

Item No.	Classification: Open	Date: 29/07/03	Meeting Name: Executive
Report title:		Individual Decision Making	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		All	
From:		Chief Executive (Head of Corporate Strategy)	

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Executive considers the options for the introduction of individual decision-making, in conjunction with the recommendations from Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC) set out in paragraphs 22 – 30.

Delegation of executive functions

1. That the Executive consider the options set out in paragraph 22 of this report, as well as the recommendation from OSC, and comment on their preferred option.

Scheme of Delegation

2. That the Executive consider the options set out in paragraph 23 of this report, as well as the recommendations from OSC, and comment on their preferred option.

Extent of individual decision-making

3. That the Executive consider the list of potential key areas for individual decision-making, set out in paragraph 24 of this report, as well as the additional recommendations from OSC, and comment on any preferences.
4. That the Executive indicate any views on appropriate financial ranges, for individual decision making, in any of the areas set out in the table at paragraph 25.

Other Issues

5. That the Executive consider each of the other issues set out in the table at paragraph 27 of this report, as well as the additional recommendations from OSC, and comment on any preferences.
6. That the Executive consider the recommendation from the OSC to increase the deadline for call-in from 3 to 5 days (see last row of table at paragraph 27)
7. That the Executive notes the responses to the OSC's recommendations in respect of the Forward Plan (see paragraphs 30).
8. That the recommendations of the Executive be referred to the Standards Committee and Council Assembly for consideration.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

9. The Issue of Individual Decision Making was initially raised at Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 16th April 2003.
10. The Executive considered the issue on the 20th May 2003 and made the following recommendations:
 - That option 1, see paragraph 22 of this report, whereby the Leader sets the delegations is their preferred option.
 - That their preferred option is for a generic scheme of delegation rather than specific schemes for each member, see paragraph 23 of this report.
11. The Executive also suggested that:
 - The examples of delegations set out in paragraphs 24 & 25 of this report were appropriate.
 - That Scrutiny and Standards should consider the other issues, see paragraph 27 of this report.
 - That the scheme of delegation to officers should be considered.
12. Overview & Scrutiny Committee (OSC) received a briefing on individual decision-making in June and identified additional information they required. They subsequently considered the report at the meeting on the 7th July 2003. The recommendations of the OSC are set out in the Key Issues for Consideration section of this report (see paragraphs 22 – 30) for consideration by the Executive.
13. The Local Government Act 2000 allows arrangements for executive functions to be discharged by:
 - The executive as a whole
 - A committee of the executive
 - An individual member of the executive
 - An officer
 - An area committee
 - Joint arrangements
 - Another local authority
14. The arrangements for discharging executive functions may either be adopted by the Council and set out in the constitution or left to the Leader to decide in which case they must be included in the scheme of delegations.
15. On 29th May 2002 the Council agreed the new constitution adopting the Leader and Cabinet model of executive. At that time it was decided that executive members would not have individual decision-making powers.
16. The introduction of individual decision-making would change the way the executive takes decisions, rather than giving any new powers. It could have a number of beneficial effects, for example:
 - Speed up decision making, as decisions would not be tied to the meeting timetable
 - Increased transparency and accountability of decision taking
 - Shorten Executive meetings
 - Reduce number of Executive meetings

17. Some principles of Individual Decision Making are that it should:

- Not erode officer delegations
- Not include human resources responsibility for individual members of staff
- Not include geographical allocation of resources e.g. Environmental Improvement Programme (EIP)

18. Other boroughs have adopted various approaches to decision-making powers for individual Members:

- The report 'Evaluating Local Governance - Survey Findings for Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) Advisory Group' was published on 28 November 2002 and reported the results of a survey carried out in the summer of 2002. It showed that, of the councils operating the Leader and Cabinet model, nearly half allowed individual members of the executive to discharge functions of the executive.
- Three of the London Boroughs with no overall control have opted for individual decision making powers i.e. Harrow, Havering and Hillingdon.
- Harrow limits individual decision taking to non-key decisions only. See appendix 3 for an extract from Harrow's Constitution, Responsibility for Functions.
- Havering and Hillingdon also allow some key-decisions to be taken individually. About 40% of executive decisions are taken individually in Hillingdon and this is about to be reviewed to increase individual decision-making. See appendix 4 for an extract from Hillingdon's Constitution, Responsibility for Functions.
- Kensington & Chelsea allow most decisions, about 88%, to be taken individually with only major policy plans, Compulsory Purchase Orders, crosscutting issues and decisions over certain financial thresholds going to Full Cabinet. See appendix 5 for an extract from K&C's Constitution, Responsibility for Functions.

19. An analysis of whether Southwark Executive's decisions, taken over four months, could have been taken by individual executive members under the Hillingdon and Kensington & Chelsea constitutions is attached at Appendix 2. Please note this analysis was based on a quick review of the minutes, not the detailed reports, so is indicative only. It should also be noted that some items, which could constitutionally be made by individuals, could be referred to a full meeting of the Executive if of a particularly controversial nature.

20. The timetable for agreeing constitutional changes necessary to implement Individual Decision Making is set out below. A report on modernising Contract Standing Orders is also coming forward, however, as additional work is required on this issue these reports will proceed separately.

Table 1: Timetable for agreeing Individual Decision Making

Meeting	Date	Action
Executive	20 th May 2003	To consider an initial view on the proposals for Individual Decision Making
OSC Briefing	9 th June	Briefing on issues
Overview and Scrutiny Committee	7 th July 2003	To comment on the proposed changes with particular regard to the impact on Overview and Scrutiny
Executive	29 th July 2003	To consider the proposed changes and make recommendations to Standards & Council Assembly.

Meeting	Date	Action
Standards Committee	2 nd September 2003	To consider proposed changes and make recommendations to Council Assembly.
Council Assembly (Constitutional Meeting)	17 th September 2003	To consider and agree changes to the Constitution.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

21. OSC received a briefing on individual decision-making in June 2003 and identified additional information they required. They subsequently considered the report at the meeting on the 7th July 2003 and a number of recommendations which are set out below as options for consideration by the Executive.

Delegation of executive functions

22. The Executive is invited to consider whether the Council Assembly should set the arrangements for the discharge of executive functions or should the delegations be left to the Leader? The options are set out in the table below:

Table 2: Options for delegation of executive functions

Option No.	Option	Other local authorities	Views of OSC /Executive
1	The Leader sets the delegations. This allows a more flexible system than if delegations have to be adopted by Council Assembly. It would however involve a change to the current constitution, which currently requires the scheme of delegation to be adopted by Council Assembly.	Hillingdon Kensington & Chelsea Westminster Newham, (Mayor in Newham sets the delegations)	Executive on 20 th May 2003 supported option 1.
2	Council Assembly adopts the scheme of delegation. This would mean any amendment to the scheme of delegations would have to go back to Council Assembly.	Harrow Hammersmith & Fulham (Both only allow non-key decisions to be taken individually)	OSC recommended initially following either option 2 or 3, subject to review at Annual Constitutional Council, on the basis that this is a learning process.
3	Council Assembly sets limitations for delegation to Individuals; the Leader then sets the delegations within these limits. This would not be as flexible as option 1 but would mean that the scheme of delegations would not have to go back to Council Assembly for minor	Camden (Camden follows a variation of option 3 whereby the Council agrees the scheme of delegation at Annual Council, but	

Option No.	Option	Other local authorities	Views of OSC /Executive
	amendments.	the Executive may agree changes during the year.	

Scheme of Delegations

23. The options for the kind of scheme of delegations that the Council may wish to consider adopting are set out in the table below:

Table 3: Options for scheme of delegation

Option No.	Option	Other Local Authorities	Views of OSC / Executive
1	A generic scheme that covers all the Executive Members.	Havering	On the 20 th May 2003, option 1 was the Executive's preferred option.
2	A separate delegation for each individual member.	Harrow Camden	
3	A combined approach of a generic scheme of delegations with specific lists of responsibilities for each portfolio.	Hillingdon, Kensington & Chelsea Hammersmith & Fulham	Overview & Scrutiny Committee supported this option

The extent of individual decision-making

24. The report has identified three models of individual decision-making, operating in London boroughs. However, these are not discrete and the level, of individual decision-making, could be set at any point on a continuum between these models. The level set could involve financial thresholds, the types of decisions which can be taken individually and whether key-decisions can be taken. Individual decision-making could cover any of the executive functions but key elements of the delegations are set out below. The Executive on the 20th May 2003 suggested that the delegations set out in the left-hand column of Table 4 below were appropriate.

Table 4: Proposed key elements of the delegations

Proposed key elements of the delegations	View of Executive / Overview & Scrutiny Committee
Approving alterations to service provision within their portfolio's budget	

Proposed key elements of the delegations	View of Executive / Overview & Scrutiny Committee
Approving departmental business plans	
Best Value Reviews	OSC recommended that this type of decision should not be taken by individuals (but felt that progress reports could).
Inspection reports	
Approving exemptions to procurement rules subject to legal and EU requirements	
Dealing with petitions	OSC recommended an additional type of decision: "Decisions on traffic petitions, which could be made in an open forum where the public can make representations".
Approving responses to consultations	
Responding to O&S Reports	OSC recommended that this type of decision should not be taken by individuals.
Decisions within financial limits (these are set out in more detail in Table 5 below:	

25. The proposed financial delegations are set out in Table 5 below. The Executive are invited to consider these limits. Members should note that the lower limit should start just above the upper limit of officer delegations, where applicable. There could also be an upper limit above which decisions would go to an Executive meeting. The limits could also include intermediate financial limits above which the portfolio holder could take decisions in conjunction with the Executive Member for Resources.

Table 5: Financial Delegations

Decision	Current range where an Executive decision is required	Examples elsewhere	Comments/Views of Overview & Scrutiny Committee/
Approving grants	Over £2,500	Kensington & Chelsea - Over £5,000	Dependent on decisions taken on the Voluntary Sector Fast Track Review elsewhere on the agenda
Approving debt write-offs		Hillingdon – Over £5,000	

		Kensington & Chelsea £10,001 - £100,000 & in conjunction with the Cabinet member for Finance and Property between £100,001 - £250,000	
Approving fees & charges	Changes in fees and charges which are less than the Annual Retail Price Index ¹	Hillingdon – Make recommendations to Cabinet on all	
Approving submissions of bids for additional Government or external resources		Kensington & Chelsea - All	
Approving compensation payments under the complaints procedure		Hillingdon – Over £1,000	
Declaring land surplus to requirement	Over £250,000	Hillingdon – All Kensington & Chelsea – Under £250,000 in conjunction with the Cabinet member for Finance and Property	Overview & Scrutiny Committee recommended that this type of executive decision should not be taken by individuals.
Agreeing Contract Tenders as set out in Contract Standing Orders	Other than the lowest tender if above £140,000 or within 20% of the lowest tender if below £140,000	See Appendix 4 & 5	Should be in line with Contract Standing Orders.
Approving variations to contracts as set out in Contract Standing Orders	Above 20%	See Appendix 4 & 5	Should be in line with Contract Standing Orders.

26. In summary the options on the extent of decision-making are set out in Table 6 below. The Executive is invited to consider the options:

Table 6: Options on extent of decision-making

Option No.	Option	Views of OSC / Executive
1	Scheme of delegation set out in paragraphs 25 - 26	Suggested by the Executive on 20 th May.

2	<p>Similar to option 1 (as set out in paragraphs 25 - 26), except that the following types of executive decisions should not be taken by individuals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responding to O&S Reports • Declaring land surplus to requirement • Final reports of Best Value Reviews (but they felt that progress reports could) <p>It was also recommended the addition of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decisions on traffic petitions, which could be made in an open forum where the public can make representations. 	This option was recommended by the Overview & Scrutiny Committee
---	---	--

Other Issues

27. The Executive is invited to express a view on the issues set out below. Its recommendations will be referred to the Standards Committee for consideration:

Table 7: Options on other issues

Issue	Option / Questions	Views of Overview & Scrutiny Committee / Executive
Arrangements when the portfolio holder is unavailable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 1 - Leader designates an alternative Executive member • Option 2 - Leader or Deputy Leader able to take decision • Option 3 - Decision referred to full meeting of the Executive 	Overview & Scrutiny Committee recommended option 2.
Arrangements when the decision affects more than one portfolio	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 1 - Joint decision taken • Option 2 - Leader designates which portfolio holder takes the decision • Option 3 - Decision referred to full meeting of the Executive 	OSC recommended option 3.
Crosscutting issues	Should consideration also be given to the use of Executive Committees for regular crosscutting issues?	OSC supported this approach.
Controversial decisions	Should the Leader / CE be able to direct that the decision be reserved to a full meeting of the Executive?	OSC supported this approach.

Reporting of decisions	<p>Forward Plan must show Key-decisions, should it also show any non-key decisions that will be taken by individuals?</p> <p>Should a decision sheet be sent to the individual decision-maker with the report for them to record the decision on?</p>	<p>OSC recommended that non-key decisions that will be taken by individuals should be shown on the Forward Plan.</p> <p>OSC supported this approach.</p>
Call-in threshold	<p>OSC had concerns about how call-in would work and in line with the practice at Hillingdon they also made the following additional recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the call-in period should be extended from 3 to 5 working days 	<p>This is a new issue that the Executive has not previously considered.</p> <p>This recommendation is consistent with good practice identified in the recent ODPM report on Strengthening Local Democracy.</p>

Reconsideration of referred back decision

28. OSC felt that an individual decision called-in for reconsideration should be referred back to the full Executive rather than to the individual Executive Member, and asked for additional advice on this point to be available to the Executive and Council Assembly.

29. Section 19 of the Local Government Act 2000 establishes that an Overview and Scrutiny's power to call in and scrutinise a decision should include power to refer the decision back to the "decision maker" for reconsideration, or to refer it to Council Assembly. There is no express power to refer a decision to someone other than the decision taker, except where the decision is referred to Council Assembly. The exercise of the power to refer decisions to Council Assembly and not back to the decision taker is subject to statutory guidance, which is that this should only occur if the decision is outside the budget and policy framework (which only Council Assembly can change), the implication being that Council Assembly could opt to change the budget and policy framework so that the decision can fit within it.

The general principle, therefore, is that a decision should be reconsidered by the decision maker who took it (as is applied in respect of Community Council, Executive Member and Officer decisions.) However, it would be possible for the Overview and Scrutiny to recommend, when it refers the decision back to the individual member to recommend that that decision be considered by the Executive as a whole.

Forward Plan

30. The Overview & Scrutiny Committee also considered the Forward Plan and a number of general issues arising from the introduction of individual decision-making. OSC also recommended that:

- Further ideas about how to improve the Forward Plan [including general exception

notices] should be brought forward for Member discussion – **response:** the Constitutional Team are reviewing the forward plan and will report separately to both Executive and Scrutiny members. Members are invited to make any comments about the format of the forward plan format directly to Ian Millichap.

- A notification list of upcoming decisions should be produced on a fortnightly basis – **response:** any additional list would have resource implications; an improved and more accessible forward plan may be sufficient.

Effect Of Proposed Changes on those affected

31. The introduction of individual decision-making could have a number of consequences and impacts on other structures:

- Decisions will be taken at various times rather than at set points in the meeting cycle. This could have consequences for scrutiny e.g. exercising call-in powers although, as mentioned earlier, longer timescales for calling in individual decisions could be considered.
- Consideration would also need to be given to how delegations to officers and Community Councils are handled e.g. delegations could be direct from the executive, onwards from individual members or a combination of both?
- Member training and development would need to be considered. Statutory guidance, to which the council must have regard, is that members of the executive need access to effective training and development to ensure that they can carry out the role of executive members effectively, and that is particularly important where functions and decision making are delegated to individual member so the executive.

32. In introducing individual decision making it would be important to:

- Guard against a reduction in consultation prior to decisions being taken.
- Guard against a reduction in public access to decision takers.
- Ensure reports, which key-decisions will be based on, are published and circulated to allow time for comments prior to the decision being taken.
- Ensure procedures are in place to publish decisions quickly and circulate them to allow call-in.

33. A decision taken by an individual would still have to conform to the constitutional and legal requirements; a possible scenario would be:

- If it were a key decision it would appear on the forward plan which would state who the decision taker will be and the earliest date at which it can be taken. Non-key decisions, which would be taken by individuals, could also be recorded on the forward plan but would not have to be.
- Officers would prepare a report to inform the decision making process in the same way as for Executive meetings.
- Copies of the reports would be made available a set period prior to the earliest date the decision can be taken, currently at least five working days.
- A decision sheet could be sent to the individual decision taker along with the report. This sheet could state the earliest date when the decision can be taken and have a section to be filled in giving the decision, date of the decision, reason for decision and any alternatives considered.
- The decision taker could discuss the report with relevant officers if required.
- Once the earliest decision date arrives the decision taker can make a decision; then

- sign, date and return the decision sheet to officers.
- Officers would publish the decision in the same way as for Executive meetings and to the timeframes set out in the constitution, currently within two days of the decision being made.
 - The decision could not be implemented for a set period after the date it was published, currently three clear working days.
 - The decision could be called-in using the same procedures as followed for decisions taken at executive meetings.
 - If not called-in the decision would be implemented after the set time has elapsed.
 - If called-in the decision would be considered by OSC in the usual way.
 - If OSC decides to refer the decision back for reconsideration it would be reconsidered by the decision taker within the set timeframe, currently seven clear working days.

Resource Implications

34. There are no specific financial implications within this report

Legal Implications

35. The Borough Solicitor and her staff have been involved in the preparation of this report and the legal implications are contained in the body of the report.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Harrow LBC's Constitution	Corporate Strategy Southwark Town Hall Peckham Rd London SE5 8UB	Jon Horne 020 7525 7251
Hillingdon LBC's Constitution	Corporate Strategy Southwark Town Hall Peckham Rd London SE5 8UB	Jon Horne 020 7525 7251
Kensington & Chelsea LBC's Constitution	Corporate Strategy Southwark Town Hall Peckham Rd London SE5 8UB	Jon Horne 020 7525 7251
Strengthening Local Democracy – Making the Most of the Constitution (ODPM Report)	Corporate Strategy Southwark Town Hall Peckham Rd London SE5 8UB	Jon Horne 020 7525 7251

ADDENDICES

Appendix No.	Title
Appendix 1	Audit Trail
Appendix 2	Analysis of decisions over the period from November 2002 to - March 2003
Appendix 3	Extract from Harrow's Constitution, Responsibility for functions
Appendix 4	Extract from Hillingdon's Constitution, Responsibility for functions
Appendix 5	Extract from Kensington and Chelsea's Constitution, Responsibility for functions

APPENDIX 1**Audit Trail**

Lead Officer	<i>Eamon Lally, Deputy Head of Corporate Strategy</i>	
Report Author	<i>Jonathan Horne, Corporate Strategy Officer</i>	
Version	<i>Final</i>	
Dated	<i>21/7/03</i>	
Key Decision?	<i>No</i>	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / EXECUTIVE MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Borough Solicitor & Secretary	Yes	Yes
Chief Finance Officer	No	No
<i>List other Officers here</i>		
Executive Member	Yes	Yes
Date final report sent to Constitutional Support Services	21/7/03	

Appendix 2

Executive Decisions From 5th November 2002 to 11th March 2003 Which Could Have Been Taken Individually Under The Hillingdon Or Kensington & Chelsea Constitutions

Date	Item	Hillingdon	K&C
11/3/03	Voluntary Sector Fast Track Review		✓
	Abandoned Vehicles – The Way Forward	✓	✓
	Early Years Development & Childcare Partnership Implementation Plan		
	Quarterly Performance Report – Annual Targets for 03/04 & Estimated Performance 03/04		
	Development of Community Warden Schemes	✓	✓
	Award of Banking Services	✓	✓
	ALG Transport & Environment Committee – Vehicle Emission Testing & Enforcement		✓
25/2/03	South London Gallery Trust Stabilisation – Decisions for Trustees		
	South London Gallery Trust Stabilisation – Decisions for Council		
	Community Strategy for Southwark 2003-6		
	Proposed Disposal Strategy for Empire Warehouse with the Development of an Educational Facility in Partnership with the Shakespeare Globe Trust		If below £250,000
	LMS Formula and Scheme for Financing Schools 2003/04		
	Youth Service Plan: 2003/04		✓
	Connexions Service Plan 2003/04		✓
	Canada Water – Permission to Seek CPO Powers		
	19-23 Sternhall Lane SE15 – Disposal		If below £250,000
	Scrutiny Recommendations in Respect of Re-Negotiation of Council Tax & Housing Benefit Contract	✓	✓
	District Audit Annual Letter		
	Parks & Open Spaces BVR – Review of the Ranger Services		✓
	Award of the Negotiated Revenues & Benefits Contract	If below £250,000	✓
Introduction of Congestion Charging	✓	✓	

	Award of Contract for Security Services for Various Council Premises	If below £250,000	✓
11/2/03	Motions Submitted – Comprehensive Performance Assessment	✓	✓
	Housing Revenue Account Budget and Rent Setting		✓
	Southwark's Budget Requirement and Council Tax 2003/04		
	The Capital Programme and Draft Capital Strategy		
	Best Value Review of Disabilities		✓
	Air Quality Monitoring and Congestion Charging	✓	✓
	Elephant and Castle – Early Development and Investment Opportunities		
	Addressing Traffic Congestion in Peckham Town Centre	✓	✓
	Regeneration Department Voluntary Sector Contracting 2003/04	✓	✓
	Recommendations from O&S – Public Disorder at the Council's 2002 Firework Display	✓	✓
	Best Value Review of Member and Constitutional Support Services		✓
	The Victoria Climbié Inquiry		✓
Review of the Revenue Budget 2003/04			
28/1/03	Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) Update		
	Equality Diversity and Community Cohesion: Update on Policy & Proposed Challenge Function	✓	✓
	Best Value Review of Highway Maintenance		✓
	Fusion Performance 2002/03		✓
	CPO – Bermondsey Square		
	Disposal of Properties at Auction		If below £250,000
	Canada Water – Selection of Developer Shortlist		✓
	Local Government Ombudsman Report 01/B/15998	✓	✓
	Local Government Ombudsman Report 01/B/17404	✓	✓
Future Management of Burgess Park		If below £250,000	

	50-58 Glengall Rd - Options		If below £250,000
	Extension of PAX Consultancy Contract	✓	✓
24/1/03	Proposed Grants Programmes 2003/04		
14/1/03	London Boroughs Grants Scheme 2003/04		
	Constitutional Changes for Community Councils		
	Implementing the Borough Identity	✓	✓
	Reference: Final Report of the Health & Social Care Scrutiny Sub-Committee – Access to Primary Care	✓	✓
	Appointment to ALG Health and Social Services Panel		
	Peckham Rd – New Lister Health Centre Disposal		If below £250,000
6/1/03	Call-In Request: Best Value Review of Early Years		
	Call-In Request: Best Value Review of Housing Management		
17/12/02	Fresh Start for the Elephant & Castle – Guiding Principles & Core Proposals		✓
	Motions Submitted – Southwark Heritage Association	✓	✓
	Motions Submitted – Dulwich Park	✓	✓
	Motions Submitted – Abandoned Shopping Trolleys		
	56 Southwark Bridge Rd	✓	✓
	Southwark's Air Quality & Improvement Plan		✓
	Southwark's Cultural Strategy – Initial Phase		✓
	Developing Southwark's Anti-Poverty Agenda		✓
	Peckham Partnership Phase 8A(1) - Disposal		If below £250,000
	Compulsory Purchase of Land at 80-118 Spa Rd		
	Draft Revised Decant Policy – Report Back on Consultation		✓
	Freedom of Information Act 2000 – Publication of Scheme		✓
	Provisional Finance Settlement & its Implications for the Council's Revenue Budget		
	Local Improvement Finance Trust (LIFT)		✓

	Potters Field – Land Transfer		If below £250,000
	Integrated Cleansing Contract		
3/12/02	Motions Submitted – Music Lessons in Primary Schools	✓	✓
	Motions Submitted – Garden Waste Scheme	✓	✓
	Motions Submitted – Council Representation on LSP	✓	✓
	Motions Submitted – Street Cleaning Contract	✓	✓
	Best Value Review of Housing Management		✓
	Quarterly Performance Report		
	Report on Education Performance	✓	✓
	Reports from Inspectors on Revenues & Benefits Service	✓	✓
	Council's Draft Enterprise Strategy		✓
	Local Strategic Partnership Employment Strategy		✓
	Disposal of Former Short-life Properties		If below £250,000
	Award of Contract Preventative Planned Maintenance Programme 2002/03	If below £250,000	✓
	Best Value Review of Early Years		✓
Best Value Review of Legal Services and Restructuring		✓	
19/11/02	Annual Library Plan		
	Comprehensive Performance Assessment		
	Auction Disposal of Short-life Properties		If below £250,000
	Bermondsey Spa Site J – Selection of Preferred Developer Team	If below £250,000	✓
	Integrated Cleansing Contract – Update Report	✓	✓
	Community Councils - Implementation		
	Draft Waste Management Strategy		✓

	Unitary Development Plan – Supplementary Planning Guidance		✓
	Short Term Waste Disposal Contract	✓	✓
5/11/02	Southwark Customer Service Centre		
	Implementation of New Funding Framework for Advice Services	✓	✓
	Community Safety Capital Programme	✓	✓
	Outcome of Fairer Charging Policies for Homecare & Non-Residential Social Services Consultation		✓
	London Secure Services: Orchard Lodge & Stamford House	If below £250,000	✓
	Post OFSTED Inspection Action Plan	✓	✓
	Post OFSTED Inspection Action Plan – Report from Education, Youth & Leisure O&S	✓	✓
	Unitary Development Plan – Supplementary Planning Guidance		✓
	Disposal of Pelican House		If below £250,000
	Insurance Broker Tender	If below £250,000	✓
	Revenue Budgets for 2002/03, 2003/04 and Future Years		
	Approval of Peckham Partnership – Phase 6B Construction		✓
	Extension of Contract with Sharpe Pritchard, Solicitors for Provision of Legal Services	✓	✓