

BLACK SLUICE INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD

MINUTES

of the proceedings of a meeting of the Audit & Risk Committee

held at the offices of the Board on
15th April 2025 at 2pm

Members

Chairperson - * Mr M Leggott

* Mr T Ashton

* Mr V Barker

* Mr M Mowbray

Cllr Z Lane

Cllr M Geaney

Cllr S Welberry

* Member Present

In attendance: Mr D Withnall (Chief Executive)
Mrs A Chamberlain (Finance & Admin Director)
Mr C Harris (Internal Auditor - Lighthouse Consultancy)
Mr J Burton (NFU)
Mr P Ingleby (NFU)

2460 Recording the Meeting - Agenda Item 1

Members were informed that the meeting would be recorded.

2461 Apologies for absence - Agenda Item 2

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr M Geaney and Cllr Z Lane. The Chairperson welcomed Mr C Harris, Mr J Burton and Mr P Ingleby to the meeting.

2462 Declarations of Interest - Agenda Item 3

No declarations of interest were received.

2463 Review the Audit & Risk Terms of Reference - Agenda Item 4

Mr V Barker questioned if the one additional member within the membership should be an Executive Committee member? The Chairperson noted that it was left open to provide more option for Board Members to join the committee.

All AGREED to recommend the Audit & Risk Committee's Terms of Reference to the Board for approval.

2464 Minutes of the last meeting - Agenda Item 5

Minutes of the last meeting held on 29th October 2024, copies of which had been circulated, were considered and it was AGREED that they should be signed as a true record.

2465 Confidential Minutes of the last meeting

Confidential Minutes of the last meeting held on 29th October 2024, copies of which had been circulated, were considered and it was AGREED that they should be signed as a true record.

2466 Matters arising - Agenda Item 6

(a) Policy No. 01: Risk Management Strategy - Risk of breach in cyber security - Minute 2388(e)

It was noted that the Board has now changed from Barclaycard to Elavon, who now conduct the same testing for trying to get into the Board's systems, which has all come back clear.

(b) Policy No. 01: Risk Management Strategy – Risk of Loss of Rating Records – Minute 2388(f)

It was confirmed that the new Drainage Rate System is now up and running.

(c) Risk Register - Minute 2394

Risk 1.1(b) – Fluvial flooding from failure of overtopping of defences and Risk 1.1(c) Flooding from failure of IDB pumping stations or excess rainfall

The Chief Executive confirmed that the Environment Agency (EA) have now completed the bank repairs at Dunsby and Quadring. It being noted that there has been some discrepancy over the levels at Dunsby, with the Board negotiating a level of 2.95, with the EA not willing to increase the level as then the next low point would flood, and they could be deemed negligent.

Regarding the four pumping stations with water running around them during high water levels, the work was put out to independent tender, with a quotation received for less than £1.5million. This compares to the quote received through the government framework (SCAPE) of over £7million. It has been fed back to both the EA and local MP about the difference in quotes from independent tender verses the government framework. The Chief Executive also confirmed that funding has been achieved for this work (up to £3million).

2467 To review the insurance arrangements - Agenda Item 7

Mr J Burton and Mr P Ingleby gave the following presentation around the principles of what the Board currently has insured and the elements that the Board doesn't currently have covered.

Vehicle Cover

- Motor Fleet Policy – Comprehensive coverage for business vehicles such as light goods vehicles, Unimog, pick up trucks and trailers with comprehensive cover.
- Commercial Vehicle Policy – Tailored insurance for special vehicles like forklifts, teleporters, excavators, etc., with liability for underground pipes and cables comprehensive cover.

Vehicle cover - what is not currently insured:

- No claims discount - this is not currently protected (based on individual vehicles). By protecting the no claims discount, the discount applied would be retained, even if there was a claim. After two claims, the no claims discount would be reduced (with the protection). The Chief Executive felt it was an insurance on an insurance.
- Loss of use - Mr P Ingleby explained that if a vehicle was being fixed through an insurance claim and that vehicle was needed immediately, then, currently, the Board would have to hire a replacement at the cost of the Board. This could be covered through the loss of use cover. The Chief Executive explained that this has been previously explored in relation to the Unimog, but it proved to be cost prohibitive.

Business Property - Full all-risks coverage for commercial premises Including subsidence (except Pumping Stations). Contents, renewables and stock.

- Business interruption is also covered (e.g., in the event of the offices burning down, the insurance would provide alternative premises to work from). The current business interruption period covered is twelve months and £500,000, Mr J Burton questioned if that is long enough to be able to get back to the original position (suggesting probably not with a site clearance phase, new plans to be produced, the construction phase etc., the availability of builders etc.)? The committee felt it would be beneficial for the NFU to provide quotes for 18 months and 24 months.
- Pumping Stations unforeseen breakdowns - Mr J Burton explained that pumping stations are insured for all the 'traditional' elements such as fire, malicious damage etc. but is not currently covered for the impacts of a sudden and unforeseen breakdown. Mr M Mowbray noted that the least that would require doing would be running a mobile pump instead. Mr P Ingleby confirmed that the increased cost of working (the mobile pump) would be covered, but the cost of the repair itself would still be the Board's.

Mr V Barker questioned how Swineshead Pumping Station would fit into this? The Chief Executive noted that because Swineshead's issues are known about, it wouldn't be covered.

The Chairperson questioned if all elements of increased cost would be covered, or whether some things wouldn't be included? The Chief Executive gave the example of Swineshead Pumping Station, explaining that, if the Board didn't know about its issues, and it collapsed (old, built on metal frame that has corroded), what would be covered? Mr J Burton noted that subsidence is excluded on pumping stations, likewise, wear and tear is also excluded. The Chairperson gave an example of the failure of a gearbox, Mr P Ingleby confirmed that he couldn't see why that wouldn't be covered.

The Chief Executive noted that, given the unique way the Board is funded, if there was work that needed to be done on a pumping station it would likely be funded through Defra (Grant in Aid).

Mr V Barker added that due to the Board's maintenance regime, he didn't believe the extra insurance cover to be necessary.

Mr T Ashton added that, for the majority of cases, it is likely that the Board are aware that something isn't right before the breakdown or issue occurs.

- Terrorism – Pumping stations are also not currently insured against acts of terrorism. The Chief Executive noted that this has been discussed before, but that it was felt a low risk in this area. The Chairperson noted that it is probably the telematics that are more at risk than the pumping stations. Mr T Ashton agreed that the risk is very low, noting that the Board's own ratepayers don't always understand what and where the Board are, let alone others.

Liability & Specialist Insurance Lines

- Employers Liability - £15million cover
- Public and Products Liability - £15million cover
- Environmental Liability

Legal & Management Protection

- Legal expenses
- Directors and Officers
- Employment Practices
- Fraud - currently limited to fraud by deception of employees only, third party fraud is not covered (physical or financial theft), i.e., employees colluding with third parties in this way.

Mr V Barker gave the only relevant example he could think of; whereby sometimes excavators have a second basket on site with them, that can then be stolen, whether seen by chance or notified by an employee.

The Chief Executive gave the example of an employee letting a third party into the offices to steal all the equipment – would that equipment be covered? Mr P Ingleby noted that he would have to check.

Mr P Ingleby gave one of the most common examples, impersonation fraud, e.g., bank details being changed on an invoice or sending emails pretending to be a colleague. The Board's robust processes were noted to prevent such incidents.

Specialist Services

- Engineering inspection
- Professional indemnity

Credit – currently not covered are there any bad debts? The Chief Executive noted that, generally, most debt is recoverable by the Board.

Accident & Illness – The Chief Executive noted that the Board did used to have this cover, but that it was stopped due to it being seen as not necessary as the Board pay six months full pay and six months half pay for sickness absence.

Mr V Barker gave an example of an employee contracting something such as Weil's Disease and then later dying from it – questioning how that would be covered? It was confirmed that the employee would have cover under the employer's liability insurance if it was proved that there was negligence from the employer (Board). If it was not proven negligent, then the Board would be paying for the employee to be off sick and not at work.

The Accident & Illness cover would compensate the Board for the sick pay. The Chief Executive noted that he believes the employee is well protected (Board's sick pay and pension), the cost would be with the Board for paying the employee whilst not working and covering the employee while not working.

Business Travel – The Chief Executive noted that for the limited travel the Board do, a bespoke policy would be taken out ad hoc if required.

Cyber – Mr P Ingleby explained that there are three packages available as below:

- Breach Bundle
- Impact Bundle
- Complete Bundle

Mr P Ingleby explained that the first bundle includes cover for the consequences of what the Board may do towards a third party. The complete bundle covers the Board's systems also. The impact bundle excludes any outsource providers. Mr P Ingleby noted that the complete bundle, in his opinion, is the recommended coverage package.

Mr P Ingleby explained that with a cyber liability policy, the customer chooses the amount covered, therefore the cost is dependent on this. Mr P Ingleby continued that in a lot of cyber-attack cases, there is a lot of expense with the forensic cyber investigation element which requires specialists, sometimes even lawyers, which can be costly, on top of the cost associated with keeping the Board operating and re-instating any lost data. Mr P Ingleby added that around 8% of claims, the insurer will pay the ransom and that fraudsters know this, with them often sitting in systems for months before making themselves known.

The Chairperson noted a recent cyber-attack (ransom group based in Russia) at a neighbouring IDB, who requested a six-figure ransom sum. After negotiation, a reduced ransom sum was paid through the insurers. All the ratepayer data was lost and down-time of 2-3weeks. He believed their insurance was c£2,500 premium for £5million cover. Mr P Ingleby noted that these groups will match the ransom sum to the company's ability to pay it, adding that it is a relatively simple process to get a quote, but that he won't know the premium until he knows how much cover is required.

Mr V Barker questioned if there is a danger of paying the ransom and then being targeted again? It was noted that these groups are about reputation, and they know if they returned to the same companies, they wouldn't get paid the ransom.

The Chief Executive noted that the Board had an attack several years ago but was spotted and stopped before they were a third of the way through the server. They had got in through an employee clicking on links sent via email, noting that it is people that are the weakest link and hence the Board now having robust processes in place, including multi-factor authentication. The Chief Executive further noted that the Board are subject to 500-1000 attacks a week, that are stopped through the Board's systems. Adding that it is ever changing, and those targeting are very clever people.

Mr M Mowbray noted that if the Board are already preventing that many attacks a week, is the insurance required? The Chief Executive noted that the insurance is not necessarily about those systems in place but is about the support and specialists it offers if the Board were subject to attack and how the Board would resolve it if they did not have the cover.

All AGREED for the NFU to provide quotes for this, to be presented to the Executive Committee and Board, at the following levels of cover: £200,000, £500,000, £1million, £2million.

The committee thanked Mr P Ingleby and Mr J Burton for their attendance, who then left the meeting.

2468 To receive a report from the Internal Auditor - Agenda Item 8

(a) Internal Audit Report for 2024/25

Mr C Harris, the Internal Auditor, gave the following update, starting by thanking the Chief Executive and Finance and Admin Director for making all the documents required for the audit readily available. The Internal Auditor highlighted that the Board were awarded 'Substantial Assurance' with no recommendations.

The Internal Auditor noted that he conversed with the Chief Executive about the Board's reserves, noting that he is happy that the Board's reserves are in a good position but the importance of it being reviewed annually and ensuring that any reserves used can be replenished in the following year.

There being no questions raised, the Board Officer's left the meeting to allow for discussion between the committee and Internal Auditor.

(b) Audit programme for 2025/26

The Internal Auditor presented the audit programme for 2025/26, noting that it follows the criteria required for the Annual Governance and Accountability Return (AGAR), and does sufficient testing to establish that the controls measures are working well, looking at things from a systems point of view.

The Internal Auditor highlighted that there is nothing within the programme on cyber security, this could be added, at a premium. Further adding that he believes the cyber insurance would be a prudent and sensible investment.

The Internal Auditor added that he can be contacted at any time, noting there is no extra charges.

The Chief Executive noted that there was discussion during the awarding of the tender for the auditing contract around the succession for Mr C Harris. The Internal Auditor noted it is intended to bring somebody on to train up for IDB auditing. The Internal Auditor noted that he won't likely still be working for the full term of the contract but will hopefully be for another two – three years yet.

Mr V Barker referenced double signatures being required, on things such as cheques, noting that he had heard of wrongful cheques being accepted by the bank (i.e., no double signature or unauthorised signatories). It was noted that it is now an electronic process and that the Board very rarely deal with cheques for expenditure. It being further added that the only expenditure that can be done without dual authorisation is the Director's credit cards (max. £5,000) and petty cash.

The Internal Auditor noted that he is happy to be contacted any time, by any Board Members, about potential areas to be added into the programme.

The Chairperson thanked the Internal Auditor, who stayed for the remainder of the meeting.

2469 To review the following Board's policies - Agenda Item 9

(a) Policy No. 1: Risk Management Strategy

The Chairperson presented the Risk Management Strategy, with discussion as follows.

1.1(a) Coastal flooding from failure of overtopping of defences

Mr V Barker questioned if the likelihood of the risk being 'low' should be higher than this due to global warming and rising sea levels. Adding that the Board need to consider outside of the Board's catchment area as well.

The Chief Executive referred the committee to the matrix and the three likelihood levels, suggesting that because of the Boston Barrier and only 8km of frontage, that the likelihood level of 'low' is suitable.

Mr T Ashton added that he believes this is something that will need to be considered over time, but due to it being reviewed annually, was of the opinion that, it is currently at the correct risk level of 'low'.

1.1(b) Fluvial flooding from failure or overtopping of defences

The Chief Executive noted that he believes there is still more work to be done to make the Board more resilient before this can be reduced. Highlighting that it states Dunsby bank has been repaired to 3.06m – this is actually 2.95m following remedial works by the contractor.

The pumping stations with water seepage during high water levels have now been successful in achieving funding, so once this work is complete, the committee can consider reducing this risk. The Chief Executive added that it is the Board leading and driving these works, as opposed to the Environment Agency (EA).

1.1(c) Flooding from failure of IDB pumping stations or excess rainfall

The Chief Executive explained that the structural issues at the pumping stations are noted within this risk, and that the EA six-year programme has been reduced to a five-year programme and have awarded the Board £6.3million funding to be spent in the next twelve months to fund some of this work.

1.1(d) Flooding from sewers or riparian watercourses

The Chief Executive noted that riparian watercourses, with landowner responsibility, is one of the elements that can take up Board Officer's time but is essential to make sure the whole system works efficiently.

1.2 Risk of loss of reputation or being found negligent due to Emergency Actions

The Chief Executive explained that this is a proposed new risk in light that there is currently an ongoing court case regarding the claimant seeking to recover costs from the Board for flooding of land (no property flooded) because of the Board making the decision to switch the pumping station (Heckington) to emergency levels (as per the Board's Emergency Response Plan). If successful, this will set a precedence and the Board will not be able to switch to emergency pumping, therefore, having to continue to pump into the South Forty Foot Drain, increasing risk of overtopping and breach. This has been mentioned to the EA Area Director and the EA have offered legal assistance if it goes to trial. This would be in addition to the Board's Barrister (through insurance). Mr W Ash questioned if the claimant has a Barrister? The Chief Executive didn't believe so. All AGREED to the addition of this risk.

1.3 Risk of loss of electrical supply

It was noted that some of the pumping stations electric transformers are being raised, the Board doing what they can to mitigate risk.

Mr V Barker questioned if there was no electric supply to the offices, what measures are in place? The Chief Executive confirmed that the Board don't have a generator that could run it, it also being felt that other IDBs wouldn't have one the size that would be required to be able to borrow. The Chief Executive did note that there are uninterrupted power supplies on the telemetry, if the remote control of pumping stations was lost completely, the workforce would operate them manually. The Chief Executive added that the Board have previously looked into purchasing a generator, and battery storage for the solar panels, but has not been progressed further than that. Mr V Barker questioned the typical daily consumption of the office? The Chief Executive responded that there is a system being installed which will analyse the electricity usage. Mr V Barker noted his initial concern around what would be done if the office was without power for a long period. The Chief Executive confirmed, that as long as it wasn't a wide outage, everything that can be done in the office can be done from home.

The Chairperson referred to the dual drive gearbox facility within pumping stations, questioning if the Board still have a list of tractor owners that could be called upon to power the pumping stations. It was confirmed that this contact list forms part of the Emergency Response Plan.

1.4 Risk of failure of Board's Pumping Stations

The Chief Executive noted that this was previously titled 'Risk of pumps failing to operate' and has proposed to change it to the above for it to be wider ranging and include for possibilities such as structural failure.

The Chief Executive questioned whether the committee think the likelihood should be increased from 'low' given the current circumstances around Swineshead Pumping Station? All AGREED to increase the potential likelihood of risk from low to medium.

1.5 Risk of Board Watercourses being unable to convey water

The Chief Executive highlighted to the committee that the Board has just spent £897,000 on slip repairs (through IDB Recovery Fund) and so the Board is now in a good position in relation to slips.

Mr V Barker noted the increase in failed culverts, as a result of increased flows, and his specific concern about those culverts that are the responsibility of Lincolnshire County Council Highways which are then not repaired. The Chief Executive confirmed that if it was preventing the conveyance of water, then the Board would remove it. The Chairperson added that litter can also cause culvert blockages, suggesting that culverts need clearing as the Board conducts maintenance of the watercourses.

The Chairperson noted the addition of '*programme of desilting to be developed prioritised following surveying*', questioning why this hasn't been done before now? The Chief Executive confirmed that the Site Engineer is now able to do this surveying work, whereas previously there was nobody employed to do such work, meaning it was therefore previously done on a 10-year rotating programme.

1.6 Risk of operating machinery to maintain watercourses

The Chairperson noted that he attends the Health and Safety Committee meetings as the Board representative and that they are thorough and useful meetings.

1.7 Risk of claims from third parties for damage to property or injury

Mr V Barker is pleased that the operators work the machines in a manner that doesn't cause frequent accidents.

1.8 Risk of third parties damage to Board maintained assets

The Chairperson noted that the Board have been lucky and not really experienced vandalism.

1.9 Risk of unplanned loss of senior staff

The Chief Executive noted that the current note within 'further work' about contingencies for senior roles could now be removed following the succession of the current Chief Executive and new Director roles. It being noted that all three Directors are trained to operate the Emergency Response Plan and have both operational and administrative knowledge between them.

All AGREED to remove the further work around contingencies and reduce the likelihood of risk to low.

1.10 Insufficient finance to carry out works

The Chief Executive noted the additional financial pressures on the Board in relation to increased electricity costs, the wet weather etc., noting that this has been offset recently by the IDB Recovery Fund, although there are structural works going forward to consider. The Chief Executive felt the Board are in a positive position, with a £12-£14million capital programme of works for 2025/26 (Grant in Aid funding).

The Chairperson was of the opinion that IDBs were lucky to get such funding and that, going forward, it is likely that government funds will be cut back, adding that, in his opinion, the risk level should remain at 6.

Mr T Ashton agreed to leave it at risk level 6 and review again next year.

1.11 Reduction in staff performance

The Chairperson noted that employees seem motivated and are good at their jobs.

1.12 Insufficient staff resources

The Chief Executive noted that he believes the elevated risk is offset by those employed in specialist roles i.e., Environment Officer and Project Manager.

2. To conserve and enhance the environment wherever practicable and possible to ensure there is no net loss of biodiversity - The Chief Executive noted the proposed change in title from 'practical' to 'practicable', which is the legal terminology.

2.1 Risk of prosecution for not adhering to environmental legislation

The Chairperson noted that the Environment Officer will help to offset this risk.

3.3 Risk of critical incident loss of office

It was noted that this was discussed within the insurance review earlier in the meeting, adding that the NFU representatives mentioned that the Board had £500,000 interruption cover over twelve months, whereas this is stated at £100,000. The Chief Executive to confirm with the NFU and amend as required.

5.3 Risk of fraud by senior officers

Mr V Barker felt this could be reduced to risk level 1. The committee reviewed the matrix, with the potential impact of risk at low being up to £20,000, the committee AGREED to reduce the potential impact to low.

5.4 Risk of inadequacy of internal checks

Mr V Barker felt this could be reduced. The Chief Executive disagreed because of the amount of impersonation fraud etc. and despite the Board's systems, the risk remains.

5.5 Fraudulent use of credit cards

The Chairperson suggested that the likelihood of risk could be reduced to low, all AGREED.

6.2 Risk of not complying with all employment regulations and laws

The Chief Executive highlighted that this relates to employment tribunals, which would likely be more than £20,000 if found to be in the employee's favour.

7.1 Risk of collecting insufficient income to fund expenditure

Mr V Barker noted his concern that risk level 1 is not high enough, giving an example of a period of high electricity costs indenting into the reserves. The Internal Auditor felt that the Board's general reserves are in a good position and would be satisfied in leaving it at risk level 1, reviewing annually based on the expenditure that year.

7.2 IDB abolished or taken over

The Chief Executive questioned whether the progression of unitary authorities and mayoral elections should be mentioned within this risk. The Chairperson noted that it could potentially affect the quality of Board Members.

Mr T Ashton explained that devolution doesn't pose a threat to the Board, with ongoing discussion around the Mayor having a greater role in the flood risk water management priorities in Greater Lincolnshire, but that shouldn't affect the work of the Board. Mr T Ashton felt the greater risk to the Board is, if, and when, Lincolnshire moves to unitary councils, there will be no guarantee around who will be appointed to the Board. There will be 180-200 councillors covering Greater Lincolnshire and so those councillors will have a lot more IDBs to cover, potentially affecting calibre and attendance. The other element to consider is that if the councillors had the majority in relation to voting on the Board, they could steer the vote in a certain direction, for example, in relation to budget setting and increases in the penny rate. It is expected that the new councils will be formed in 2027-2028. The Chief Executive also noted the risk of where the special levy will go, if a unitary authority, rather than the current four councils within the Board's catchment. The Chief Executive didn't feel there was an increased risk of abolishment or being taken over, explaining that the Lead Local Flood Authority will be unitary (surface water), the Environment Agency are also a supervising body (fluvial) and there will be a new mayoral authority with some responsibility for water management, which is currently unknown. All AGREED to add under 'further work' – 'Monitoring developments with unitary devolution and establishment of the mayoral authority'.

8.3 Risk of loss of internet connections

The Chief Executive noted that the reference to 'recent limitations on the network due to low upload speeds' can now be removed.

8.5 Risk of breach in cyber security

In light of the discussion with NFU insurance regarding cyber security, the Chairperson questioned if the committee are happy with a risk level of 2? After reviewing the criteria of the matrix and considering the number of attempted penetrations into the system per week, the committee AGREED to increase potential impact to high and the potential likelihood to medium.

8.6 Risk of network security breach

The Chief Executive explained that in order to get into the network, somebody would require a username and password and their mobile phone. Mr V Barker felt that the risk level was appropriate in light of all the measures in place. Although the measures reduce the likelihood, it was felt the impact could be high. It was confirmed that this risk relates more to data breaches than cyber security, with the Internal Auditor adding that data protection fines can be quite large. All AGREED to increase the impact to high.

8.7 Risk of virus being introduced to the network

The Chief Executive felt that this risk has become more aligned with risk 8.5 and could therefore be merged together to become one risk. All AGREED.

8.8 Risk of loss of accounting records

The Chief Executive noted that HBP (IT Consultants) provide the accounting software, so could easily be retrieved through their systems, therefore meaning the impact could be reduced to low. All AGREED to reduce the potential impact to low.

8.9 Risk of loss of rating records

The Chief Executive noted that there are three back ups of this systems at three locations. The risk of not being able to collect the drainage rate income, or a delay in the collection of drainage rates was noted, with the Chairperson suggesting that the impact could be high. All AGREED to increase the impact to high.

The Committee RESOLVED to recommend that the Risk Management Strategy (No. 01) be approved at the next Board meeting.

(b) Policy No. 33: Smoking

The policy was presented, noting the minimal proposed changes. The Chairperson noted the reference to 'matches and match boxes' suggesting that the majority would use lighters rather than matches.

The Committee RESOLVED to recommend that the Smoking policy (No. 33) be approved at the next Board meeting.

(c) Policy No. 35: Fire Management Plan

Mr V Barker noted that he has been unable to let himself out of the lift on more than one occasion. The Chief Executive suggested the addition of 'Do not use lift in the event of an emergency' to paragraph 2.5 – Evacuation procedures for disabled persons.

The Chief Executive highlighted the proposed change to paragraph 2.7, noting that a sweep of the building would be done as leaving. Further noting that, due to GDPR, an electronic visitors' book is being considered, which would enable logging in to retrieve a list of who is in the building on any device.

It was confirmed that the fire alarm is tested quarterly at random.

The Committee RESOLVED to recommend that the Fire Management Plan (No. 35) be approved at the next Board meeting.

(d) Policy No. 39: Wearing of seatbelts in Board vehicles

The Chief Executive highlighted the proposed addition of HSE approved guidance into the policy, explaining that this has been added due to it being raised by employees at the Health & Safety Committee meetings that they don't believe they should wear seatbelts whilst working adjacent to water. The Chief Executive disagrees and believes they should wear their seatbelts near water, noting the risk of banging their head and becoming unconscious because of not wearing it, for example. Therefore, Regulation 25 and 26 of the HSE Approved Code of Practice and Guidance has been included in the policy, which confirms they should be wearing the seatbelt when near water. The Chairperson agreed with the Chief Executive in that the guidance of the HSE should be adopted, noting that the employees concern was around not being able to get the seatbelt off to get out due to pressure it would be under, it being suggested that the employees are issued with a tool to be able to cut the seatbelt.

Mr V Barker referenced 4x4 trucks working alongside watercourses, noting that if the vehicle were to enter the watercourse, it is likely that the electric systems would be immobilised, it therefore being beneficial to have the windows open so that there would be an escape route.

It was noted that a device can be purchased which will cut the seatbelt and smash the window. All employees to be issued with one, it being added into the policy 'Window breaker seatbelt cutter device to be kept within reach in all vehicles operating near watercourses'.

The Committee RESOLVED to recommend that the Wearing of Seatbelts in Board Vehicles (Policy No. 39) be approved at the next Board meeting.

(e) New Policy: Maternity

The Chief Executive noted that the occupational maternity pay has been approved by the Executive Committee.

The Committee RESOLVED to recommend that the Maternity Policy be adopted at the next Board meeting.

2470 To review the Board's' Cyber Security measures - Agenda Item 10

The Chief Executive noted that this report details the current measures in place in relation to cyber security.

2471 To review the Risk Register - Agenda Item 11

The committee AGREED that the Risk Register be accepted (with the changes to be made as per the Risk Management Strategy).

2472 To receive the Catalogue of Board Policies with recommended approval dates – Agenda Item 12

The Committee AGREED that the Catalogue of Board Policies be adopted.

2473 Any Other Business - Agenda Item 13

(a) Thanks to the Chief Executive

Mr V Barker thanked the Chief Executive for his initiative and lead, with regard to the accounts and achieving substantial assurance in the internal audit but especially in relation to computer systems and measures to prevent cyber security threats.

(b) Thanks to Internal Auditor

The Chairperson thanked the Internal Auditor for his attendance and for his input throughout the meeting.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 16:45.