however, that, given the short time left before the end of the call-in period on 22 February 2018, it could be considered on this occasion.

(i) Healthy Stevenage Strategy

The Council's Assistant Director (RG) introduced the report, which outlined the development of the Healthy Stevenage Strategy, the rationale that underpinned it and provided a summary of strategic outcomes. The report also highlighted and considered the wider implications.

The proposed priorities within, and the rationale for the Strategy, were considered by the Council's Community Select Committee on 31 January 2018, at which, there had been clear support for the Council's leadership in this area, with strong recognition that the involvement of health organisations such as the

Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) would be key to delivering a genuinely strategic approach for Stevenage. The Select Committee also discussed the importance of developing the right approach to working with communities and the impact of schemes such as tea dances and social and community-based activities, which were not necessarily branded as “health promotion activities” but were clearly beneficial to health and well-being.

It was **RESOLVED** that the Part 1 Decisions taken by the Executive at its meeting on 14 February 2018 be noted.

(ii) Budget and Policy Framework Item – Final General Fund and Council Tax-Setting 2018/2019

The Council’s Assistant Director (CF) introduced the report, which considered the Council’s Final General Fund Budget for 2018/2019 and projected 2017/2018 General Fund Budget and final proposals for the 2018/2019 Council Tax. She referred Members to the draft report, which the Committee had considered in January 2018, and said that this was now the final version of the report, which would be presented to Council at its meeting to be held on 28 February 2018. The Assistant Director (CF) corrected a typographical error at Recommendation 2.9 to the report to the effect that the figure quoted for Growth Options was £470,371 and not “£430,371” as listed in the report. In conclusion, she said that the Executive had recorded its disappointment in having not been included within the Business Rates Pilot, where those included, kept all gains received from business rates.

It was **RESOLVED** that the Part 1 Decisions taken by the Executive at its meeting on 14 February 2018 be noted.

(iii) Budget and Policy Framework Item – General Fund Draft Asset Management Strategy and Action Plan

The Council’s Assistant Director (CF) introduced the report, which sought approval to the new draft General Fund Asset Management Strategy and Action Plan. She drew Members’ attention to a third recommendation agreed by the Executive that, the Asset Management Strategy adopts a cooperative approach to engagement with communities, in particular through reviews of assets in different localities.

It was **RESOLVED** that the Part 1 Decisions taken by the Executive at its meeting on 14 February 2018 be noted.

(iv) Budget and Policy Framework Item – Final Capital Strategy 2017/18 to 2022/23

The Council’s Assistant Director (CF) introduced the report, which sought approval to revisions to the 2017/18 General Fund and Housing Revenue Account Capital Programme and approve the draft Capital Programme for 2018/19 for recommendation to Council. The report also set out the Council’s approach to funding its key Future Council priorities and updated Members on (i) the Council’s draft five-year Capital Strategy and the resources available to

fund the Capital Strategy; (ii) the recent government consultation on prudential borrowing and Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP); and (iii) the work of the Leader's Financial Security Group (LFSG) in reviewing all General Fund capital bids prior to inclusion in the Capital Strategy.

She referred Members to the draft report, which the Committee had considered in January 2018, and said that this was now the final version of the report, which would be presented to Council at its meeting to be held on 28 February 2018.

She drew Members' attention to an 11th recommendation agreed by the Executive that, in 2018/19, SBC capital reserves be used to fund £200,000 of the Regeneration Capital Bid assumed from GD3 monies, to allow the SG1 Regeneration Scheme to progress. This was required because the Government had not signed-off governance, which would allow the release of GD3 monies.

It was **RESOLVED** that the Part 1 Decisions taken by the Executive at its meeting on 14 February 2018 be noted.

(v) Budget and Policy Framework Item – Annual Treasury Management Strategy and Prudential Indicators 2018/19

The Council's Assistant Director (CF) introduced the report, which recommended to Council the approval of the Treasury Management Strategy 2018/19, including its Annual Investment Strategy and the prudential indicators following considerations from the Audit Committee and the Executive. She said the report had been updated and the use of balances had been discussed by the Audit Committee. She said that this was a planned use of the Council's balances in line with its strategies.

It was **RESOLVED** that the Part 1 Decisions taken by the Executive at its meeting on 14 February 2018 be noted.

(vi) URGENT PART 1 BUSINESS – Town Centre Regeneration (SG1)

The Council's Strategic Director (TP) reaffirmed the Chief Executive's update given at the Executive on the progress of the decision taken at the last meeting regarding the appointment of the preferred developer for the SG1 Scheme. The developer chosen was preparing a formal launch of the plans on 27 February and the Council was producing a dedicated edition of Chronicle.

Strategic Director (TP) made reference to a national press release issued earlier in the day (Monday 19 February 2018), which confirmed that the appointed development partner was Mace, the international development and construction company behind some of the world's landmark developments would be undertaking the first phase of regeneration, called SG1. This ambitious scheme would bring £350million of private investment into the town centre and would see the area covering the Council's offices here at Daneshill House, the Plaza, bus station and some of the adjacent car parks redeveloped with new shops, bars and restaurants, homes, new public spaces, and a central public sector hub accommodating the Council's offices, a library,

exhibition space, and health services.

Over coming days and weeks, more details of the scheme and the timeline would be shared. The Council was also talking to local businesses and organisations, who are enthusiastic and supportive of the plans, as well as with the media. The Council is hopeful that, following the planning process, construction work will start during next year, and it will then take several years to complete.

It was **RESOLVED** that the Part 1 Decisions taken by the Executive at its meeting on 14 February 2018 be noted.

4 **URGENT PART 1 DECISIONS AUTHORISED BY THE CHAIR OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

None.

5 **URGENT PART 1 BUSINESS**

None.

6 **EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

It was **RESOLVED**:

1. That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as described in paragraphs 1-7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act, as amended by SI 2006 No. 88.
2. That having considered the reasons for the following item being in Part II it be determined that maintaining the exemption from disclosure of the information contained therein outweighs the public interest in disclosure.

7 **PART II DECISIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE (IF ANY)**

It was **RESOLVED** that the Part II section of the Minutes of the meeting of the Executive held on 23 January 2018 be noted.

8 **URGENT PART II BUSINESS**

None.

CHAIR

Meeting OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
Portfolio Area
Date 8 March 2018



MEDIA & COMMUNICATIONS REVIEW

Authors STEPHEN WEAVER | 2332
Lead Officers STEPHEN WEAVER | 2332
 RICHARD PROTHEROE | 2938

1 PURPOSE

- 1.1 This report is to agree any further recommendations that Scrutiny Members wish to make following the LGA Peer Review feedback on the recent review of SBC Communications carried out in November 2017, which was considered at its meeting on 7 February 2018.
- 1.2 At the 7 February meeting Members were invited to comment on the findings and recommendations of the LGA Peer Review and whether they wished to add any further recommendations of their own (which are detailed in this report at item 2.1 to 2.2.5) which would be incorporated into an action plan for Communications for the Council.

2 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 That the Assistant Director, Corporate Services and Transformation meet with the Leader as Executive Portfolio Holder for Media and Communications to consider the following recommendations of the Committee within two months of the publishing of the recommendations.
- 2.2 That the further recommendations that Members wish to add to those that the LGA Peer Team have made are to be incorporated into an action plan are as follows:

- 2.1.1 That the Council explores how best to better engage residents in developing its communications;
- 2.1.2 That the Stevenage Youth Council be invited to own a strand of the place brand and to promote this amongst the Town's young people.
- 2.1.3 That officers consider with the Leader as part of the resulting Communications Action Plan the community engagement response, where does the Council want to be on the (Arnstein) ladder of participation?
- 2.1.4 That there be a priority for informed rapid response to incidents and breaking news over planned 'ribbon cutting' events, etc., when necessary.
- 2.1.5 That the associated Communications Action Plan should also include reference to the issues that Members had previously highlighted as part of their review as areas of development, including:
 - The importance of intelligence to pre-empt issues and proactively engage with local press.
 - The benefit of positive news, especially with regard to any developing issues which might be of concern to Stevenage residents.
 - The need to build and maintain relationships with local media agencies.
 - The need for Members to exercise caution when using social media such as Twitter or Facebook but that training be provided to them to help build confidence.
 - The need to strengthen 'out of hours' coverage especially for social media comments.

3 BACKGROUND

- 3.1 The Overview & Scrutiny Committee agreed Media and Communications as a scrutiny review item when it agreed its work programme at its meeting on the 16 March 2015.
- 3.2 Subsequently the Media and Communications Scoping document was considered and agreed by the Overview & Scrutiny Committee when it met on 19 October 2015 (see attached Appendix A).
- 3.3 At a meeting of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee on 16 November 2015 Members received a presentation from the Assistant Director, Corporate Services and Transformation and the Communications Manager. Following this, Members raised a number of points about Communications at which included:
 - The importance of intelligence to pre-empt issues and proactively engage with local press.
 - The benefit of positive news, especially with regard to any developing issues which might be of concern to Stevenage residents.
 - The need to build and maintain relationships with local media agencies.
 - The need to exercise caution when using social media such as Twitter or Facebook.

- The need to strengthen 'out of hours' coverage especially for social media comments.
- 3.3.1 Based on Members comments at the presentation and in accordance with the stated aims of the scoping document, to engage with an expert external critical friend, the Assistant Director agreed to approach the LGA to carry out an independent Peer Review of the Council's communications and Members agreed to keep their review on hold pending the outcome of the Peer Review.
- 3.3.2 Members agreed to effectively put their review on hold while the LGA Peer Review Team were undertaking their work, as it was felt by Members and officers that this work would be to a greater capacity and more far reaching than the Committee's review could have achieved continuing with their own work.
- 3.3.3 On 8 February 2018 David Holdstock, Director of Communications at the Local Government Association presented to the Committee the findings of the independent Peer Review of the Council's Communications.

4 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDED COURSE OF ACTION AND OTHER OPTIONS

- 4.1 Members had previously identified areas of development for the Council in relation to Media and Communications as detailed at recommendation 2.1.5 and paragraph 3.3.
- 4.2 The Committee received the presentation and a copy of the final report and recommendation from the LGA Communications Peer Review, presented by David Holdstock, Director of Communications at the Local Government Association. This laid out the Review's agreed focus which was structure, capacity and capability; internal communications and place branding, which collectively aimed to identify whether the current model for delivering communications was the right one; how effective was the Council at communicating with, informing and engaging all staff members and how effective was the Council in promoting Stevenage as a place.
- 4.3 Achieving Good Communications
- 4.3.1 The Peer Review outlined the importance of good communications and how the Council could achieve this. The review provided challenge regarding leadership (clarity of purpose and commitment) which was crucial and has challenged the Council on this issue regarding its strategic planning around communications. To this end the Council should strive to achieve a fully-resourced communications plan, linked to the Council's corporate priorities that were owned by everyone.
- 4.4 Strong Leadership
- 4.4.1 The Peer Review had found that the areas for improvement were fairly typical of many other local authorities but it highlighted that Stevenage was a hugely ambitious Council, with a will at all levels to deliver change. The Peer Review found that in terms of corporate communications, the Council was strong or very strong in communications leadership from the Leader of the Council and clear staff leadership from the Chief Executive and showed a

strong commitment to improving communications. Also participation in the Modern Member Programme, which was a valued development opportunity, was a good step forward in terms of communications within the Council.

4.5 Place Branding

- 4.5.1 In terms of Stevenage's branding, the Peer Review focused on the strengths and issues around place branding. Stevenage had all the elements required and a good basis to build upon, its strengths including a shared vision of priorities amongst Members, staff and residents. Stevenage held a strong basis for a place narrative given, amongst other things, its proud history and bright future. The Peer Review had found that Members were keen to be ambassadors for Stevenage. In terms of issues around place branding, there was a need for a place brand for Stevenage to be fully articulated and shared; to demonstrate that Stevenage was changing (e.g. clear timescales, milestones and tangible delivery of regeneration etc.) and for a co-ordinated approach to marketing Stevenage as a place. Stevenage needed to have a cohesive story, i.e. what did Stevenage want to be famous for?

4.6 Internal Communications Team

- 4.6.1 The Peer Review found that the Council's current internal communications had a number of strengths and had shown a big improvement over the last 18 months, with visible leadership and staff recognising the difference. There had been improved staff engagement and some innovative approaches to internal communications. There had also been some improvement in Member communications. However, in terms of the current internal communications there were inconsistencies in approach to internal communication and there was a need to improve current communications channels (e.g. intranet, frequency of communication and networks for managers at all levels).

4.7 Structure, Capacity and Capability of the Communications Team

- 4.7.1 With regard to the structure, capacity and capability the Communications Team was relatively well resourced for a Borough Council and it had "City" ambitions. The Communications Team was delivering a high volume of communications and possessed some good skills and showed a commitment to continued development. Members received good briefings ahead of media interviews and had a good relationship with the Press. This evidence was in line with the original work that Scrutiny Members found when they interviewed the team, who offered a very comprehensive service. However, in terms of structure, capacity and capability, the Peer Review found that the Council lacked a central, strategic oversight and that communications was not consistently part of the Council's decision-making processes.

4.8 Strategic Planning and Priority Setting

- 4.8.1 The Peer Review also found that Communications, as a service, was reactive and its approach was not sufficiently strategic with a lack of strategic planning or link to strategic priorities. Communications needed to improve measurement and evaluation and that its communications competencies were a little out of date. The communications plans were too complex and that the Team was sometimes seen as a "blocker." There was an inconsistent approach to corporate identity and a lack of robust process for

design and print. The Council's website content, insofar as the way it was structured, was a risk of a single point of failure.

- 4.9 On key issues to be addressed, the Peer Review Team's findings were that:
- 4.10 There was a need for the whole of the Council to step-up its communications effort to match the ambition of the Council;
- 4.11 The Council to agree place and corporate narrative (that everybody could use);
- 4.12 The Council's communications resources to be strategically aligned with the Council's agreed priorities and to co-ordinate activity.
- 4.13 The Council to take a more confident, less risk-averse approach to communications;
- 4.14 The Council to make more effective use of communications resources, targeted at agreed priorities (both politically and managerially)
- 4.15 There was a need to evidence the impact of communications (what did success look like?);
- 4.16 Time and space be created for shared Senior Leadership Team and Executive Board sessions; and
- 4.17 Following through to delivery, issues are seen through to the end both internally and externally.
- 4.18 Peer Review Recommendations
- 4.18.1 Within the Peer Review report the team made a series of Strategic recommendations, Council wide recommendations and Operational recommendations which refer to the issues outlined above, which the Overview and Scrutiny Committee supported.

5 IMPLICATIONS

Financial Implications

- 5.1 There are no direct financial implications to this report.

Legal Implications

- 5.2 There are no direct legal implications to this report.

Equalities and Diversity Implications

- 5.3 There are no direct Equalities and Diversity Implications to this report.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

BD1 LGA Communications Peer Review Report and Recommendations

APPENDICES

A O&S Committee Media & Communications Scoping Document

Template Scoping Document

As amended with O&S Member comments 09 10 15

Page 13

<p><u>Overview & Scrutiny Committee</u> <u>(Sitting as a Select Committee)</u></p>	
<p><u>Scrutiny Review Title:</u></p>	<p>Media & Communications</p>
<p><u>Background issues</u> to review – rationale for scrutinising this issue:</p>	<p>Members raised the issue of reviewing Media & Communications, which was agreed by the Overview & Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 16 March 2015 as the focus of its scrutiny review for 2015/16.</p> <p>It had been agreed in the proceeding municipal year to defer this item from 2014-15 to 2015-16 given the workload of the Committee at the time.</p> <p>Members wish to investigate this matter as they are of the view that Media & Communications plays a vital role in the way the Council communicates with the public and its partners, so consideration of this matter by a scrutiny review would be beneficial to establish what are the current practices and to see if there are any areas that could be improved upon.</p>
<p>Is the issue highlighted as one of the Council’s corporate aims and objectives of the Council’s <u>Corporate Strategy</u>, – ‘Sharing the Dividends’? If so which one:</p> <p>Is the issue addressed by the Council’s <u>Community Strategy</u>?</p>	<p>There are no specific references to media and communications within the Council’s Corporate Strategy. However, within the ethos of being a co-operative Council and providing “value for money services” that “put residents first” there are broad commitments that as well as providing an internal service for Members and officers would also support the aspiration of providing a communications service that could benefit the local voluntary sector and other local good causes and events.</p> <p>The Council’s media and communications is not an issue that is directly addressed by the SoStevenage Community Strategy. However, good communications between the Council and its</p>

	<p>partners is a vital component to achieving its goals so consideration of the Council's media and communications should be welcomed by officers.</p> <p>There is a Corporate Communications Strategy which will be considered as part of the evidence for the review.</p>
<p>Is this issue one that raises interest with the public via complaints or Members' surgeries?:</p>	<p>There have been no recorded complaints regarding Media & Communications.</p>
<p>Focus of the review: (State what the review focus will be)</p>	<p>To be identified by the Committee at the scoping meeting.</p> <p>Members have so far suggested the following possible Options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Corporate Culture – moving to a collaborative approach with residents, partners and the voluntary sector - Is SBC getting its culture and behaviours round to a positive community support role, not just a telling us what has been decided?</i> • <i>Processes – Find out what the normal 'day job' is for the Council's Communications Team? Officers to describe the sort of work the Team undertakes and show examples and how work is signed off. How formalised are these processes and are they regularly adhered to?</i> • <i>Is the service proactive or reactive i.e. does the service rely on Executive Members and Senior Officers to approach the Team or are there mechanisms in place to ensure that when they are communicating externally that a corporate standard is maintained?</i> • <i>The review could also consider the relationship with the local media; Councils use of Social Media; the increase in the use of Freedom of Information requests; communicating in Plain English;</i> • <i>Case Studies - Members to highlight cases of external communications that they are aware of where they consider improvement could be made or which demonstrated good practise: ((i) Recent flash flood on 17 July 2015 and how this issue & response was communicated; (ii) Facebook/online petition re Cemetery; (iii) Stevenage Football Club parking at the showground; and (iv) Town Centre Regeneration)</i> <p>Other issues identified by Members at the scoping meeting: Cllr Sarah Mead <i>"this review is an opportunity to look at the way that letters are worded – communication by letter is one of the most common issues, particularly in the event of a missed payment of rent/council tax. Where letters cross</i></p>

	<i>from separate departments this leads to particular anxiety and there should be scope to acknowledge processes clearly.”</i>
Timing issues: Are there any timing constraints to when the review can be carried out?	None apparent prior to scoping, but the review will have to fit in with the timing of the other Select Committee review work programme items. Officers will advise at the meeting if there are any timing issues to consider.
The Committee will meet on (provide dates if known):	Dates: Day/Month/Time/Venue 22 September 2015 – Consider draft Scoping Document with Head of Business Strategy Community & Customer Services 19 October 2015 – Formally agree scope 16 November 2015 – Presentation of Service & interviews with officers & other witnesses including “critical friend” 16 December 2015 – Interview with Leader & Chief Executive 20 January 2016 - Draw together findings and draft recommendations 15 February 2016 – Provisional date for the Final Report and Recommendations
SBC Leads (list the Executive Portfolio Holders and SD’s Heads of Service who should appear as witnesses):	<i>Officers have suggested the following people:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Leader of the Council*– Cllr Sharon Taylor</i> • <i>Chief Executive – Scott Crudgington</i> • <i>Head of Business Strategy, Community and Customer Services – Richard Protheroe</i> • <i>Communications Manager - Lucie Culkin</i> • <i>Various “back office” departments to possibly include; the Customer Service Centre (how they handle social media service requests/complaints); Housing Allocations – Jaine Cresser</i> <p><i>*Executive Member with corporate responsibility for Media and Communications</i></p> <p><i>Any other officers or Members? – Members suggested a representative of the Local Media</i></p>
Any other witnesses (external persons/critical friend)?:	To be identified by the Committee at the scoping meeting. <i>Possible options identified by officers:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>A peer from a neighbouring area to act as a “critical friend” – Richard Protheroe has advised that a contact at the LGA would be invited to attend.</i>

<p><u>Background Documents/data</u> that can be provided to the review</p>	<p><i>To be identified by the Committee at the scoping meeting 22 September 2015.</i></p> <p><i>Possible options suggested by officers:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Case study documents (when agreed)</i> • <i>Evidence of normal practises – showing the process of refining a document prior to publication</i> • <i>Communications Strategy</i> • <i>Residents Survey data, when published Sep/Oct 2015</i>
<p><u>Agreed Milestones and review sign off</u> -To be agreed by Members and officers</p>	<p><i>Formal response from Executive Portfolio Holder (Executives have a Statutory requirement to respond to Scrutiny review recommendations two months after receiving a final report and recommendations of a review: Date Executive Portfolio responses are expected (dependent on the final report & executive portfolio response template publishing date – Possibly February 2016):April 2016</i></p> <p><i>Date for monitoring implementation of recommendations – final sign off (typically one year from completion of the review): February 2017 (Close to this date the O&S Committee will receive a report at a Committee meeting to agree the final sign off of the review recommendations)</i></p>

This page is intentionally left blank