



South Holland District Council

Review of

Printing and Postage of Committee Agenda Packs

An Overview and Scrutiny Review undertaken by the Reduction of Paper and Postage Task Group on behalf of Policy Development Panel

13th February 2017

This page is intentionally left blank

Contents

1. Introduction
2. Scope of the Review
3. Membership of Task Group
4. Background to Review
5. Method of Review
6. Summary of Findings
7. Conclusions and Recommendations
8. Financial implications of recommendations
9. Main Sources of Information and individuals contacted during the Review
10. Abbreviations

Appendices

- A1. Summary of Agendas Produced – October 2015 to September 2016.
- A2. Summary of Agenda Distribution.
- A3. Members Survey Comments.
- A4. Officers Survey Comments.

This page is intentionally left blank

1. Introduction.

1.1 South Holland District Council is undergoing significant change through the commissioning of a Moving Forward (Transformation) Programme. This is looking at all aspects of the Authority to identify ways of becoming more efficient.

1.2 A considerable amount of resources is spent each year distributing South Holland District Council agendas to Members and Officers. This breaks down into:

- Paper cost.
- Consumables cost, including rental of devices and per page copy charge.
- Democratic Services Officer time, to print, collate and distribute agendas.
- Postage cost, at 1st class for those Members who do not collect from Priory Road.

2. Scope of the Review.

2.1 The scope and therefore terms of reference were defined as:

- To review the use of printed materials and postage regarding committee agendas.
- To formulate a member policy.
- To make recommendations for an officer policy.

The Task Group also looked at other internal/external printed material, but these are considered in separate reports.

3. Membership of Task Group.

3.1 The task group comprised of Councillors J Astill (Chairman), H Drury, M Pullen and A Woolf.

3.2 Councillor J McLean withdrew from the task group and was replaced by Councillor M Pullen.

3.3 The lead officer was Andy Prior and the Task Group was supported by Democratic Services. The Task Group would like to thank Shelley French for the initial work in collating details of agendas produced.

4. Background to Review.

4.1 The review was conducted following a request from the Moving Forward (Transformation) Programme and ICT Working Group requesting a review of the way Members receive agenda packs, with a view to making potential savings.

5. Method of Review.

5.1 The Task Group met several times between 24th October 2016 and 9th February to consider the printing of agenda packs.

5.2 Information was sourced from agendas printed between October 2015 and September 2016 for the following committees:

- Cabinet.
- Committee of the Licencing Authority.
- Full Council.
- Governance and Audit.
- Joint PDP/PMP.
- Licencing Committee.
- Licencing Panel.
- Panel of the Committee of the Licencing Authority.
- Performance Monitoring Panel.
- Planning Committee.
- Policy Development Panel.
- South East Lincolnshire JSP Committee.
- Spalding Town Forum.
- Standards Panel.
- Strategy Board.

5.3 For each agenda pack produced, the following was collated:

- The number of pages printed per agenda for the specified period.
- The distribution for each agenda.

5.4 Democratic Services / Compass Point Business Services provided:

- The cost of 1st and 2nd Class postage for the different weights and sizes of letters.
- The cost of rental of the two Democratic Services MFDs along with the cost per printing each page.

5.5 Members and officers to be surveyed across several questions associated with their use of mod.gov and how they receive agendas.

6. **Summary of Findings.**

6.1 Printing and Postage.

6.1.1 The task group identified that across the period of October 2015 and September 2016 for the 15 committees, there were:

- 87 individual meetings.
- 2603 agendas printed.

6.1.2 The figures above translate to the following A4 paper usage:

- 99780 sheets (printed as duplex so using both sides).
- 199.56 reams.
- 39.31 boxes.

6.1.3 The total cost of consumables (e.g. paper and printing costs) was £1237, this breaks down into:

- £739 for Members agendas.
- £153 for Officer agendas.
- £172 for Clerks agendas (used as spares for Members who forget their printed copy).
- £173 for Statutory purposes (e.g. access to information files, reception notice boards and external recipients).

Notes:

- The costs exclude the quarterly rentals of £964 for the MPC8002 device and £81 for the MPC6501 device located in Democratic Services.
- The costs assume ALL printing is in monochrome, as it is not possible to estimate what proportion is in colour. The cost per colour page for the Democratic Services MFDs is on average £0.03 higher than monochrome.

6.1.4 The estimated cost of postage for members is £1387. This is calculated using the pricing information provided by CPBS. A formula is used to estimate the weight of the agenda being posted.

Note: Postage cost excludes the cost of the 1157 envelopes used.

6.1.5 The estimated officer time and cost is 260 hours or £4005 (this is calculated using an on cost of £30k per annum, with the provision that an officer can collate 10 agendas per hour). This breaks down into:

- 147 hours or £2263 for Members agendas.
- 33 hours or £503 for Officers agendas.
- 39 hours or £605 for Members agendas.
- 41 hours or £634 for Statutory purposes (e.g. access to information files reception notice boards and external recipients).

6.2 Survey Results.

6.2.1 Across the period the survey was live for members to complete, 30 out of 37 provided responses.

6.2.2 Across the period the survey was live for officers to complete, 17 out of 24 provided responses.

6.2.3 Not all questions asked were directly related to printing of agendas, therefore a summary of the responses is shown below. A full copy of the results can be found in the appendix of this report.

6.2.4 Question 1 – How often do you use the Mod.Gov application to view committee agendas?

Member responses:

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
All agendas	10.0%	3
Some agendas	70.0%	21
Don't use Mod.gov	20.0%	6
<i>answered question</i>		30
<i>skipped question</i>		0

Officer responses:

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
All agendas	11.8%	2
Some agendas	47.1%	8
Don't use Mod.gov	11.8%	5
Do not attend committee meetings	11.8%	2
<i>answered question</i>		17
<i>skipped question</i>		0

6.2.5 Question 2 – Do you feel that more training is required on the Mod.Gov application before you can use it to read agendas?

Member responses:

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	34.5%	10
No	48.3%	14
Not sure	17.2%	5
<i>answered question</i>		29
<i>skipped question</i>		1

Officer responses:

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	53.3%	8
No	20.0%	3
N/A	26.7%	4
<i>answered question</i>		15
<i>skipped question</i>		2

6.2.6 Question 3 – Do you collect your agendas or have them posted?

Member responses:

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Collect	27.6%	8
Posted	65.5%	19
N/A - (Access everything online)	6.9%	2
answered question		29
skipped question		1

Officer responses:

Officers were not asked this question, therefore no comparison available.

6.2.7 Question 4 – Individual Committees:

6.2.7.1 Are you a member of or do you attend this committee?

Member responses:

Answer Options	Yes	No	Response Count
Cabinet	9	13	22
Licensing Committees (any)	9	12	21
Full Council	25	1	26
Governance & Audit	5	15	20
Performance Monitoring Panel	10	10	20
Policy Development Panel	10	10	20
Planning	13	10	23

Officer responses:

Answer Options	Yes	No	Response Count
Cabinet	6	8	14
Licensing Committees (any)	5	9	14
Full Council	5	9	14
Governance & Audit	3	10	13
Performance Monitoring Panel	7	7	14
Policy Development Panel	7	7	14
Planning	1	13	14

6.2.7.2 Use Mod.Gov to view agendas?

Member responses:

Answer Options	All the time	Occasionally	Not at all	Response Count
Cabinet	4	9	4	17
Licensing Committees (any)	1	7	10	18
Full Council	2	14	9	25
Governance & Audit	0	7	7	14
Performance Monitoring Panel	1	10	6	17
Policy Development Panel	1	9	5	15
Planning	1	14	4	19

Officer responses:

Answer Options	All the time	Occasionally	Not at all	Response Count
Cabinet	4	4	1	9
Licensing Committees (any)	3	2	4	9
Full Council	3	3	2	8
Governance & Audit	2	2	5	9
Performance Monitoring Panel	3	2	3	8
Policy Development Panel	3	2	3	8
Planning	2	1	3	6

6.2.7.3 Do you receive a printed copy of the agenda?

Member responses:

Answer Options	Yes	No	Response Count
Cabinet	12	9	21
Licensing Committees (any)	9	10	19
Full Council	25	1	26
Governance & Audit	6	10	16
Performance Monitoring Panel	10	5	15
Policy Development Panel	11	4	15
Planning	21	0	21

Officer responses:

Answer Options	Yes	No	Response Count
Cabinet	4	6	10
Licensing Committees (any)	3	7	10
Full Council	4	5	9
Governance & Audit	3	7	10
Performance Monitoring Panel	4	6	10
Policy Development Panel	4	6	10
Planning	1	7	8

6.2.7.4 Happy to receive agendas electronically?

Member responses:

Answer Options	Yes	No	Response Count
Cabinet	12	6	18
Licensing Committees (any)	12	7	19
Full Council	10	15	25
Governance & Audit	10	5	15
Performance Monitoring Panel	12	6	18
Policy Development Panel	11	5	16
Planning	11	11	22

Officer responses:

Answer Options	Yes	No	Response Count
Cabinet	8	0	8
Licensing Committees (any)	9	0	9
Full Council	7	0	7
Governance & Audit	8	0	8
Performance Monitoring Panel	7	0	7
Policy Development Panel	7	0	7
Planning	5	0	5

6.2.8 Question 5 – Digital Transformation (Officers were not asked this question, therefore no comparison available):

Answer Options	Strongly Agree	Agree	No View	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Response Count
As a member I fully understand the council's	9	16	2	2	0	29
The Council is correct in providing more electronic	10	18	1	0	0	29
As a member I fully understand that the Council should	8	17	2	2	0	29
<i>answered question</i>						29
<i>skipped question</i>						1

6.2.9 Question 6 – Statements on Printing and Postage:

Members responses:

Answer Options	Strongly Agree	Agree	No View	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Response Count
Recipients should Opt-in to having agendas printed and posted for them?	9	14	3	2	1	29
Recipients who want agendas posted should have these sent 2nd class?	5	14	4	3	2	28
Printing copies of the Planning agenda for members who are not on the committee should stop immediately?	11	12	2	4	0	29
Printing spare copies of agendas Democratic Services should stop printing spare copies of agendas for members of officers immediately?	12	9	2	4	2	29
Mod.Gov application is an easy way to view agendas?	6	14	5	3	0	28
Pad screen size is suitable for reading agendas?	5	14	2	6	0	27
<i>answered question</i>						29
<i>skipped question</i>						1

Officers responses:

Answer Options	Strongly Agree	Agree	No View	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Response Count
Recipients should opt-in to having agendas printed (and posted where applicable) for them	10	3	0	1	1	15
Members who want agendas posted should have these sent 2nd class	10	2	1	1	1	15
Printing copies of the Planning agenda for members who are not on the committee should stop immediately	14	0	0	1	0	15
Democratic Services should stop printing spare copies of agendas for members of officers immediately	11	1	1	2	0	15
Mod.Gov application is an easy way to view agendas	5	6	1	2	0	14
Your device screen size is suitable for reading agendas	6	4	1	1	3	15
<i>answered question</i>						15
<i>skipped question</i>						2

7. Conclusions and Recommendations.

7.1 Conclusions Reached:

- That a significant amount of officer time is spent printing/collating agendas for members/officers and posting agendas to members. Any reduction in officer time spent on this task would increase the amount of time available supporting members.
- That savings could be made on printing costs by asking members to opt-in (rather than opt-out) of printing.
- That small savings could be made on postage costs by sending any printed agendas by 2nd class mail.
- Some committees lead themselves towards having printed agendas (e.g. those containing finance reports).
- Agendas largely containing simple text can be viewed easily via the Mod.Gov application.
- That electronic devices should be used more effectively to view agendas, but with the expectation that ICT equipment and services available to members remains reliable.
- A majority of members surveyed were happy to receive agendas electronically with the exception of Full Council.
- As the council makes more of its services available online and encourages residents to use these more efficient services, officers and members should be leading by example and creating a paperless environment.

7.2 The task group reached the following recommendations, **these were all supported by the finding of both the officers and members' surveys by a clear majority.**

7.2.1 Non-cash:

- That further training should be provided to members and officers on the use of Mod.Gov application to review and annotate agendas.

7.2.2 Cash:

- That meeting rooms 1 and 2 plus the Council Chamber should have fixed projectors or display equipment installed, and that use of these becomes commonplace within **ALL** meetings.
- That as part of the ICT Refresh, collaboration software is deployed (e.g. Microsoft Lync) to enable individuals in **ANY** location to be able to share information or video conference between their devices.
- That where possible officers should produce reports (containing items other than text) capable of being printed in black and white (rather than colour) to further reduce printing costs.
- From 1st May 2017:
 - Recipients should opt-in to receive paper copies of agendas.
 - Any agendas being posted are sent 2nd Class.

- Planning agendas are not automatically printed for those not on the committee.
- Democratic Services no longer produce spare copies of agendas for members use or copies for officer's use.
- Full Council agenda is reduced in size by including electronic links to Committee Minutes.

8. Financial Implications of Recommendations.

8.1 Cost:

Notes	Cost
Display Equipment for MR1 and MR2	Circa £10k (final cost would depend on requirements of members/officers)
Projector for Council Chamber	Costs included within the £56.8k budget to upgrade Council Chamber equipment (officer decision 4.15)
Deploy collaboration software to Officer and Member devices	Costs should be built into the ICT Refresh project.

8.2 Potential Savings Per Year:

Item	Consumables	Postage	Officer Time (hours)
Recipients opt-in to receiving agendas printed and posted (25% to 75%)	£309 to £927	£346 to £1040	45 to 135
Sending posted agendas by second class.	n/a	£225	n/a
Not automatically printing planning agendas for ALL members.	£87	£267	24
Stop printing spare copies of agendas for members	£171	£0	39
Stop printing copies of agendas for officers	£153	£0	32

Notes:

- The savings shown are calculated from the actual printing/postage costs shown in section 6 of this report.
- It is not possible to estimate the savings for removing the printed pages of other Committee Minutes.

9. Main Sources of Information and individuals contacted during the review.

9.1 The main sources of information were provided by the departments referred to in paragraph 5.

10. Abbreviations.

Abbreviation	Description
MFD	Multi-Function Device (e.g. Photocopier)
CPBS	Compass Point Business Services

Appendices.

A1. Summary of agendas produced – October 2015 to September 2016:

A1.1 Members:

Committee	Total Committee Meetings	Total Pages per Committee	Members					
			Total Agendas Printed	Cost Consumables	Total Agendas Posted	Cost Postage	Estimated Officer Hours per Year	Estimated Officer Cost per Year
Cabinet	7	730	105	£67.89	56	£72.16	10.50	£161.54
Committee of the Licensing Authority	4	184	60	£17.11	40	£41.40	6.00	£92.31
Full Council	9	1392	333	£319.32	243	£377.46	33.30	£512.31
Governance and Audit	7	830	42	£30.88	28	£41.84	4.20	£64.62
Joint PMP/PDP	5	402	125	£62.31	105	£129.15	12.50	£192.31
Licensing Committee	4	26	60	£2.42	40	£31.60	6.00	£92.31
Licensing Panel	2	20	6	£0.37	6	£4.74	0.60	£9.23
Panel of the Committee of the Licensing Authority	12	752	36	£13.99	36	£41.46	3.60	£55.38
Performance Monitoring Panel	4	218	60	£20.27	52	£57.20	6.00	£92.31
Planning	11	640	407	£146.82	352	£388.80	40.70	£626.15
Policy Development Panel	5	228	80	£22.62	70	£72.66	8.00	£123.08
South East Lincolnshire JSP Committee	4	204	24	£7.59	20	£20.70	2.40	£36.92
Spalding Town Forum	4	28	44	£1.91	24	£18.96	4.40	£67.69
Standards Panel	2	8	12	£0.30	8	£6.32	1.20	£18.46
Strategy Board	7	368	77	£25.10	77	£82.39	7.70	£118.46
Totals	87	6030	1471	£738.89	1157	£1,386.84	147.10	£2,263.08

A1.2 Officers:

Committee	Total Committee Meetings	Total Pages per Committee	Officers			
			Total Agendas Printed	Cost Consumables	Estimated Officer Hours per Year	Estimated Officer Cost per Year
Cabinet	7	730	28	£18.10	2.8	£43.08
Committee of the Licensing Authority	4	184	20	£5.70	2	£30.77
Full Council	9	1392	54	£51.78	5.4	£83.08
Governance and Audit	7	830	21	£15.44	2.1	£32.31
Joint PMP/PDP	5	402	10	£4.98	1	£15.38
Licensing Committee	4	26	20	£0.81	2	£30.77
Licensing Panel	2	20	8	£0.50	0.8	£12.31
Panel of the Committee of the Licensing Authority	12	752	48	£18.65	4.8	£73.85
Performance Monitoring Panel	4	218	12	£4.05	1.2	£18.46
Planning	11	640	55	£19.84	5.5	£84.62
Policy Development Panel	5	228	15	£4.24	1.5	£23.08
South East Lincolnshire JSP Committee	4	204	0	£0.00	0	£0.00
Spalding Town Forum	4	28	0	£0.00	0	£0.00
Standards Panel	2	8	8	£0.20	0.8	£12.31
Strategy Board	7	368	28	£9.13	2.8	£43.08
Totals	87	6030	327	£153.43	32.70	£503.08

A1.3 Clerk (e.g. spare copies for Members):

Committee	Total Committee Meetings	Total Pages per Committee	Clerks			
			Total Agendas Printed	Cost Consumables	Estimated Officer Hours per Year	Estimated Officer Cost per Year
Cabinet	7	730	35	£22.63	3.50	£53.85
Committee of the Licensing Authority	4	184	16	£4.56	1.60	£24.62
Full Council	9	1392	45	£43.15	4.50	£69.23
Governance and Audit	7	830	28	£20.58	2.80	£43.08
Joint PMP/PDP	5	402	20	£9.97	2.00	£30.77
Licensing Committee	4	26	16	£0.64	1.60	£24.62
Licensing Panel	2	20	10	£0.62	1.00	£15.38
Panel of the Committee of the Licensing Authority	12	752	60	£23.31	6.00	£92.31
Performance Monitoring Panel	4	218	16	£5.41	1.60	£24.62
Planning	11	640	55	£19.84	5.50	£84.62
Policy Development Panel	5	228	20	£5.65	2.00	£30.77
South East Lincolnshire JSP Committee	4	204	16	£5.06	1.60	£24.62
Spalding Town Forum	4	28	20	£0.87	2.00	£30.77
Standards Panel	2	8	8	£0.20	0.80	£12.31
Strategy Board	7	368	28	£9.13	2.80	£43.08
Totals	87	6030	393	£171.63	39.30	£604.62

A1.4 Statutory/External:

Committee	Total Committee Meetings	Total Pages per Committee	Statutory / External			
			Total Agendas Printed	Cost Consumables	Estimated Officer Hours per Year	Estimated Officer Cost per Year
Cabinet	7	730	28	£18.10	2.8	£43.08
Committee of the Licensing Authority	4	184	16	£4.56	1.6	£24.62
Full Council	9	1392	36	£34.52	3.6	£55.38
Governance and Audit	7	830	28	£20.58	2.8	£43.08
Joint PMP/PDP	5	402	20	£9.97	2	£30.77
Licensing Committee	4	26	16	£0.64	1.6	£24.62
Licensing Panel	2	20	14	£0.87	1.4	£21.54
Panel of the Committee of the Licensing Authority	12	752	120	£46.62	12	£184.62
Performance Monitoring Panel	4	218	16	£5.41	1.6	£24.62
Planning	11	640	44	£15.87	4.4	£67.69
Policy Development Panel	5	228	20	£5.65	2	£30.77
South East Lincolnshire JSP Committee	4	204	16	£5.06	1.6	£24.62
Spalding Town Forum	4	28	16	£0.69	1.6	£24.62
Standards Panel	2	8	8	£0.20	0.8	£12.31
Strategy Board	7	368	14	£4.56	1.4	£21.54
Totals	87	6030	412	£173.33	41.2	£633.85

A1.5 Summary:

Committee	Total Committee Meetings	Total Pages per Committee	Summary						Total Cost
			Total Agendas Printed	Total Agenda Pages Printed (per Committee)	Total Consumables Cost for Year (per Committee)	Estimated Officer Hours per Year	Estimated Officer Cost per Year	Estimated Postage Cost	
Cabinet	7	730	196	730	£126.73	19.60	£301.54	£72.16	£520.03
Committee of the Licensing Authority	4	184	112	184	£31.94	11.20	£172.31	£41.40	£256.85
Full Council	9	1392	468	1392	£448.78	46.80	£720.00	£377.46	£1,593.04
Governance and Audit	7	830	119	830	£87.48	11.90	£183.08	£41.84	£324.30
Joint PMP/PDP	5	402	175	402	£87.23	17.50	£269.23	£129.15	£503.11
Licensing Committee	4	26	112	26	£4.51	11.20	£172.31	£31.60	£219.62
Licensing Panel	2	20	38	20	£2.36	3.80	£58.46	£4.74	£69.36
Panel of the Committee of the Licensing Authority	12	752	264	752	£102.57	26.40	£406.15	£41.46	£576.59
Performance Monitoring Panel	4	218	104	218	£35.14	10.40	£160.00	£57.20	£262.74
Planning	11	640	561	640	£202.37	56.10	£863.08	£388.80	£1,510.34
Policy Development Panel	5	228	135	228	£38.17	13.50	£207.69	£72.66	£332.02
South East Lincolnshire JSP Committee	4	204	56	204	£17.71	5.60	£86.15	£20.70	£130.16
Spalding Town Forum	4	28	80	28	£3.47	8.00	£123.08	£18.96	£153.51
Standards Panel	2	8	36	8	£0.89	3.60	£55.38	£6.32	£66.20
Strategy Board	7	368	147	368	£47.91	14.70	£226.15	£82.39	£371.16
Totals	87	6030	2603	6030	£1,237.27	260.30	£4,004.62	£1,386.84	£6,889.03

A2 Summary of agenda distribution:

Committee	Members	Posted	Officers	Clerk	Access to Info files	Reception	Agenda - notice board	External	Total
Cabinet	15	8	4	5	2	1	1	0	28
Committee of the Licensing Authority	15	10	5	4	2	1	1	0	28
Full Council	37	27	6	5	2	1	1	0	52
Governance and Audit	6	4	3	4	2	1	1	0	17
Joint PMP/PDP	25	21	2	4	2	1	1	0	35
Licensing Committee	15	10	5	4	2	1	1	0	28
Licensing Panel	3	3	4	5	2	1	1	3	19
Panel of the Committee of the Licensing Authority	3	3	4	5	2	1	1	6	22
Performance Monitoring Panel	15	13	3	4	2	1	1	0	26
Planning	37	32	5	5	2	1	1	0	51
Policy Development Panel	16	14	3	4	2	1	1	0	27
South East Lincolnshire JSP Committee	6	5	0	4	2	1	1	0	14
Spalding Town Forum	11	6	0	5	2	1	1	0	20
Standards Panel	6	4	4	4	2	1	1	0	18
Strategy Board	11	11	4	4	2	0	0	0	21
	221	171	52	66	30	14	14	9	406

A3 Member Survey Comments.

<p>iPad screen viewing of an agenda with more than 30 pages is not acceptable to me. I always make notes on paper agendas and will continue to do so.</p>
<p>I believe all agendas should be put into the members draw in the members room and not posted.</p>
<p>If we progress towards the electronic route, the main committee rooms and chamber should have fixed projectors installed in each location. Using a projector as part of the running of a meeting should become commonplace. For the planning agenda to progress down the electronic route, the agenda sheet needs to have the address details shown in addition to the planning system reference. iPad screens whilst small are suitable for reading agendas that are predominantly text, but for reports that contain graphical style reports or budget information I find that difficult. When members devices are refreshed larger screens should be considered.</p>
<p>Occasionally it is good to see the view bigger, such as for plans, but these could be printed out individually if necessary.</p>
<p>Get on with it. people will adapt quickly if have to. Some people will moan. They did when we stopped using quill, chalk & slates.</p>
<p>There is a need to ensure Members do not become less informed due to the transition.</p>
<p>2nd class postage would require the officers to prepare the agendas in a timely fashion. Stopped using mod.com unable to recall passwords etc.</p>
<p>The questions are somewhat leading therefore aimed just at providing the answers required by the task group rather than the actual true opinion at times - and disregards the methods that residents may opt for as a preference of postage Re the agendas being sent 2nd class- sometimes there is barely enough time for the agendas to be read at the moment as sometimes late receiving them</p>
<p>Whereas I fully support the access to agendas via mod.gov, there will always be times when hard copy of complicated documents will be necessary. Consideration should be given to an individual call off in such cases.</p>

Training and encouragement should be considered to the printing facility in the members' room to support this view to reduce officer time in such cases.

Some supplements and Appendices to Agendas can be difficult to view electronically, due to the orientation of the layout, so may have to be issued separately (in Member's drawer), for large agendas such as Full Council and Governance & Audit.

Planning agendas for ward members not on committee should ONLY cover those particular applications. I agreed to collect my agenda even though I am one of the remotest members.

Some questions are too black and white, as no doubt was the intention. For casual glancing through an agenda, an iPad is ideal, especially if you are not a member of that particular committee, panel. However, I remain concerned that the slant of these particular questions, is the start of a process that could lead to the removal of paper copies of every agenda. In respect of planning and licensing, and especially planning, I can see no opportunity to make members comfortable with an iPad based agenda being used to make what can often be very important decisions with far reaching implications. These decisions have an impact well beyond the bounds of the council and in many cases, are impossible to reverse. As a minimum, within the chamber, the viewing medium would have to be much improved and offer the committee members the opportunity to easily view more than one page at a time, something not suited to an iPad screen. Images projected as part of the presentation are currently poor and these too would need to be vastly improved, with easy access to the online background paperwork potentially needed. All these requirements would need to be balanced against the projected savings in printing and postage. My concerns are similar when it comes to the cabinet agendas in respect of cabinet members and their decision making responsibilities. There is certainly scope for the immediate introduction of a hybrid system, whereby elements of any agenda are only made available electronically. Far too many annexes and supplementary pages are included with core reports as background papers, often unnecessarily in paper form, even if they do have to be titled and referenced. The most recent full council agenda is a perfect example of this, with its referred from cabinet report about a municipal bonds agency. 9+ cabinet agendas, became 37+ full council agendas, with a report containing an annex of 60+ pages. I think you get my point mini rant over ;-)

A4 Officer Survey Comments.

<p>I tend to use Mod.Gov to submit reports rather than to view them routinely. I normally only print for internal meetings where I need to make notes as it's sometimes hard to keep up trying to make notes on the laptop, although I'm getting better at this.</p>
<p>Need to understand how you would view large excel documents etc.</p>
<p>My view is that, so long as the kit works properly and agenda papers are also projected, we should go all electronic. I have indicate that we should not send agendas second class and should not stop printing spares. this is because, if some members really cannot get on with electronic versions, then we should not disadvantage them by slowing down the delivery - and we should have a very small number of spare hard copies - say 3.</p>
<p>If we are to encourage residents (and members) to move to digital means we need to be leading by example. The money saved by the reduction in paper and postage should be reinvested in better AV equipment to allow all meetings to be paperless.</p>
<p>Officers other than EMT members who have I-pads are not provided the tools to access committee reports electronically. Democratic services need to significantly improve the training they provide on mod.gov.</p>
<p>I no longer print agendas or papers for meetings. I take my laptop to all meetings and use MS OneNote to record all my notes. I find this to be extremely useful and haven't used a paper notebook for meetings since.</p>
<p>Frequent drop-outs and intermittent Wi-Fi access within the building and also in external venue is only mitigated through taking paper copy. Until this is improved it is very difficult to ditch the paper! Reliability of surface pro and small screen size do not help when staring down at such a device for a long period during a meeting.</p>
<p>Inability to make own notes on electronic agenda papers is severely limiting. An appropriate device would be hugely beneficial.</p>
<p>People's individual needs from an equalities perspective should be considered rather than a blanket ban.</p>

