Appendix - Potential Options for the constitution of the Committee

| No. | OPTIONS | PROS | CONS | ADDITIONAL COMMENTS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | No change to the current Committee | - A majority of the Committee is already constituted by members of the majority political group on the Council <br> - Only Council members can vote, so the Council has the majority/only vote <br> - The Committee already has employer and member representation, which fulfils one of the recommendations of the Good Governance Review | - It does not address the request that has been made for non- voting members of the Committee to have a vote <br> - It does not address the current constitution of the Committee, which has some inconsistencies due to partly being formed from two former sub-committees <br> - It would possibly be a missed opportunity - the Committee could be re-designed so that it is more fit for purpose and takes account of the recommendations set out in the Good Governance Review | - This is the most straight forward option |
| 2 | Give the current non- voting members the right to vote | - This addresses the request that has been made for non-voting members of the Committee to have a vote <br> - This addresses the recommendation in the Good Governance Review to have employer and member representatives but goes further than is strictly necessary as the Review does not state that such representatives should have voting rights | - A majority of the Committee would no longer be constituted by members of the majority political group on the Council <br> - The Council would no longer have the majority vote on the Committee <br> - It would make the Committee unwieldy in terms of decision making <br> - It does not address the current inconsistencies in terms of employer and member representation on the Committee | - This option is potentially unworkable <br> - An additional 10 members of the majority political group on the Council would be required, taking the total number of voting members to 31 |


| No. | OPTIONS | PROS | CONS | ADDITIONAL COMMENTS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | Remove all of the nonvoting members from the Committee and set up separate employer and member committees and forums to obtain input | - A majority of the Committee would be constituted by members of the majority political group on the Council <br> - The Council would retain the majority/only vote on the Committee <br> - It maintains a decision-making committee that is not too big or unwieldy | - It does not directly address the recommendation in the Good Governance Review to have employer and member representatives on such committees, however this would be addressed in part by setting up separate employer and member committees/forums | - There will be a staff resource issue to this option which needs to be factored in <br> - Without additional staff, there is currently no capacity to manage additional committee work |
| 4 | Reduce the overall number of members on the Committee and give all members a vote. This could be done in a variety of ways but one approach to membership of the Committee could be: <br> - 5 Council members from the majority political group <br> - 2 other Council members <br> - 1 employer representative <br> - 1 member/trade union representative | - This addresses the request that has been made for non-voting members of the Committee to have a vote <br> This addresses the recommendation in the Good Governance Review to have employer and member representatives but goes further than is strictly necessary as the Review does not state that such representatives should have voting rights <br> - A majority of the Committee would be constituted by members of the majority political group on the Council <br> - The Council would retain the majority vote on the Committee <br> - It maintains a decision-making committee that is not too big or unwieldy | - This is a more wholesale change to the Committee, but does provide an opportunity to re- design the Committee so that it is more fit for purpose and takes account of the recommendations set out in the Good Governance Review | - This reduces the current Council members from opposition parties to 2 , which may raise concerns <br> As an alternative the current Council membership of 11 voting members could be retained with the addition of 1 employer representative and 1 member/trade union representative, giving a total of 13 voting members <br> - Reducing the current 10 non-voting members to 2 voting members may not address the concerns that have been raised by the non-voting members. Such a significant reduction, albeit in return for voting rights, may result in increased concerns |


| No. | OPTIONS | PROS | CONS | ADDITIONAL COMMENTS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 | Increase the size of the current Committee \& give some of the non-voting members the right to vote | - This addresses the request that has been made for non-voting members of the Committee to have a vote <br> - This addresses the recommendation in the Good Governance Review to have employer and member representatives but goes further than is strictly necessary as the Review does not state that such representatives should have voting rights <br> - A majority of the Committee would be constituted by members of the majority political group on the Council <br> - The Council would retain the majority vote on the Committee | - It could make the Committee unwieldy in terms of decision making with a total of 15 voting members and 8 non-voting members <br> - It creates a division between current non-voting members, giving some of them voting rights but others would have none | One approach could be as follows: <br> - Add an additional 2 voting members from the majority political group on the Council, taking the total to 8 <br> - Give voting rights to one of the existing employer representatives and 1 of the existing member/trade union representatives, which gives 7 other voting members in total |

