

Appendix A - Category A Outline Business Cases

Reference	Department	Service area	Title	Equality Impact Assessment Required & Undertaken
A01	ASCH&PP	Older Adults	Living at Home Phase II	Yes
A02	ASCH&PP	Older Adults	Dementia Quality Mark	Yes
A03	ASCH&PP	Younger Adults Commissioning	Use of Public Health funding	No
A04	ASCH&PP	Younger Adults Commissioning	Development of reablement in Physical Disability services	No
A05	ASCH&PP	Joint Commissioning, Quality & Business Change	Reduction in staff posts in the Joint Commissioning Unit	Yes
A06	ASCH&PP	Joint Commissioning, Quality & Business Change	Reduction in staff posts in the Performance Improvement Team	Yes
A07	ASCH&PP	Joint Commissioning, Quality & Business Change	Major redesign and restructure of business support function	Yes
A08	ASCH&PP	Joint Commissioning, Quality & Business Change	Reduction in staffing in the Framework Development Team	Yes
A09	ASCH&PP	Joint Commissioning, Quality & Business Change	Restructure of Adult Care Financial Services (ACFS) and a reduction in posts	Yes
A10	ASCH&PP	Promoting Independence & Public Protection	Reduction in Emergency Planning staffing	Yes
A11	ASCH&PP	Promoting Independence & Public Protection	Registration Service Income Generation	No
A12	ASCH&PP	Horizontal	Group Manager Restructure	Yes
A13	CFCS	Support to Schools Service	Support to Schools	Yes
A14	CFCS	SEND Policy and Provision	SEND Hub	Yes
A15	CFCS	Business Support	Business Support Service	Yes
A16	CFCS	School Access	School Access	Yes
A17	CFCS	Targeted Support & Youth Justice	Targeted Support and Youth Justice	Yes
A18	CFCS	Children's Social Care	Children's Social Care Management Review	No

A19	CFCS	Planning, Perf & Quality Assurance	Planning, Performance and Quality Assurance Group	No
A20	CFCS	Department wide	CFCS Management Structure Review	No
A21	E&R	HR and Customer Services - Business Support Centre	Restructure, efficiencies and cost reductions in the Business Support Centre	No
A22	E&R	HR and Customer Services - Operational and Strategic HR	Review Human Resources activity & support - increased self service	No
A23	E&R	HR and Customer Services - Health and Safety	Review Health & Safety service - income generation and sharing of services	No
A24	E&R	HR and Customer Services - Job Evaluation and Organisation Design	Deletion of Senior Analyst post - Job Evaluation	No
A25	E&R	HR and Customer Services - Occupational Health and Wellbeing Service	Cease counselling service and signpost employees to alternative providers	No
A26	E&R	HR and Customer Services - Workforce and Organisational Development team	Review of integrated Learning & Development activity - to further streamline structures; commission more training externally and with others	No
A27	E&R	Review & transfer of services to Customer Service Centre	Customer Service Centre - efficiencies and shift to more cost effective access channels	No
A28	E&R	Efficiency savings & shared services at the Customer Service Centre	Customer Service Centre - generation of additional income and sharing of services with other public sector providers	No
A29	E&R	Review of face to face service provision	Review of face to face customer service provision across the county	No
A30	E&R	Transport Property & Environment - Catering & Facilities Management	Reduction in County Offices Maintenance	No
A31	E&R	Transport Property & Environment - Property	Reduction in Property Staffing	No

A32	E&R	Transport Property & Environment - Property	Rationalisation and staffing reductions	No
A33	E&R	Transport Property & Environment - Property	Reduction in Planned Maintenance Budget	No
A34	E&R	Highways	Highways Contract savings	No
A35	E&R	Highways	Increased efficiency by Highways Operations Group	No
A36	E&R	Highways	Efficiencies through more effective pothole repair & patching service	No
A37	E&R	Highways	Reduce contribution to Highways Safety Shared Service	No
A38	E&R	Highways	Shared Service for Central Processing Unit	No
A39	E&R	Highways	Renegotiation of contribution to the Urban Traffic Control Shared Service	No
A40	E&R	Highways	Removal of Robin Hood Line subsidy	No
A41	E&R	Highways	Reduce Street Lighting Energy Costs	Yes
A42	E&R	Highways	Increased Highways Income from additional housing development activity	No
A43	E&R	Highways	Increased income from various service areas	No
A44	E&R	Highways	Increased income from providing services to neighbouring local authorities	No
A45	E&R	Highways - Safety, Signals and Lighting	Restructuring - staff reductions	No
A46	E&R	Highways - Programme Design and Delivery	Restructuring - staff reductions	No
A47	E&R	Highways - Planning, Access and Commissioning Group	Restructuring - staff reductions	No
A48	E&R	Highways - Highways Management	Restructuring - staff reductions	No
A49	E&R	Finance & Procurement	Finance & Procurement Staffing Reductions	No
A50	E&R	ICT Services	Contract Savings	No

A51	E&R	ICT Services	Savings in provision of online @home service	No
A52	E&R	ICT Services	Termination of licence agreement	No
A53	E&R	ICT Services	Reduction in provision of ICT equipment replacement	No
A54	E&R	Business Support and Development	Staffing reductions in the Business Support and Development team	No
A55	E&R	Transport Property & Environment - Transport & Travel Services	Staffing Reductions in Transport & Travel Services	No
A56	E&R	Highways	Establishment of fund for replacing worn out integrated transport measures	Yes
A57	E&R	Highways	Reduction of discretionary spend	No
A58	E&R	Highways	Use of financial contributions (Commuted Sums) from developers	No
A59	E&R	Highways	Gully cleaning	No
A60	PPCS	Conservation	Restructuring - staff reductions	No
A61	PPCS	Legal Services	Redesign staffing structure	No
A62	PPCS	Democratic Services	Cease holding of Member Forum meetings.	No
A63	PPCS	Democratic Services	Reorganise Civic Office support staff and reconfigure support activities.	No
A64	PPCS	Democratic Services	To provide governance & democratic support service to the PCP and PCC.	No
A65	PPCS	Democratic Services	To move to partial electronic only provision of committee papers.	No
A66	PPCS	Complaints & Information	Streamline corporate complaints	No
A67	PPCS	Office of the Chief Exec	Redesign staffing structure	No
A68	PPCS	Policy, Performance & Research	Redesign staffing structure	No
A69	PPCS	Comms & Marketing	Refocus communications and marketing activity	No
A70	PPCS	Comms & Marketing	Alternative delivery of translation and interpretation services.	Yes
A71	PPCS	Comms & Marketing	Income generation	No
A72	PPCS	Departmental Management	Review PPCS management structure	No

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A01

1 SERVICE AREA

Older Adults - Residential Care

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

This proposal is to increase the target currently in place for the Living At Home (LAH) programme to reduce the number of Older Adults living in long term care who are financially supported by the County Council.

There is a current programme of work already in place to assist people to live as independently as possible at home called the "Living at Home Programme." To deliver on this programme of work we will need to financially support fewer people in long term care in the future. As a Council we currently support more people in long term care than similar Councils. This proposal seeks to divert more people away from long term care over the next 3 years. This will result in an additional saving of £952k by 2016/17.

Proposal previously agreed – no further consultation necessary.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC) currently admits a higher proportion of older people into residential care homes than its comparator authorities, and earlier; the national average age on admission is 86 years, compared to 83 years in Nottinghamshire. The Living at Home (LAH) Programme will enable older people to live within their own home environment safely for longer, with the help of a range of flexible care support services.

The LAH Programme consists of 6 projects:

- 1.Extra care housing - the intention is to develop, in partnership, 4-6 Extra Care Housing facilities, providing the Council with up to 160 nomination rights for people who would be at risk of being admitted into long term care.
- 2.Partnerships with Health - exploring ways of integrating services with Health.
- 3.Assistive Technology - utilising different types of technology to support people to live at home.
- 4.Care and Support Centres - utilising existing buildings and staff to provide more specialist short term support for people.
- 5.Re-ablement - maximising our use of reablement services to promote independence.
- 6.Looking at how we manage admissions into care, and how we can divert people away as appropriate; improving our crisis management services and our admissions panels.

All of these projects will test and further develop a range of support services to offer greater choice and control to older people. It will also change culture within (and also external to) the Authority, in order to enable older people to live within their own home environment safely for longer, by:

- maximising older people's independence;
- enabling them to take risks and choose from a menu of flexible support services that can be tailored to their needs.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

71,124

NET
£000

41,850

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	0	2268	1,622	3,890
LESS Loss of Income	0	-837	-599	-1,436
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	-876	-627	-1,503
NET SAVING	0	555	397	952

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET? 2.3%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

0.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

0.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

Dedicated project management, project officer and business support would be required, as secured as part of the existing Living at Home Programme (currently approved until March 14).

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

Service users and their carers may be expected to accept a higher level of risk, as the price for being supported in their own home.

Carers and relatives may have additional responsibilities for caring.

Service Users will have greater choice about whether they stay at home or not. People will retain their independence for longer, should they remain in the local community.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

This would impact on a reduction in demand for the providers of long term care.

It would also lead to a potential increase in the need for community based care and support services.

Health services and the Voluntary sector may experience an increase in demand for services.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

A further reduction in residential placements would add demand pressure to services delivered in the home, e.g. START services. However, a separate proposal seeks to target START services on people who are likely to be eligible for on-going social care services without undergoing a period of reablement.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

Service users affected by this proposal are older adults living at home and their carers. A refreshed equality impact assessment has been developed on the current Living at Home Programme, and this has informed development of the Equality Impact Assessment that has been undertaken on this new savings proposal.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

The existing programme already has a populated risk log.

The existing programme already has a challenging target and there is a risk that the targeted reduction may not be achievable given the increase in service users whose needs can only be met within a residential setting.

Other Authorities who have achieved similar reductions in their population in long term care have taken 6-7 years to achieve this.

A reduction in the number of service users requiring long term care placements could lead to the closure of some care homes, due to their loss of income impacting upon their viability. Mitigation - Market Development to work with providers to develop alternative models of care e.g. short term care.

The use of assessment beds in residential care homes may help relieve pressure on hospitals, but could lead to a higher number of people entering long term care as residents often become long term residents once they enter care homes on a temporary basis. Mitigation - continually review the outcomes resulting from transfer to assessment beds and admissions into long term care and explore the use of alternative facilities from assessment beds e.g. Extra Care housing

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A02**1 SERVICE AREA**

Older Persons - Dementia Quality Mark

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

As part of the review completed during 2012 of the local 'Fair Price for Care' fee framework and fee levels for older persons' care homes, the Council consulted on the proposal to introduce a Dementia Quality Mark.

Previously, all older persons' care homes that provide care for people with dementia were allocated an enhanced payment for dementia on the basis that high quality dementia care requires higher staffing levels and a consistent and well-trained staff group. However, it is evident through the annual quality audit process that many of these homes are not providing high quality dementia care.

It was proposed that the dementia premium payment would only be awarded to those care homes which are successful in achieving the Dementia Quality Mark. Additionally, the criteria for allocating the dementia premium payment for individuals is to be tightened so that the payment is only allocated for those residents where dementia is the primary reason for them requiring a care home placement.

Proposal previously agreed – no further consultation necessary.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The dementia premium payment to date has been paid to all those care homes providing dementia care to residents assessed as needing that dementia care, irrespective of the quality of the dementia care received.

The rationale behind this proposal is that the premium payment should only be paid where it can be evidenced that the dementia service being provided is of high quality.

In addition, since the introduction of enhanced dementia payment, the threshold for the diagnosis of dementia has reduced, i.e. people are being diagnosed earlier and are therefore not requiring as much additional support as someone with more complex behaviours.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

2,155

NET
£000

2,155

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	563	0	0	563
LESS Loss of Income	-63	0	0	-63
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	500	0	0	500

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

23.2%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

N/A

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

N/A

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

This proposal will incur initial one-off costs of approx. £45k to secure the services of an independent organisation to complete the Dementia Quality Mark audit of all the care homes that want to apply for the dementia premium payment.

Future auditing will need to be undertaken within the Market Development and Care Standards Team and will be contained within current resources/budgets.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

This proposal will impact across all areas of Nottinghamshire.

The main group affected will be older people in residential and nursing care homes.

The purpose of this initiative is to ensure that service users who have dementia are being provided with high quality services and that their dementia care needs are being met appropriately. The initiative should provide a financial incentive to care home providers to improve the quality of the care they receive.

The impact of the proposal on service users has been considered in the Equality Impact Assessment undertaken to accompany this outline business case.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Some care home providers will no longer receive a premium payment for residential and nursing care placements for people with dementia. It is possible that some care home providers may challenge the Council if they are not successful in obtaining the dementia quality mark.

Some packages of care may be jointly funded with Health. Additionally, their 'Any Willing Provider' fee rates are currently at the Council's fee rates. Any reductions in our rates may benefit Health partners. However, they may also be subject to challenge by some providers.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

N/A.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

The main group affected by this proposal will be older people with dementia in residential and nursing care homes. The proposal should bring some positive impacts to service users, as it will require providers to be suitably qualified to deliver services to them, and provide a higher quality service to meet their dementia specific care and support needs.

However, as some providers will not receive the premium or enhanced dementia payment, this may result in them experiencing financial pressures. If subsequently a provider takes the decision that it is no longer financial viable to deliver the service, then the service would have to be re-commissioned to another provider, which will impact directly on the service user.

The Equality Impact Assessment on this proposal considers its potential impact on service users and protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Providers were consulted on the proposal to introduce the Dementia Quality Mark as part of the extensive 'Fair Price for Care' consultations undertaken during 2012. They have also been notified in writing of the initiative prior to it being implemented during the first half of 2013/14. The enhanced payment will be allocated to those care homes that are successful in achieving the Dementia Quality Mark and it will be backdated to the start of April 2013.

The fee increase applied to all older persons' care homes in April 2013 means that all providers will have received a fee uplift. However, the increase will be marginal for those care homes that were previously receiving the dementia premium payment but that are not successful in achieving the Dementia Quality Mark. There is a risk that some homes, primarily homes in Band 1, will not be able to sustain their services because of financial viability, and this could result in the closure of some of the homes. The Council has clear plans and processes in place in the event of home closures, and will work with health partners and providers to ensure that if a home is to close, then the residents are moved to suitable alternative care homes.

If a home is not successful in obtaining the DQM, then the home may request that the service user be moved to a DQM assessed home, as they may have challenging behaviour. There may be complaints where service users with dementia are in homes that are not assessed as meeting the DQM criteria. This may also require staff time, in the transition between homes. To mitigation against this, the Council will work with the successful providers to support them to improve the quality of their dementia care services.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A03**1 SERVICE AREA**

Younger Adults residential rehabilitation services for substance misuse

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

From April 2013 Public Health teams formerly responsible to Nottinghamshire County Primary Care Trust (PCT) and Bassetlaw PCT transferred into the Local Authority. Commissioning of health services within Nottinghamshire County and Bassetlaw PCTs devolved to the NHS Commissioning Board (NHSCB) and Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs), and all PCTs were disbanded.

As part of this transition, Nottinghamshire County Council took on full responsibility for commissioning various Public Health initiatives, including Drug and Alcohol, Sexual Health and Social Intervention Services, amongst others. This transfer of Public Health functions included the transfer of £30 million of Public Health funding.

Discussions have taken place between Public Health and Adult Social Care, Health and Public Protection staff on joint priorities, joint tendering arrangements and pooling of funding in order to maximise its impact on service users.

One outcome of such discussions is the shared priorities of the substance misuse work that is commissioned by the Department's Mental Health service, leading to an offer by Public Health to contribute £200k annually towards the cost of delivering substance mis-use residential rehabilitation provision.

This proposal therefore seeks to utilise this funding, releasing Younger Adults funding.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

Optimising use of additional funding sources such as this by working in partnership with other organisations ensures that the costs of care are reflected in proportionate contributions from the Authority and other agencies.

It also results in improved alignment of priorities and funding with partner agencies towards joint outcomes, thereby increasing its effectiveness.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

294

NET
£000

294

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	200	0	0	200
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	200	0	0	200

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

68.0%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

N/A

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

N/A

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)
None.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

The proposal will apply across the whole of Nottinghamshire.

There will be no direct impact on service users. The procurement of residential rehabilitation services is included within the current tender for the commissioning of substance misuse services.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Integrating the commissioning and delivery of all substance misuse services within a single framework will improve the pathway for services and simplify processes for providers.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

No impact foreseen.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

As above, there will be no direct impact on service users and no disproportionate, adverse or negative impact on them.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

There are no risks for the county council in relation to this option.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A04

1 SERVICE AREA

Physical Disability and Asperger's - Reablement

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

This proposal seeks to further develop the work of Promoting Independence Workers in Younger Adults Commissioning Teams to deliver re-ablement support to individuals with newly acquired physical disabilities and long-term health conditions.

This will complement a separate savings proposal (reducing demand in Younger Adults). In tandem, the desired outcomes are to:

- Reduce the number of people requiring on-going social care support.
- Ensure that all people who use social care funded services are eligible for support at the level required and only receive support for as long as is required.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

In 2012, 16 FTE Promoting Independence Workers (PIWs) transferred from Physical Disability Day Services to Younger Adult commissioning teams. The PIWs provide re-ablement services to: individuals with newly acquired physical disabilities; those with long-term conditions such as Multiple Sclerosis, Muscular Dystrophy, and other chronic conditions, which often present high usage (and therefore cost) of health and social care provision with numerous admissions and re-admissions to hospital and community facilities; and those with Asperger's.

The aim is to enhance people's independence through provision of short-term interventions, focussing on developing confidence, making links with mainstream community services and assisting people to access education and employment. Ultimately, this aims to prevent or reduce longer-term support needs in future.

During 2012/13, the service focussed on existing service users, to review care packages and improve people's quality of life, with a view to reducing care packages for existing service users and more efficient use of resources. This year (2013/14), the focus has shifted to interventions to manage new demands coming into the service, leading to new service users either needing no or reduced care packages.

Whilst the service has assisted over 200 individuals with improved outcomes and has delivered some cashable benefits, in the majority of cases interventions have led to cost-avoidance or non-cashable savings.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

64,159

NET
£000

54,718

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	150	150	0	300
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	150	150	0	300

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

0.5%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

0.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

0.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

The posts are currently funded on a temporary basis with the intention that the cost of the posts can be offset by reductions in demand on commissioning budgets in addition to the required level of saving.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

The re-ablement services support service users with new physical disabilities, long-term conditions and Asperger's, who benefit from short-term intensive support, early intervention and prevention services, alongside similar interventions that are delivered to Older Adults. This brings the following benefits to them:

- Help with maximising their function and independence, usually after a period of illness or loss of confidence.
- Assisting some people to retain or regain skills, thereby helping them to 'do things for themselves' rather than 'having things done for them'.
- Improved outcomes in respect of employment, accommodation, relationships, thereby increasing their participation in society and their contribution to their communities.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

N/A

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

There is limited overlap with the work of the START team, which provides very short-term re-ablement support to Older and Younger Adults, in that some individuals who are on the START programme may subsequently be referred to the Physical Disability (PD) Reablement service. The review of the end to end reablement pathway in PD will identify if any improvements can be made to the interface with the START programme.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

There should be no direct impact on service users and so no disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics is anticipated.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Risk; The majority of the reablement work to date has delivered cost-avoidance or non-cashable savings on existing cases known to the teams. Unless the focus of the team changes, there is a risk that the PIWs will not be used as intended and savings won't be achieved. **Mitigation;** focussing of the roles of the PIWs on meeting priority outcomes in a timely fashion, managing new demands coming into the service, leading to new service users either needing no or reduced care packages.

Risk; the reablement intervention may result in a need for long term services to be commissioned, and / or result in packages of care (and thus costs) increasing. **Mitigation;** However, this is unlikely to be as a consequence of the PIW intervention, but rather that the intervention has identified and clarified a long-term and / or increased need.

Risk; The cost of the PIW posts will not be offset by reductions in demand. **Mitigation;** The PIW posts are currently funded on a temporary basis. If the expected reduction in demand on commissioning budgets cannot be achieved, then the posts will have to be disestablished.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A05**1 SERVICE AREA**

Adult Social Care, Public Protection and Health, Joint Commissioning, Quality and Business Change, Joint Commissioning Unit Staffing

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To realise £183k savings from staffing reductions of 4.5 FTE posts in the Joint Commissioning Unit (JCU).

ASCH&PP commissions approximately 80% of its social care and support services from independent and voluntary sector providers. It has contracts in place with over 400 independent and voluntary sector providers for a whole range of services. The JCU undertakes needs analysis, specifies, monitors and manages these contracts, working with providers to ensure value for money. The Unit also works to develop a diverse local market including for services that people can arrange and purchase themselves (through Direct Payments or as self funders).

The Market Development and Care Standards Team (MD&CST), based within JCU, completes 400 yearly quality audits on the directly contracted providers for residential/nursing care, home care, supported living, day care and housing related support. It follows up improvement actions required arising from these, signposting providers to advice and support, and also responds to approximately 300 annual referrals of concern, which either come through the Multi-Agency Safeguarding hub or direct from people, their families, and staff from a range of agencies.

Post reductions proposed: 0.5 FTE Commissioning Manager , 2 FTE Commissioning Officer/Market Development posts; and 2 FTE Quality Development Officers.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

Consideration has been given to reducing the JCU staffing by 30%. This would equate to reductions of 10.5FTE. This, however, has been reviewed in light of the emphasis in the Care Bill on the need for Local Authorities to work jointly with partners to strengthen arrangements to address issues of care standards, value for money, quality and failing providers, as well as developing local markets. The Bill will formalise these responsibilities into statutory Local Authority duties to:

- promote the diversity and quality of local services, so that there is a range of high quality providers in all areas allowing people to make the best choice to satisfy their own needs and preferences; and
- co-operate with other local organisations, work to integrate services to promote well-being, and improve quality and outcomes.

As the majority of the JCU staff are within the Market Development and Care Standards Team, a 30% level of reduction would have a high impact on capacity to undertake this work and, for example, would mean that the quality audits currently undertaken on providers annually would need to be reduced and completed every two years.

A project is underway to streamline and reduce the time required to undertake quality audits. However, as more contracts are established within the independent sector, the number of quality audits required and referrals are rising. In addition, a number of posts with short-term funding, such as the Micro Market Development co-ordinator role, the Choose My Support web based directory implementation post, and Think Local Act Personal Commissioning Officers are due to end in Mar 14, and this work is planned to be mainstreamed and absorbed into the unit, without any additional staffing capacity.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

1,895

NET
£000

1,871

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	34	0	149	183
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	34	0	149	183

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

9.8%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

33.9

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

4.5

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)
No

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

There is the potential for a reduction in monitoring, and more time may be required to follow up concerns raised about providers.

Reduction in capacity/posts that support user engagement will reduce opportunities for service users to input to evaluating existing and shaping future services.

Reduction in capacity/posts that deliver person centred planning training is likely to impact on the quality of assessment, support planning and communication with service users across the department.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Providers - reduced access to support and advice to improve their services.

- reduced access to information and facilitation to develop local markets.

Health & Care Quality Commission - reduction in number of quality audits and monitoring may impact and require amendment of their aligned monitoring processes.

Partnerships/Health and Wellbeing Board - reduction in capacity to engage in partnerships and projects could lead to missed opportunities for integration that could potentially benefit all partners by commissioning joint streamlined services, with improved outcomes at reduced costs.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Operational teams - the Market Development and Care Standards Team has a key role in providing information to, and following up, safeguarding investigations. Reduced capacity to do this may impact on operational teams.

Corporate Procurement - reduced capacity to evaluate, review and specify new services, as well as develop the local market may impact on work schedule.

Public Health - reduced capacity to undertake needs analysis work may impact on Joint Strategic Needs Analysis work plan led by Public Health.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

This proposal involves internal staffing changes. Any potential disproportionate, adverse or negative impact on staff has been considered as part of the Equality Impact Assessment that has been undertaken on this proposal, as part of consideration of all proposals affecting staffing changes within the Department. However, at this stage it is not believed that the proposal will have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on staff with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Risk: Insufficient capacity to undertake quality audits could lead to poor quality and negative outcomes for service users. **Mitigation:** review is already underway with partners to streamline the quality audit process to take less time and align with partners' processes.

Risk: Insufficient capacity to manage contracts and relationships with providers leads to gaps in market, failure to deliver contracts and inadequate capacity of care and support services to meet local need. **Mitigation:** where possible, reduce number of providers and volume of contracts to manage. Continue to explore all options for merging multiple small similar contracts both within the Council, jointly commissioning and managing contracts with partners and establishing joint commissioning post(s). Also ensuring optimum numbers of providers are selected to deliver sufficient capacity for direct contracts, rather than maximum/any willing provider. Staff reduction is timed for the end of savings programme, due to level of work required to undertake contract reductions as part of other savings projects.

Risk: Reduction in ability to engage in partnerships, identify integrated commissioning opportunities and support Health and Wellbeing Strategy priorities. **Mitigation:** prioritisation of JCU work to be agreed by the Adult Social Care, Health & Public Protection Dept's Senior Leadership Team. Exploration of potential for jointly funded posts with partners.

Risk: Work with service users becomes less person centred due to reduced resources to support this. **Mitigation:** explore potential to raise income from charging external agencies for training in person centred planning and approaches

Risk: Relationships with partners. **Mitigation:** will need to be managed through discussion throughout the process.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A06

1 SERVICE AREA

ASCH&PP - Performance Improvement Team (PIT)

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

The Performance Improvement Team provides key management information to enable the Senior Leadership Team to make informed decisions and operational staff to manage their workload and improve performance. The team also responds to external requests for data, and completes all the statutory returns required by the Department of Health.

The Council is piloting the use of a new information reporting system 'SWIPE' as part of the Corporate Business Reporting project. The implementation of this system will reduce the amount of time taken to retrieve management information reports across the authority. Therefore, this proposal seeks to reduce the number of posts within the Performance Improvement Team from 7.85 FTE posts to 5.5 FTE posts. This would be achieved by restructuring the team. Savings would also be made against photocopying, printing and associated staffing overhead costs.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The Council is piloting the use of SWIPE as part of the Corporate Business Reporting (CBR) Project. This will improve business intelligence across the Council to aid decision making.

The implementation of SWIPE reduces the amount of time taken to retrieve management information reports. This will enable the team to focus on the analysis of information rather than the retrieval of data and will enable the delivery of efficiencies.

In addition, front line social care team managers will be able to directly access relevant management information. Whilst the remaining posts are likely to be based in the department, the expectation is that they will be managed corporately from 2014/15.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

290

NET
£000

290

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	92	0	0	92
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	92	0	0	92

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

31.6%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

7.85

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

2.35

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

The only costs will be redundancy costs for 2.35 FTE staff.

The costs for the implementation of SWIPE are being met from the Improvement Programme budget.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

Services users are all client groups served by the ASCH&PP Department. Service users should see no direct impact from these proposals.

There will be reduced capacity to monitor performance in relation to referrals, assessments and packages of care, and to focus on performance improvement. The implementation of SWIPE will help to mitigate this risk as the performance management information reports will be accessible to all operational managers. This means that managers can manage the quality of service delivery.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Emphasis will be put on the completion of statutory returns for the Department of Health rather than developing joint performance frameworks with the Health and Wellbeing Board and the integrated Commissioning Groups. There will be reduced capacity to work with partner organisations and other Councils to share and promote good practice.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

The Senior Leadership Team will receive less dedicated time from performance analysts to focus on specific service information. In addition, the level of performance reports to monthly performance boards is likely to be reduced. The reduction of the team could impact on the reputation of the Council if there is less time to focus on improved service delivery with other agencies.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

This proposal involves internal staffing changes and will not impact directly on external service users.

Any potential disproportionate, adverse or negative impact on staff will be considered as part of the Equality Impact Assessment that will be undertaken on this proposal as part of consideration of all proposals affecting staffing changes within the Department. However, at this stage it is not believed that the proposal will have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on staff with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

There may be a loss of skills and capacity within the team to monitor, review and improve service delivery within the department and in conjunction with other agencies. In addition, a single manager post managing performance across the Council will require a challenging skills set. Prioritisation of tasks for and by the department will have to be given adequate weighting, given the levels of complexity. SWIPE will need to be fully implemented and rolled out not only to the PIT Team but also to Group and Team Managers. SWIPE will also need to provide all the information to enable completion of statutory returns.

There will be an expectation that front line Social Care managers take responsibility for checking performance reports regularly and address areas of poor practice directly, rather than waiting for monthly performance reports.

The work of the team will also be prioritised to ensure that sufficient time is spent working with other agencies, particularly Health, to ensure that there are joined up ways of measuring outcomes for service users.

Early indications from the government suggests it is considering introducing a new performance assessment framework. This will place additional requirements on Councils to provide performance data and to be measured on their performance. Such activities have previously been undertaken by the Council's Performance Information Team, and resources would need to be reviewed should additional measures be introduced.

A lot of strategic and operational decisions, including those associated with the new savings options, are made based on the benchmarking and performance information provided by the team. The capacity to provide this level of information will reduce as a result of the proposed reduction to the team.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A07

1 SERVICE AREA

Adult Social Care, Health & Public Protection - Business Support

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

The Adult Social Care, Health & Public Protection (ASCH&PP) Business Support service provides support to the strategic and operational functions of the department. It is currently separate from the corporate function, although there are strategic links between the business support services of departments and joint working on a range of corporate initiatives.

This proposal seeks to make efficiency savings by undertaking a major redesign of the department's business support structure, and reducing the business support complement overall.

The proposal will be developed in conjunction with colleagues in Children, Families and Cultural Services, and will seek to maximise efficiencies from integrated working, both in localities and at County Hall.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The Department's business support function was reduced by approximately 30% in 2011, in line with corporate guidance on structures and appropriate levels of business support workers.

Other business cases propose that a number of operational and strategic services provided by ASCH&PP are changed. As a result, the business support provided to those services should be altered accordingly, particularly where the function is to be reduced or where process reviews indicate that work can be undertaken more efficiently or from different locations.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

4,172

NET
£000

4,081

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	411	400	0	811
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	411	400	0	811

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

19.9%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

181.9

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

38.7

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)
Redundancy costs will be incurred.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

Service users may be impacted by the reduced support to operational and strategic teams. This impact would fall within any area where employees are working with service users and where the changed business support provision means they are required to undertake business support tasks themselves, in addition to the operational and/or professional tasks for which they are paid and skilled.

Other, more general impacts for service users are the potential for a reduction in the quality of communication from the authority, and longer response times.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Organisations working with the authority, particularly where co-location or partnership arrangements are in place (such as for Mental Health and Intermediate Care Teams), may experience different customer service and response times. This will be a reduced service either directly from business support staff, or from the operational staff for whom workload has increased as a result of providing their own business support.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Within the department, strategic and operational service areas and senior managers will be affected by receiving a reduced level of business support - they would be required to undertake a number of administrative, systems and property duties themselves. The remaining business support service would also be less flexible to meet urgent business needs.

Examples of some of the areas where the department overall will receive less support includes duties associated with managing risk, health and safety, business continuity, emergency planning, representing services' interests in strategic property matters and maintenance, and support to the Nominated Property Officer role with its health and safety compliance responsibilities. This brings associated risks to the Department, including reputational issues arising from delays in progressing activities. Mitigating measures can be viewed in the 'risks' section below.

The departmental and corporate systems review, which will ultimately reduce the amount of time staff spend inputting and retrieving data from its business systems, will facilitate a reduction in the business support establishment. Process reviews prior to the business support service being altered will also ensure that staff time at all levels is spent as efficiently and productively as possible.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

This proposal involves internal staffing changes.

Any potential disproportionate, adverse or negative impact on staff has been considered as part of the Equality Impact Assessment undertaken on this proposal.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

A number of risks have been listed in the sections above. The department's business support function was reduced by 30% in 2011. Some savings options put forward by other services within the department will require business support staff to assist in their implementation, and could change future business support requirements, particularly in view of the requirement to ensure that more senior or operational staff are undertaking tasks which are suitable for their skills and grade. Additional administrative duties for non-business support staff could make their workload unsustainable and lead to poor staff retention and wellbeing; distract them from priority activity; and lead to higher unit costs.

If strategic or operational posts were reduced with a view to passing activities onto more appropriate levels of staffing to achieve lower unit costs, this could imply a need for further business support posts. There is therefore a risk that redundancy payments are incurred, only to have to recruit additional business support capacity in future, which could lead to challenge. To mitigate these risks as far as possible, changes to the business support establishment will take place largely after process reviews have identified efficiencies, and other service reviews have realised savings, to permit an appropriate level of business support to be retained.

The changes and extended duties arising from the Care Bill will need to be considered in terms of future business support requirements. It is anticipated that some additional funding will be made available from Government to mitigate for the increased workloads.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A08

1 SERVICE AREA

ASCH&PP - Framework Development Team

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

The Framework Development Teams provide the Council (Adult Social Care, Health and Public Protection and Children, Families and Cultural Services) with a database capable of monitoring delivery of services to its service users. One Team sits within the Adult Social Care Health & Public Protection (ASCH&PP) Dept. and another within Children Families & Cultural Services (CF&CS).

This proposal seeks to reduce the ASCH&PP Team from 10.8 FTEs to 8.8 FTE,s and to discontinue the use of Enlight software across both ASCH&PP and CF&CS.

It is anticipated that savings of £79,000 will be achieved by the end of 2014/15 (£11k from ceasing of the software, and £68k from staff reductions).

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

Frameworki is the care management system used by ASCH&PP and CF&CS to maintain social care records. The costs for maintenance and development of the system are shared across both departments, and there is very close working between both Framework Development teams. There are, however, some differences in the way the departments use the systems.

As part of this savings proposal, consideration was given to merging the ASCH&PP and CF&CS Framework Teams, which would have resulted in 1.0 Team Manager savings (split 50/50 across both Teams). However, the impact on developments across both departments would be considerable and high risk. As such it is proposed not to merge the two teams at this point in time.

Savings will be made from restructuring the ASCH&PP Framework Team and identifying any vacant posts.

Finally, the Enlight Software has been in existence since 2009 and was intended to be a Help Facility for staff using Framework. Whilst initially the system brought some benefits to operational staff, over time its effectiveness has reduced. This view is shared across both ASCH&PP and CF&CS.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

908

NET
£000

908

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	79	0	0	79
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	79	0	0	79

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET? 8.71%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

10.8

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

2.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

Redundancy costs will apply to disestablished posts but may be reduced by any vacant posts

There are no penalty costs associated with ending the Enlight Software contract.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

There is potential for minimal impact on external service users as a result of these proposals, but the likelihood is low and the implementation of the new reporting system 'SWIPE' does significantly reduce the risk.

Internal 'customers' serviced by the ASCH&PP Team are its Senior Leadership Team and staff. For example, the Team provides management information to enable SLT to make informed decisions and operational staff to manage their workload.

The loss of staff resource could therefore result in the Team being less able to respond to customer requests and developments.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

A reduced Framework resource will also impact on the support to Health partners in providing joint information, including support to colleagues such as in Mental Health services and Rampton Hospital. Development work will continue, but it is likely that the Team will be less able to respond in a timely manner to requests for changes to Framework, or new reports to be generated.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

The loss of resource could result in an impact on the Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH), particularly if further management information reports are required and the SWIPE Team is unable to deliver these requirements due to competing priorities.

The loss of Enlight Software should not impact on staff in either department as usage has declined significantly as the benefits have reduced.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

This proposal involves internal staffing changes and should not significantly impact on external service users.

Any potential disproportionate, adverse or negative impact on staff will be considered as part of the Equality Impact Assessment that will be undertaken on this proposal, as part of consideration of all proposals affecting staffing changes within the Council. However, at this stage it is not believed that the proposal will have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on staff with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

The loss of resource could reduce the quality and timeliness of data provided to operational staff. The ability to provide accurate budget commitments could also be at risk. Challenges from service users could also be an outcome if a reduction in resource translates into the security of social care records being potentially compromised.

In mitigation, the implementation of SWIPE should ensure that more frequent data quality checks can be undertaken by operational managers. In addition, as part of the review of E Support Worker roles, ensuring the quality of data has been identified as a high priority, and more robust checking of the Framework system will be carried by the remaining post out on a regular and planned basis. This will mitigate to some extent the potential for data protection issues, but will not totally remove all risk.

As knowledge and skills develop in the use of SWIPE, it is anticipated that the improvements stated above will take place over a period of time.

To mitigate any risks associated with the removal of the Enlight Software, work is underway to identify complexities within the system and to streamline and simplify where feasible, resulting in longer term benefits.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A09**1 SERVICE AREA**

ASCH&PP - Adult Care Financial Services (ACFS)

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

This proposal seeks to restructure ACFS. Currently there are four teams within ACFS; the Visiting Team; the Community Assessment Team; the Residential Assessment Team; and the Client Finance Team. It is proposed that the functions of the Visiting Team and the Client Finance Teams are reduced and that these two teams merged in to other teams, thereby reducing from 4 to 2 teams. This will bring the following changes:

Visiting Team - Home visits to carry out financial assessments will be reduced and will only be provided to those service users where there is no family support. For other service users with family support, assessments will be made over the telephone, online or by post. A reduced number of staff from this team will be transferred to the Community and Residential Assessment Teams to continue home visits to the most vulnerable service users.

Client Finance Team - It is proposed to transfer responsibility for Deputyship to the Safeguarding Adults Team and to transfer responsibility for Appointeeship to the Residential Assessment Team. Management of Direct Bank accounts will cease.

Savings will be made through restructuring ACFS and disestablishing 7 FTE posts.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The Lean+ review of ACFS has identified a number of processes within the service that can be streamlined to significantly reduce the number of home visits that are carried out to complete financial assessments. Recommendations from the review include:

- Introducing screening to cease visits for service users who do not receive a chargeable service or who have a service with a fixed fee such as meals or transport.
- Systems will be designed to support financial self assessment and completion of financial assessment forms by service users, relatives and carers.

The Client Finance Team currently undertakes Deputyship and Appointeeship for service users who lack mental capacity. The team is responsible for paying approximately £5 million in care charges both to the County Council and direct to care providers, which may not be paid in full. Whilst these are discretionary services, it is considered that the risks in terms of safeguarding are too high to propose a ceasing of this activity. However, a reduction to the number of Team Leaders in ACFS necessitates a reduction in line-management responsibilities for the remaining Team Leaders to avoid spans of control being too wide and unmanageable. It is therefore proposed to transfer responsibility for Deputyship to the Safeguarding Adults' Team, as other Local Authorities have done, and to transfer responsibility for Appointeeship to the Residential Assessment Team, for the following reasons:

- Deputyship: the emphasis will be on safeguarding individuals from financial abuse, so the transfer of responsibility for this service aligns more readily with the Safeguarding Adults' Team.
- Appointeeship: this is generally provided for service users in residential care and is predominantly a process of making applications to the Department for Work and Pensions, collecting benefits and paying care charges. It therefore seems appropriate to transfer responsibility to the Residential Assessment Team.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

1,339

NET
£000

1,234

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	93	121	0	214
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	93	121	0	214

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

17.3%

NB: This OBC incorporates benefits identified in the Lean + review and these should therefore not be counted separately.

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

41.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

7.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

ACFS has a Temporary Team Manager in post for 12 months, due to cease at the end of November 2013. This post was funded by departmental reserves to improve advice and information to the public on charging following the implementation of personal budgets.

It is proposed to extend this post for 16 months until March 2015, to support business reengineering required to implement the new structure. This will cost £67k which would be met from existing ICT reserves.

In addition there will be redundancy costs associated with the 7 FTE post reductions, which will have to be met from Corporate Reserves.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

Service users will not receive the same level of support to complete applications for additional benefit entitlement. They will also not receive detailed explanation on charging provided at face to face meetings. This may result in

- An increase in the number of enquiries coming into the service, thus hindering the streamlining of the service.

- The amount of money that service users contribute towards their care is changeable due to the changes in the amount of services received, sometimes on a week by week basis.

There may also be an increase in the number of complaints from service users and/or carers if they are not provided with up to date or timely information about their contributions arising from the changes in their services.

This will impact across all service user groups who are receiving a care service funded by the County Council.

A full Equality Impact Assessment and consultation on the proposals has been undertaken, to inform decision making.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

There will be reduced capacity for the Team to be represented at stakeholder meetings, e.g. Independent Sector Provider Forums, Carer Forums and community based drop in sessions on charging and funding for the general public. Once again, this may increase the number of enquiries coming into the service, thus hindering the streamlining of the service.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

The transfer of responsibility of the deputyship work into the Safeguarding Adults' Team has been factored into the separate Outline Business Case relating to that area of service.

ACFS will have reduced capacity to offer support and advice to frontline social care staff.

The workload for Income and Credit Control may increase in terms of queries from the public and carrying out debt recovery on accounts.

There will be reduced capacity to be involved in development of services, e.g. Direct Payments Pilot for Residential Care.

As a result of the streamlining of processes, stemming from the Lean+ review, this proposal should not result in more enquiries to the Customer Service Centre.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

Currently, the visiting teams go to people's houses to undertake financial assessments. In future, service users will either have to visit the team or have an assessment undertaken over the phone. This will impact across all service user groups who are receiving a care service funded by the Council.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

- Despite streamlining of the processes, the demand for visits may still be too high. To mitigate against this, clear communication of changes to social care staff, careful planning and road testing for online and hard copy assessment forms will be available.
- No capacity for managers to support IT developments, e.g. Framework (key operational system for the management of social care), ABACUS (IT application used by ACFS to manage income collection around adult social care services), BEDS (provides details of Notts care homes and identifies self funders who can be supported with prompt financial advice) and CASPAR (will manage service users finances, where we act as deputies). In mitigation, priorities will be given to implementing recommendations from the IT service review and system changes which will produce cashable benefits.
- Unmanageable spans of control and insufficient resource to plan for upcoming legislation on Funding Reform, Welfare Reform and Pensions. In mitigation, the Temporary Team Manager post would assist with business re-engineering and implementation of new structure.
- Training, supervision and development of staff will be affected due to reduction in the team leader posts. This will be mitigated against through the use of group supervision and training sessions in place of one to one sessions, where possible.
- Re-evaluation of changed jobs may result in higher staffing costs. In mitigation, careful consideration will be given to job roles and responsibilities when implementing the restructure, to limit the need to submit new evaluation requests where possible.
- Loss of staff with high level of knowledge, expertise and experience may affect ability to deliver service. This will be mitigated to some extent through handover arrangements before staff leave and through staff training and development.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A10

1 SERVICE AREA

EMERGENCY PLANNING AND SAFETY OF SPORTS GROUNDS

The purpose of the service is to ensure that the County Council and communities within Nottinghamshire are resilient to the impact of emergencies of all kinds, and that the Council fulfils its duties to ensure the safety of spectators at major sports grounds within the county.

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

This proposal is to reduce the number of staff within the Emergency Planning Team by 15%. This will reduce the establishment from 6.6 to 5.6 FTE's.

This would be achieved by making 1 Emergency Planning Officer post redundant. The Service will utilise the ability of colleagues in other parts of the Council to manage emergency response with reduced support from an emergency planning officer. The Service will prioritise the work of emergency planning staff and the support available to significant public events.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

As part of the existing savings and efficiency measures, the Service has targeted resources and support to communities in dealing with significant emergencies. Therefore, this proposal seeks to continue this as follows:

- Reduce support activities to the Council's Departments.
- Extend the normal review period of emergency plans from 3 to 4 years
- Reduce the number of routine sports ground inspections undertaken.
- Tighten the criteria for attendance at Event Safety Advisory Groups, in order to reduce attendance.

Any further reductions in staff would impact on the service's ability to fulfil the duties under the legislation, and to maintain current income generated by providing emergency planning support to District and Borough Councils.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

324

NET
£000

260

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	35	0	0	35
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	35	0	0	35

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

13.5%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

6.6

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

1.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

The proposal will require dedicated management time to develop advice and guidance available to support County Council departments to manage the reduction in support, and to increase advice available for the public on the Council's website.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

The emergency planning function serves all residents and visitors to Nottinghamshire who may be affected by the impact of major emergencies of all kinds. Therefore, this proposal impacts across all geographical areas of the County.

The Service will have reduced capacity to establish and sustain support to the full spectrum of County Council responses to an emergency that impacts on the local community.

Sports clubs and spectators at major sporting and crowd events will have reduced support from safety management expertise within the Emergency Planning Team.

The impact of the proposal on service users has been considered in the Equality Impact Assessment undertaken to accompany this outline business case.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

The service will have reduced capacity to support the emergency services and other emergency response partners in planning and preparing for emergencies, training staff and exercising plans. The Service will be unable to sustain the current response to emergencies.

The service will have reduced capacity to fulfil its commitments currently detailed in joint emergency plans and mutual aid agreements with other areas.

The service will have to prioritise capacity to deliver the current enhanced Service Level Agreement with District and Borough Councils, to maintain current income levels.

The emergency services and other agencies that have a part to play in implementing safety at sports grounds would have reduced support and leadership from the service.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Reduced emergency planning resources will cause some costs and duties to be driven into other County Council services, in order to maintain adequate preparedness for emergencies and business continuity incidents. More support will be needed from across the Council when responding to an actual emergency or incident.

There will be reduced capacity to support and facilitate the corporate 'Risk, Safety and Emergency Management Board', 'Business Continuity Forum' and departmental groups.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

Older people, people with disabilities, pregnant women and parents with young children generally require more support during emergencies or in the event of a failure of safety management at a sports ground. There will be a disproportionate negative impact on these groups.

The Equality Impact Assessment on this proposal considers its potential impact on service users and protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

RISK: Reduced capacity to maintain safety of sport grounds **MITIGATING ACTIONS:** The risk can be reduced by increasing the skills of staff in the Council, to assist with safety in sports grounds.

RISK: Risk of not realising previous levels of income **MITIGATING ACTIONS:** Promote and develop additional income streams and funding sources.

RISK: Risk of difficulty in maintaining level of support to partners through the Councils' Service Level Agreements, leading to loss of income: **MITIGATING ACTIONS:** Ensure remaining emergency planning staff time is prioritised to ensure delivery of SLA commitments.

RISK: The Council's response to statutory emergency planning work would be severely compromised. **MITIGATING ACTIONS:** Prioritise the work on the team to deal with the highest risk, most frequent emergencies, and those that have greatest detriment to the public.

RISK: Risk of prosecution as Emergency Planning and Safety of Sports Grounds work would be reduced. **MITIGATING ACTIONS:** The impact can be reduced by increasing the public's and organisation's own resilience to emergencies. To work with partner emergency services and other agencies to increase their resilience in implementing safety at sports grounds.

RISK: Reduced capacity to support and facilitate the corporate Risk Safety and Emergency Management Board, Business Continuity Forum and department groups. **MITIGATING ACTIONS:** To reduce the frequency of the Boards and Forum to utilise ICT solutions to monitor progress against the Strategic Plan.

RISK: Capacity to undertake assessments and deal with core business activities.

MITIGATING ACTION: Through the Ways of Working Programme, mobilisation of the workforce, ICT led improvements and a Lean+ review, further efficiencies will be found to maximise staff's time to undertake core business activities.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A11

1 SERVICE AREA

REGISTRATION AND CELEBRATORY SERVICES

The service is responsible for the registration of births, stillbirths and deaths, notices of marriage and civil partnerships, production of legal documentation and the approval of premises for marriages and partnerships. The Service is also responsible for Citizenship Ceremonies and other ceremonies; including baby naming, renewal of vows and civil funerals.

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

That the service becomes cost neutral by further developing income streams, to ensure that charges reflect the total cost of the service to the Council.

This will involve maximising the current range of services offered to the public and the introduction, delivery and marketing of enhanced and new registration services.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The Service is already moving towards being cost neutral.

Moving to a full cost recovery model is a realistic and achievable ambition. To achieve this, a further £47K of income is required to fully cover the total cost of running the service. This will be achieved by:

- Increased income from enhanced marriage and civil partnership ceremonies, by gaining increased market share
- Expansion of income-generating non-statutory ceremonies business, e.g. baby naming ceremonies and renewing of vows
- Introduction and optimisation of income from a new Nationality Checking Service
- Substantial increase in volume of copy certificate business
- Property rationalisation to reduce revenue spending
- Increase in fees income
- Increased cost recovery by sale of advertising and attracting sponsorship.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

1,291

NET
£000

47

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	47	0	0	47
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	47	0	0	47

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET? 100.0%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

38.1

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

0.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

The proposal will require dedicated management time to increase income, to rationalise property and to reduce costs. Commercial analysis support from the Improvement Team will be required to develop income opportunities and/or to optimise the service offer.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

The public would be impacted on by any increase in the fees charged for registration and celebratory services.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

The profits of premises licensed by the Council for civil ceremonies will be reduced if fees are significantly increased, and low volume venues are liable to stop offering marriage and civil partnership ceremonies.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

If registration staff focused on income generating activities, this would reduce their time to administer the Tell Us Once Service. This would increase costs on other departments e.g. Adult Social Care, the Department of Work and Pensions, as well as District Councils and central Government.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

No potential disproportionate, adverse or negative impact on service users with protected characteristics is anticipated.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

RISK: The public will choose not to purchase enhanced services. **MITIGATING ACTION:** Enhanced marketing of the range of services available.

RISK: Unable to realise revenue savings from disposal of properties. Revenue costs will continue if it is not possible to find a buyer for the Basford Office.

MITIGATING ACTION: Marketing and use of the premise for registrations.

RISK: Reduced income. **MITIGATING ACTION:** The enhanced website which will go live this year will increase the potential revenue through advertising, and selling products (via an online shop facility). In addition, other income streams include: nationality checking service, copy certificate business, family records service, same sex marriages and extended times people can have a ceremony.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A12**1 SERVICE AREA**

Horizontal - Group Management structure

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

There are currently 16.8 FTE Group Managers in the Department covering a range of responsibilities and activities. In response to the service changes and reductions proposed in the department's overall savings and efficiencies programme, together with changes to the local and national policy agenda, it is proposed that some of the areas of service and activities are realigned or merged as part of an interim structure. This will enable a reduction of 3 Group Manager posts.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

An interim structure is required that will be fit for purpose for the Department's future direction of travel.

The key drivers will be a structure that:

- Is cost effective. The council is facing unprecedented reductions in funding which requires a review of every area of expenditure. In order to ensure that all available resources are directed to the delivery of high quality services, we need to ensure that management and support costs are as lean as possible.
 - Is sensitive to local commissioning and provision of services, whilst maintaining sufficient capacity to provide robust management and leadership to the organisation .
 - Is aligned with the new social care model and the future Care Bill. The department is currently consulting on a new model of social care for Nottinghamshire, which leads to different ways of working and a change in the way that resources (both human and financial) are utilised. The Care Bill, which will be enacted within the next 12 months, brings new responsibilities alongside a requirement for different approaches to the commissioning and delivery of care services. The department will need to be ready to respond flexibly to these changes.
 - Leads towards integration with the local NHS. National policy is moving toward further and increased integration between health and social care services. The government has signalled that future funding and performance frameworks will be explicitly linked to the delivery of joint outcomes across health and social care at a local level.
 - Fits with Corporate and departmental changes in leadership and areas of responsibility.
- The departmental senior leadership team is being realigned on an interim basis to provide a more coherent and consistent approach to relationships with external partners and in particular local NHS services. The savings and efficiencies proposals being developed and consulted upon will change responsibilities and the delivery / management of services both within the department and across the council.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

1,081

NET
£000

1,081

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	200	0	0	200
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	200	0	0	200

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

18.5%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

16.8

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

3.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)
Redundancy costs will apply.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

The changes relate to internal management structures and there should not be any significant impact on service users and on communities. However, processes will need to be revised and realigned, to ensure that potential delays in response times in relation to correspondence, including concerns and complaints, are mitigated.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Group Managers currently represent the Department at various meetings and events with different organisations and a reduction in the numbers of Group Managers will mean that managers will need to prioritise attendance at some of these meetings. However, the realigned structure should also mean that relationships with key partners can be developed through regular or consistent representation from the Department based on local knowledge of the entirety of social care and public protection services.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Group Managers also represent the Department at various meetings within the Council and a reduction in the numbers of Group Managers will mean that some of these meetings will have to be prioritised.

There will be fewer opportunities for Group Managers within the Department to support and represent one another, and cover for the out of hours rota will have to be shared between fewer managers.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

This proposal involves internal staffing changes and will not impact directly on external service users.

Any potential disproportionate, adverse or negative impact on staff has been considered as part of the Equality Impact Assessment that has been undertaken on this proposal, as part of consideration of all proposals affecting staffing changes within the Department. However, at this stage it is not believed that the proposal will have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on staff with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Risk; The department will be delivering a large number of savings and efficiencies projects many of which will involve a reduction in numbers of staff. This will be at a time when there will be an increase in activities arising from the implementation of the overall savings programme. In mitigation, there will be some changes in roles and activities arising from:

- implementation of the new social care model.
- a streamlining of systems and processes arising from Lean+ reviews.
- a re-alignment of responsibilities in accordance with Health integration.

Risk; The reduction in Group managers will impact on the ability to cover corporate initiatives and countywide responsibilities, such as service reviews, emergency planning, etc. Mitigation; Activities will be prioritised, a matrix management approach will be adopted, where appropriate, and delegation of some responsibilities will be made.

Risk; Activity and finance reporting will not be aligned to management responsibility.

Mitigation; Systems and processes will be developed to allow for management information to be collected, collated and reported for both local purposes and national reporting.

Accountability for finance and performance will be made explicit within roles and functions.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A13

1 SERVICE AREA

Support to Schools Service

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To redesign the Support to Schools Service around statutory duties whilst realising necessary savings. Some of the savings will be secured by reducing the amount of county council funding allocated to addressing maintained schools causing concern, particularly schools in an Ofsted category or at risk of being in an Ofsted category. By including a sold service element of £320K the service will be able to provide additional capacity in relation to securing all schools as good or outstanding and further contributing to the Closing the Gap agenda (reducing the attainment gap between the poorest and richest pupils in Nottinghamshire). It is also proposed that Governing Body Services (a sold service supporting School Governors) will join the Support to Schools Service. Savings will be generated from:

- Reduction in school improvement service core staff structure saving c£450k
- Reduction in the School Targeted Support budget from £526k to £320k saving £206k
- Reduction in the School Improvement Partners budget from £310k to £100k saving £210k
- Reduction in the Closing the Gap budget from £225k to £50k saving £175k
- General non staffing budget savings of £36k
- New Income generation target of £320k (includes business support costs of £27k)

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

In order to achieve savings targets the service will be required to reduce its capacity and reduce non staff budgets which are currently used to support school improvement. However the redesigned service will need to continue to:

- ensure that every child has a school place;
- review the support for the admission of vulnerable pupils;
- ensure that the strategic planning for School Place Planning is delivered effectively using Basic Need funding appropriately;
- ensure that appropriate support and challenge can be provided by the Council's school improvement team;
- ensure that the data of all Nottinghamshire schools (academies, free school, maintained schools) is appropriately analysed to identify any school failing to provide a good and outstanding level of education to children and young people in Nottinghamshire and broker / provide appropriate support and challenge to secure improvement.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

4,310

NET
£000

3,891

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	1,000	370	0	1,370
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	1,000	370	0	1,370

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET? 35.2%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

42.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

6.4

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

There are no significant expenditures associated with the proposed plan although additional resources would be required from HR to provide support and advice around a restructuring process. The cost of associated redundancies and potential protected pay would also need to be considered as some roles will be re-evaluated

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

The main service users of the Education Improvement Service are schools and other external agencies such as Ofsted, the Department for Education and the Standards Testing Agency. As the proposed new structure focuses on core responsibilities, service users should not perceive significant change. By building in a budget to use associate officers and advisers, it should be possible to broadly maintain the current level of support and challenge in relation to statutory duties and to respond to Ofsted judgements.

In relation to Place Planning and Admissions, key service users are schools, other settings, parents and the wider community. It is essential that responsibilities for Strategic Place Planning and Admissions are not compromised. The proposed restructuring also aims to address issues around capacity and succession planning as these services are currently compromised when key single post holders leave the Council.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

The proposed plan ensures that communicating with external key agencies such as the Department for Education, Ofsted and the Standards Testing Agency can be maintained.

In relation to Place Planning and Admissions, the proposals also ensure that communications with District Councils, and other external partners such as developers and the Education Funding Agency are also maintained

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

A reduction in senior officers will reduce the ability to contribute as comprehensively to corporate projects or initiatives. The reduction of senior officers within the proposed new structure may also reduce the capacity of the service to respond to requests from senior officers and councillors within expected timelines.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

An equality Impact assessment is required for this proposal given the proposed reduction in budgets regarding school targeted support, Closing the Gap and School Improvement. Assessments will need to identify how these reductions will be allocated so that those families with vulnerable characteristics are not adversely effected.

It is important to note that the revised structure in the Strategic Place Planning and Admissions Team seeks to address current shortfalls and so has an element of service improvement which will create new posts.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

The proposed restructure of the Place, Planning and Admissions Team aims to continue to meet statutory requirements and at the same time address succession planning concerns. The challenges of the increasing numbers of school aged children resulting in the need to plan strategically will require the consolidation and restructuring of the team to ensure expertise is retained.

The refocusing of the Education Improvement Team within the Support to Schools Service will ensure that Council responsibilities in relation to the school improvement strategy, can be fulfilled. The Partnership approach with Maintained Schools, Teaching Schools, National and Local Leaders of Education, will support all schools in Nottinghamshire to be good and outstanding.

Whilst there will be a reduction of Council funding to support schools causing concern, direct Department for Education funding to such schools through the Teaching School Alliances will reduce the immediate impact.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A14

1 SERVICE AREA
SEND Hub**2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?**

This proposal aims to achieve savings of **£492,000** and comprises three parts:

Part 1: Whilst the majority of the Educational Psychology Service (EPS) is funded from the Schools budget, a small proportion of staff salaries are funded from the Local Authority (LA) budget totalling £92,000. It is proposed to recharge this amount (£92,000) against the School and Family Specialist Services (SFSS) Budget which is located within the Schools Budget. Funding is available within SFSS to meet these costs. This will achieve a saving of **£92,000** against the LA budget.

Part 2: From September 2014, a new multi-agency assessment process for children with SEN will become law and be implemented in Nottinghamshire. This will involve new arrangements for producing Education Health and Care plans and will present opportunities to consolidate systems and processes which will enable staffing reductions without an adverse effect on provision. In fact, there is the potential for an improved quality of service through the combined effects of partnership working and a more integrated approach to service delivery.

These changes will achieve savings totalling **£247,000**.

Part 3: A permanent reduction in non-staffing budgets totalling **£153,000**. This will be achieved by deleting funding available to support initiatives and project work for pupils with SEND. These budgets are also used to fund consultation activities with stakeholders to inform future strategies and planning. The LA's capacity for strategic development will need to be delivered within existing alternative resources in future.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

Part 1: There is no rationale for the EPS being differentially funded from the schools and LA budgets. Both budgets are used to pay salary costs. This proposal will simplify reporting for the EPS budget which will then sit exclusively within the Schools Budget. The service provided by EPS fits in with the definition of support for inclusion which is a legitimate charge against the schools budget.

Part 2: To rationalise 3 existing teams i.e. Assessment and Statementing, Post 16 and Strategy, Planning and Commissioning into a single multi-agency assessment hub. This team will be responsible for producing the new Education, Health and Care Plans which will replace the existing SEN statement process. In order to deliver high quality EHC Plans, it will be necessary to change the organisational structure and culture across these agencies. In doing this there will be the opportunity to achieve savings through efficiencies i.e. by combining a number of existing teams undertaking separate assessments into a single EHC Hub.

There will be some benefits in bringing together teams in order to complete work around an individual case.

The essence of the new team's work would be to identify needs and determine how these needs are best met. This is a clear movement towards what is envisaged in the County Council's new operating model.

Part 3: Consultation will be undertaken with our stakeholders through more cost effective and innovative ways such as using digital technology. The information gathered will inform future planning and service development.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

1,943

NET
£000

1,782

-

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	492	0	0	492
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	492	0	0	492

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

27.6%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

27.5

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

4.4

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

Voluntary redundancy costs will apply. One proposed reduction relates to a post with enhanced terms and conditions.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

Part 1: The recharge of a small proportion of EPS salaries against the SFSS budget will have a minimal impact on service users. These costs will be set against an existing permanent underspend which had already been achieved through a previous efficiency exercise.

Part 2: The creation of a single multi-agency assessment hub will not necessarily have a negative impact on the quality of service and aims to improve the customer experience through the removal of duplication and unnecessary bureaucracy.

Part 3: The permanent reduction in SEN Strategy budgets will result in a decrease in funding available to support project work and consultation exercises with stakeholders in Nottinghamshire

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Developing a multi-agency hub will involve collaboration between other parts of the County Council and the health service.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

See above.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

An Equality Impact Assessment is required for this proposal because as new processes for assessment of SEND are introduced, care will need to be taken to ensure that children and families with protected characteristics are not disadvantaged.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Part 1: There will be no reduction in service from this proposal.

Part 2: As a result of the new Education, Health and Care Planning process, there is a risk that parents may lose confidence in the process or conversely have expectations inflated. In order to mitigate against this an effective communications strategy will be in place.

Part 3: The permanent reduction in strategic budgets could potentially decrease the County Council's capacity to develop innovative ways of working and reduce the capacity to consult with stakeholders in order to develop and improve service provision. We will mitigate against this by using low cost alternative communication channels with stakeholders such as online and digital technology.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A15

1 SERVICE AREA

Business Support Service, Business Development and Support: ESI division CFCS

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To re-scope the CFCS Business Support Service and reduce the number of posts; to consolidate arrangements re structures and possibly locations; to review and streamline processes where possible. To achieve the savings target of £2.43m the Business Support Service will need to reduce the number of FTE posts by approximately 121. This proposal will need to flex and accommodate departmental service changes as defined in other OBCs. Revised proposals for business support will be developed in conjunction with ASCH&PP and will seek to maximise efficiencies from integrated working both in localities and at County Hall.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

- To achieve savings in line with departmental and wider NCC requirements
- To re-align the service to meet the business and administrative requirements of delivery services following service reviews across the department, and in line with any future council-wide integration of business and administrative functions
- To review and streamline existing processes and ways of working to generate efficiencies within the teams.
- To continue to provide an efficient service to support the infrastructure needs of the department

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

7,372

NET
£000

6,257

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	500	1,330	600	2,430
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	500	1,330	600	2,430

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET? 38.8%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

346.0

(approx. 35 externally funded)

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

121.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

Redundancy costs

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

There will be fewer FTE staff in the BSS including those with front line responsibilities. The BSS will consider all functions it currently provides and re-prioritise, in partnership with the services we support, those functions which are essential in supporting service users and delivering statutory requirements, objectives and targets and the strategic plan and policies of the County Council.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Externally funded posts will continue to be supported / hosted as deemed appropriate by the Council

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Reductions should be planned in relation to changes in other areas across the department / Council. The bulk of the savings will be largely dependent on the rescoping of other services e.g. reducing their activity and engaging with what will be a change in culture with regards to business support requirements. Reductions are likely to be largely outside CSC in the first instance, so will have a disproportionate impact on other services including Early Help. Some posts are currently charged to the schools budget, so the implications of this will need to be considered.

The interdependencies reach across the department in relation to integrated developments with ASCH&PP and cross-cutting themes common to all departments.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

An Equality Impact Assessment is required for this proposal due to the staffing reductions proposed, and any possible impact on service users as a consequence.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

- Reduced delivery services may seek to pass some of their previous activity to the BSS, resulting in potential increased work pressures on BSS. Some of that redistribution may be cost effective, some counter productive, therefore close joined up working will be required.
- Important to synchronise BSS reductions with the rescoping / restructuring of the 'lead' delivery service to avoid discontinuity and inappropriate capacity.
- Support requirements in some areas of CSC are on the increase and will need to be taken into account.
- Reductions will not be equally spread across the service but must reflect service need
- Careful phasing of staffing reductions is needed to ensure congruence with the proposals of other services and to deliver savings at the appropriate time.
- Risk of double counting savings e.g. development of an integrated approach with ASCH&PP; Schools Access Project.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A16

1 SERVICE AREA

Children's Services: Schools Access Team, CFCS

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To utilise learning from the Customer Service Centre and Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH) arrangements, to simplify access to services provided to parents and carers in relation to schools. The aim is to create a single point of access for a range of processes including applications for school admission, free school meals and home to school transport.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

To increase efficiency and reduce duplication in the handling of routine applications and processes and to simplify these for service users through a 'hub' approach

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

N/A

NET
£000

N/A

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	0	50	50	100
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	0	50	50	100

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

N/A

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

N/A

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

N/A

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

A 'one stopshop' approach for service users in relation to applications and enquiries associated with access to school, and more streamlined / joined up advice and signposting

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Greater clarity for partners derived from a single point of access

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Transparency and consistency by bringing together functions of a similar nature which relate to broadly to the same service users. Opportunity to clarify the relationship between routine processing and more complex enquiry handling by specialist teams, and provide a pathway which allows for economies of scale at the 'front end' of the process. Project involves a range of services in the Children, Families and Cultural Services department and across the Council, utilising support from the Improvement Programme.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

A provisional Equality Impact Assessment has been prepared for this proposal. Although the focus is on service improvement, the proposal needs to identify whether the planned access arrangements may have any adverse consequences for staff in relation to the protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Use of Lean + methodology will enable more detailed analysis of the opportunities and risks associated with the various strands of the project. It will be essential to map progress carefully to ensure any savings to be found are not being double counted as part of existing service reviews i.e. across departmental business support arrangements, future proposals regarding integrated business support services across the Council, transport arrangements, Services to Schools review and progress of Education, Health and Social Plans for children with special educational needs and disabilities

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A17**1 SERVICE AREA**

Targeted Support and Youth Justice

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

The Service will deliver savings by focussing youth crime prevention on the highest areas of youth crime and using only programme methods with proven effectiveness. This will limit the number of locations targeted but give the maximum impact given a reduced level of resources. Service delivery for missing children, young carers and excluded young people will also be remodelled so that they receive a core service from within the Service's district based support teams rather than the disparate arrangements that currently exist. The Service will also integrate its assessment provision for young people with disabilities into wider Special Educational Needs "Hub" arrangements. Management and back office costs and the costs of externally commissioned services will be reduced, whilst still retaining safe levels of management oversight and the ability to quality assure work. The Service will also continue to develop a clear evidence base for its work, so that all programmes of activity provide good value for money, and funding and commissioning is fully aligned with that of partner agencies.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The above changes represent the best way of reducing cost with the minimum impact on service users and performance. It takes into account predicted reductions in grants and partnership funding.

Whilst a reduction in crime diversion projects is planned, which will affect "Partnership Plus" areas, there will continue to be youth crime prevention work in all of these areas through the Youth Offending Teams and Outreach youth work team, and in some locations intensive Junior Youth Inclusion Projects. Youth crime hotspots are kept under constant review so resources will continue to be directed to areas with significant or emerging problems.

The integration of assessment provision for young people with disabilities into wider Special Educational Needs "Hub" arrangements fits well with the project plan for that Service area and still leaves the required capacity to do the work. This revised model is expected to deliver an improved service to this group of young people. Learning Centre pupils will still retain a named key worker from Targeted Support and will be eligible for the Service.

Spending on staff training and service user participation will be reduced but the Service will retain two dedicated Development Officer functions for these areas and some grant monies will still be directed into these areas so that good practice continues to be developed. Whilst reductions in temporary staffing can leave the statutory services provided vulnerable in the event of staff absence, the current staffing and case load profile suggests that this can be managed.

Young people's substance misuse services are already scheduled for recommissioning. A needs assessment has been completed which indicates a model that is just as effective but with a reduced unit cost and which is more closely aligned to the differing needs of young people. It is envisaged that a more effective model can be commissioned at a reduced cost with some development costs needed in 2014-15 reducing in 2015-16, realising a further saving.

As a result of the previous partnership that Targeted Support & Youth Justice had with "The Hall" homelessness project in Mansfield, the Service has a cohort of youth work staff currently working with homeless adults aged 18-21. This falls outside the core work of Targeted Support and Youth Justice and could be reduced without impacting on the key outcomes for the Service area.

A reduction on Targeted Support programme costs may see a small reduction in the number of drop-in sessions offered at satellite bases of probably two sessions per week across the County. By the point that this reduction is needed a strong evidence base will exist on the need and take-up of drop-in provision that can help target the reduction. "Virtual" online drop-ins should also be well established by this time, so the need for physical drop-in may be reduced.

By 2016 a new way of working will have been developed for children's services and a more refined model of intensive family intervention produced, using academic research and local experience. It is believed that this can generate savings through careful targeting. It would still target the most complex, chaotic and costly families within the County.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

13,000

NET
£000

8,000

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	800	100	100	1,000
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	800	100	100	1,000

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

12.5%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

147.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

3.9

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)
N/A

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

No significant equality issues have been identified for service users. There should be minimal impact on front line services from these proposals.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

A reduction in some programmes, for example crime prevention, could have a negative impact on some partners' performance but planning to mitigate this is already underway. Some services delivered by the voluntary sector would be decommissioned and transferred to a social enterprise part-owned by the County Council.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

The operating relationship with the Learning Centres (Pupil Referral Units) would need reviewing and s.139a assessments would transfer with a reduced resource to another division.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

An Equality Impact Assessment is required for this proposal to identify the demographics of the children and families who would be likely to experience a reduction in support.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Risk: Increased offending by young people as diversion programmes reduce.

Mitigation: Commissioning of two Junior Youth Inclusion Projects in high crime areas, retention of deployable outreach resource, joint work with Police and Crime Commissioners office on commissioning, continued Youth Offending Teams support for prevention.

Risk: Reduction in available advice to those subject to school exclusion and reaching school leaving age.

Mitigation: Adoption of case allocation within Targeted Support of all excluded pupils

Risk: Reduced access to intensive family packages

Mitigation: Increased targeting, better knowledge of "what works" and improved service effectiveness.

Risk: Reduced service for young carers

Mitigation: Ensure all Targeted Support staff understand carer assessment methodology and available services and financial assistance

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A18

1 SERVICE AREA
CSC Management

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?
To reduce management costs within Children's Social Care.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?
It is expected that as a result of planned changes within the division and through broadening portfolios of responsibility there will be a reduction in management posts. The specific posts have not yet been identified, but is expected that these will emerge as a planned management review is undertaken.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT
BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

1,530

NET
£000

1,530

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	120	80	0	200
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	120	80	0	200

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET? 13.1%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

26.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

TBC

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

Redundancy costs associated with the deletion of posts are anticipated, but cannot be calculated until specific posts are identified.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

It expected that any posts deleted will be as a consequence of other changes in organisation or delivery. The impact of removing a management post will be minimal as the function fulfilled by each post will be planned for as part of wider changes. More detailed impact assessment will be possible as specific posts are identified.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

N/A

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

N/A

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

It is not believed that the proposal will have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics. However any reduction in posts will be subject to the established corporate HR procedures which includes consultation with staff.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Risk assessment will be carried out once specific posts have been identified. It is expected that risks will be minimal as any removal of post will not impact on frontline service delivery and will link into wider changes.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A19**1 SERVICE AREA**

Children Families and Cultural Services - Planning, Performance and Quality Assurance Group

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To reduce budgets that support joint use activity on school sites and also for academy conversions, given that schools themselves receive funds directly to offset the administrative and legal costs of conversion to academy status.

Savings within the data and performance and planning and quality assurance services will arise from bringing together all of the resources presently supporting these functions within discrete service areas into a single central support service within the Department. This will yield cost reductions of 25% in delivering these support services.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The proposed reductions within the capital projects budgets reflect the fact that the majority of school sites that house a joint use leisure centre are academies. The future financial arrangements of these joint use facilities were secured during the process of the school converting to an academy. The remaining budget is thus being re-aligned to reflect the financial commitments at a much smaller number of sites. Equally, the savings in the local authority budget to support academy conversions is predicated on the fact that the majority of the secondary schools, where evidence shows there to be relatively more complex issues to address during the conversion process, have now converted to academy status. Moreover, schools themselves receive funding directly from the government to contribute towards the administrative and legal costs of becoming an academy.

For the data, performance, planning and quality assurance services, the proposed reductions are to be done in a way that balances protection for front line services for children, young people and families with the requirement for an appropriate level of back office support for front line service delivery. The aim is to make significant savings as soon as possible in these service areas.

**4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT
BUDGET?**GROSS
£000

6,050

NET
£000

4,160

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	1,350	150	0	1,500
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	1,350	150	0	1,500
WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?				36.1%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

34.5

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

11.5

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

The departmental review of data, performance, planning, and quality assurance requires project support from the corporate Improvement Programme (as part of its wider support for the development of a revised operating model for children's services provision).

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

Although schools that elect to have a change of governance (e.g. to seek academy status) will receive less resource from the Council to support their transition, they do receive funding directly from central Government to contribute to the administrative and legal costs of becoming an academy. Other services provided by this group to schools, e.g. capital project support / Private Funding Initiative (PFI) contract management / performance and data support (as a sold service) will be largely unaffected by these proposals.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

It is anticipated that the Group will continue to coordinate and support the work of the Children's Trust Board. The focus of this work has recently been reviewed in light of the Trust Board's relationship to the Health & Wellbeing Board

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Other front line services within the Department that receive support from these services will receive a remodelled service that is commensurate with the requirements of the department's revised way of working. This would apply similarly to services in other parts of the Council with whom the service has close links, e.g. property services in relation to capital projects, and with the emerging proposals to bring together a single service to support the Council's strategic management framework.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

An equalities impact assessment is not required for this proposal as it does not impact on frontline provision or vulnerable groups.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

The nature of these support services mean there is generally less inherent risk in budget reductions, albeit the Group does provide some critical support functions to key front line services, such as children's social care and early help services, and school admissions. Service provision to schools will be largely unaffected; schools that elect to become academies will be supported to do so safely and the Council's interests will continue to be properly protected.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A20

1 SERVICE AREA

Children, Families and Cultural Services Department - Management Structure Review

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

This proposal would deliver savings in senior management costs across the Department as part of wider changes to the Department's operating arrangements. Savings would be generated from Group Manager and Team Manager costs, and would deliver a staffing structure that is fit for purpose and efficient.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

To ensure a management structure that reflects service changes across the Department and to reduce management costs. Specific posts have been identified in year 1 (2014/15); savings in later years will be generated through the delivery of planned new operating arrangements.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

N/A

NET
£000

N/A

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	80	110	185	375
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	80	110	185	375

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

N/A

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

TBC

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

TBC

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

None

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

The operational impact of reducing posts will be managed, as senior level structures are adjusted to reflect changes in the Department's operating arrangements.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

None

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

None

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

An Equalities Impact Assessment is not required for this proposal as it does not impact on frontline provision or vulnerable groups.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Risk assessment will be carried out once specific posts have been identified. It is expected that risks will be minimal as any removal of posts will be as a consequence of broader changes across the Department.

1 SERVICE AREA

HR and Customer Services - Business Support Centre

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To save £1.7m by 2016/17 by reviewing processes and staffing structures at the Business Support Centre to reduce costs and improve efficiency.

Phase 1: reduce costs and increase efficiency by:

- Review of business processes from end to end
- Redesign and development of staffing structures which, over time, will reduce staff numbers in line with best practice and growing experience of usage of the new system
- Implementation of a whole service model with staff working across all business areas to generate further efficiencies and economies of scale
- Increased self-service by internal and external customers as system and processes bed in
- Increased self sufficiency of the competency centre to reduce external support costs.

Phase 2: Support Services Review - Strategic options appraisal considering the following in isolation and together. The targets set within the Business Case in years 2 and 3 are for further improvements and savings in-house. If an alternative way of running the business is chosen this would require savings beyond this to be identified. Potential options for service delivery include:

- Outsource
- Shared Service Centre – with other councils
- Shared Service Centre with Customer Service Centre – internal and external customers combined
- Joint Venture/Arms Length Management Organisation (ALMO)
- Additional income generation
- Consideration of corporate business support resources being managed via the BSC as a single point of contact to improve efficiency, achieve greater consistency and join up end to end processes and systems to ensure effective support to front line services with reduced resources.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The Council's Business Support Centre (BSC) undertakes transactional HR activity (payroll, contracts of employment, maintenance of HR records, maintenance of organisational structures and recruitment and pre-employment checking); pensions administration activity for the Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS) in Nottinghamshire; accounts payable and accounts receivable (invoice processing, debt recovery, income and credit control activity); basic treasury management and accounting and clearing house activity. The centre is also responsible for supporting the effective day to day functioning and maintenance and future development of the Council's integrated Business Management System via the Competency Centre which is housed within the BSC. Services are provided across Nottinghamshire County Council and some services (e.g. payroll) are sold to schools and other organisations.

The proposals involve reviewing transactional HR, finance and procurement activity and resource requirements to generate savings following completion of implementation of the new Business Management System. The review will also exploit synergies and interdependencies between different areas of transactional activity to maximise the benefits to Nottinghamshire County Council, its customers and service users. Phase 1 process review, redesign and restructure is currently underway to deliver full year savings by 1.4.14. This will include identification of further opportunities for savings or income generation in-house in phase 2. Potential savings from alternative operating models will be identified as part of the Support Services Review.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

8,619

NET
£000

4,835

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	1,000	500	200	1,700
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	1,000	500	200	1,700

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

35.2%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

225.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

35.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

Training and up-skilling of staff at BSC, managers and business support staff.

Redundancy costs.

The BSC may be required to buy in additional external support to enable implementation of improved functionality in key areas to enable managers and employees to undertake a greater range of self- service activity with reduced resources.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

Increased efficiency; reduced costs; reduced duplication and waste; more joined up approach to customers with increased customer satisfaction overall. Impacts are likely to be felt equally across all customers.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Improved service delivery; more efficient; reduced cost, waste etc. in respect of sold services and organisations for whom we provide a service. Higher levels of self-service are likely to be required from external and internal customers. This may impact negatively on the level of sold services and income generated.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Improved transactional service delivery, efficiency and value for money in terms of Nottinghamshire County Council day to day operations.

Reduced levels of debt and timescales for recovery.

Prompt and efficient payment of suppliers within terms.

Positive impact on Nottinghamshire County Council reputation.

Impact on managers, schools and employees in terms of new processes and ways of working - increasing self-service will impact on workloads and roles elsewhere in the Council.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

The proposals are not likely to have a disproportionate adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Risk 1: Impact of increasing levels of self service on managers, employees and external customers at a time when available resources are under increasing pressure or decreasing.

Mitigating actions: Managers will require training and support to enable them to fulfil these requirements. Development of a menu or range of service offers would enable external customers to choose the level of support and service they require and can afford and enable a more personalised approach.

Risk 2: Potential impact on levels of sold services and income generation.

Mitigating actions: Need to ensure customers can choose appropriate levels of service provision they require and how they access these and that these are appropriately developed, fully-costed and effectively marketed.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A22

1 SERVICE AREA

HR and Customer Services - Operational and Strategic HR

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To save £547,000 by 2016/17 on operational and strategic Human Resources (HR) support to the County Council and schools by developing online support and resources for managers and focussing HR resources on achieving the Council's strategic priorities.

To review day to day HR activity and support to managers and head teachers with revised service level agreements and contracts with greater focus on customer management. This will include full implementation of the business partner role and enhanced account management activity.

The proposal will result in less HR involvement in day to day operational and people management matters with increased focus on organisational change, workforce planning and development etc. whilst empowering and enabling managers/head teachers to effectively manage staff on a day to day basis. Managers and head teachers will be increasingly required to self-serve for operational HR activity.

In order to support managers in their roles HR policies and procedures will be reviewed and streamlined, made easier to use and access.

Savings will be achieved by reduction in HR staff (5fte by voluntary redundancy) and deletion of vacant posts held or filled on a temporary basis.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The HR team develops proposals and ensures effective implementation of HR policies, strategies and action plans in relation to workforce and organisational development at a strategic level. The HR service is responsible for the development and maintenance of effective employee relations and employee engagement frameworks across the Council. The team also provides HR advice and support to Nottinghamshire County Council employees and managers and to other organisations via sold services. We have already created a pooled HR service to maximise flexibility and use of resources and mitigate the impact of previous budget reductions. 2014/15 savings of £500k have been brought forward to 2013/14 and delivered an additional 9 - 12 months of savings.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

-

NET
£000

1,012

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	500	0	47	547
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	500	0	47	547

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET? 54.1%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

36.5

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

5.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

Redundancy costs. The remainder of the reductions will be made through deletion of vacant posts.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

Reduced levels of support and differently provided HR advice and guidance to managers may potentially impact on managers' capacity to ensure effective and efficient delivery of good quality services on a day to day basis.

The change in focus of the service and pooled operating model should support implementation of organisational change with less resource.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Reduced HR resources may affect the take up of sold services to other organisations such as schools and levels of customer satisfaction. This may result in reduced levels of income from sold services and impact on the on-going relationship between the County Council and schools within Nottinghamshire.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Reduced HR resources will result in increasing levels of self service for internal and external customers. This may impact on the uptake of sold services and impact on workloads for managers and head teachers at a time when resources are increasingly under pressure.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

The proposals apply equally to all employees and managers across the Council. They are unlikely to have a disproportionate or adversely negative direct impact on people with protected characteristics. HR staff do advise managers and head teachers in relation to support for employees with protected characteristics and will continue to do so.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Risk 1: Increased risk in terms of Employment Tribunal claims, costs and reputational risk. Reduced overview and monitoring of compliance by managers also poses a potential risk. Mitigating actions: Refocus of the service and full implementation of the business partner role will help mitigate the impact of the reductions in HR staff for Nottinghamshire County Council managers. Making it easier for managers to self-serve in terms of online access to policies, procedures, guidance and training will also be essential to ensure that managers are able to access the necessary support.

Risk 2: Perceived reduction in the level of support offered by the Council to schools and other key partners and stakeholders.

Mitigating actions: In order to ensure that head teachers continue to be adequately supported, HR staff will need to develop the account management and business partner function with schools; increasing the level of customer focus and responsiveness to customer needs.

Risk 3: Reduced levels of income from sold services.

Mitigating actions: Service offers and contracts will need to be developed to offer flexibility in terms of service provision and cost to meet customer needs and expectations.

Risk 4: Further reductions in HR support would result in further decrease in service levels, quality or the range of support provided or reduction in income generated from these services.

Mitigating actions: Consider alternative operating models as part of the shared service review to see if they can offer additional savings whilst mitigating further risks to service provision.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A23**1 SERVICE AREA**

HR and Customer Services - Health and Safety

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To refocus Health and Safety advice to priority service areas, sell expertise to external organisations and encourage greater take-up of online training and support tools for managers.

Areas for consideration include:

1. Increased manager self-service. Less general advice and support – more targeted and prioritised by key risk areas. This will be enabled by a review of policies, procedures and guidance to make them easier to access and to use by managers.
2. Reduction in inspection regime and auditing of compliance with increased self-inspection by service areas.
3. Review OHSAS British Standard (Occupational Health and Safety Assessment Series) accreditation.
4. Integration of health and safety resources retained in some front line service areas to deliver efficiencies and economies of scale and effective professional development.
5. Review training delivery to move to greater commissioning if at comparable quality and reduced costs. This is most likely for low value, generic training. For retained in-house delivery - move to e-learning and more cost effective methods. NB: Need to make sure this is perceived as good value to retain sold services.
6. Income generation - could sell more specialist training, advice and support to the external market and generate income. Already exceed income target.
7. Pre-qualification work with suppliers and contractors to ensure the risk is adequately managed and reduce the number of ad hoc inspections required by the safety team.
8. Explore options of sharing service delivery with other public sector organisations.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The health and safety team is responsible for the development, maintenance and effective implementation of the Council's overall Health and Safety Management System. The team also monitors and audits performance and compliance with policy, legal and good practice requirements. The team offers professional and technical advice and support and training to managers and head teachers via sold services to schools. The rationale for the proposals is to review current health and safety provision to deliver services at lower cost by increased levels of self service by managers and reduced spend such as OHSAS accreditation, training costs etc. and identify options for increased generation of income.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

723

NET
£000

359

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	80	0	0	80
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	80	0	0	80

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

22.3%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

15.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

3.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)
Possible redundancy costs.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

The Council needs to ensure sufficient support to managers and monitoring and auditing of compliance to ensure effective management of risk to employees, the public and service users. These proposals seek to achieve this and support effective front line service delivery and achievement of the desired outcomes for citizens at reduced cost.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

These proposals would lead to improved value for money for sold services whilst allowing the Council to continue with a similar level of service provision which is popular with schools and other partners and stakeholders. Providing services jointly with key stakeholders would ensure consistent, joined up service provision. We have a high quality service, highly regarded, with high levels of experience and technical expertise at relatively low cost which is in short supply in the market which other organisations could benefit from.

The team currently exceeds its income target. Any significant further reductions in staffing within the team, beyond those set out in the proposal, will reduce capacity to generate income where there is a clearly defined and buoyant market within which we are well-placed to provide high quality, good value specialist services to partners and other stakeholders in addition to the wider market.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

The proposals seek to ensure flexible, efficient, value for money services with a clear service offer and monitoring of performance which effectively manages risk and ensures legal compliance whilst focussing on strategic priorities. This is an area of specialist technical expertise therefore we need to be sure of the competence of any provider and the quality of the service and monitor this carefully. The proposals would ensure increased efficiency; greater consistency; reduced waste and duplication; improved value for money with appropriate specialist support for professional staff. This is a high quality service, highly regarded, with high levels of experience and technical expertise at relatively low cost which is in short supply in the market. Nottinghamshire County Council may be able to use this as a trade off with other sold services and exploit the wider benefits to the Council of maintaining closer relationships with schools and partners to effectively and proactively manage risk, costs and any potential liabilities which may arise.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

There is no disproportionate or adversely negative impact on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Risk 1: Nottinghamshire County Council is a large complex organisation providing a wide range of services to some of the most vulnerable people in the County. Effective management of risks to service users their families and the public in general; employees and contractors is critical. The resource allocated to support managers in their day to day operational management has been reduced over the last three to four years. Significant further reductions in the service would impact on the effective implementation of the Council's health and safety management framework and day to day management of risk with potential for inadequate identification and management of risks and potential failure in legal compliance. This could result in injury to staff and service users, legal action, fines and reputational risk.

Mitigating actions: These proposals seek to mitigate the impact of further reductions by ensuring better value for money and generating income whilst still supporting managers to undertake their day to day health and safety responsibilities.

Risk 2: Less independent inspection, auditing and monitoring of compliance could lead to less effective and proactive identification of risks at an early stage.

Mitigating actions: Robust training for managers and head teachers, regularly refreshed, is increasingly important and ensuring that the principles of good health and safety practice are regularly applied on a day to day basis and become part of business as usual is critical. This will require senior managers to routinely review practice as part of the EPDR and routine supervision processes.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A24

1 SERVICE AREA

HR and Customer Services - Job Evaluation and Organisation Design

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

The proposal is to delete the Senior Analyst post to achieve £41k early delivery of saving from 31.5.13. and then review alternative opportunities for further reducing the cost of service delivery. Options for consideration include:

1. Buying-in the service in total or considering an alternative service provider and test the market. It is likely to be more costly to undertake evaluations externally and they are unlikely to have the extensive local knowledge which the existing job analysts do. But we could explore external validation of all or some of the process whilst retaining some moderation activity to maintain accreditation and protection from equal pay claims.
2. Explore sharing of process/service/validation with districts/other stakeholders.
3. Review and streamline processes with reduced levels of moderation/validation.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The Job Evaluation and Organisation Team was initially created to implement the job evaluation process as part of the Single Status agreement with the intention that a core team would be retained to ensure robust and consistent application of the evaluation scheme and an overview of grades and structures across the Council. Any additional temporary resources to undertake the implementation programme have ceased leaving a core team of 4 FTE. Work on phase 1 and phase 2 implementation of the job evaluation programme for support staff in schools is now complete. The Council and schools are now in the maintenance phase of the process with the team evaluating grades for new and changed roles only. The Job Evaluation and Organisation Design team has been integrated into the wider operational HR service to increase flexibility and join up service delivery to get the maximum from the service. Two analysts and administrative support remain so further staff reductions are difficult if we retain the service in-house. Some capacity is necessary to evaluate changed posts as part of the current round of budget savings and service redesign and ensure that outcomes are in line with the Pay Strategy and Single Status Agreement.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

152

NET
£000

152

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	41	0	0	41
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	41	0	0	41

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET? 27.0%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

4.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

1.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)
Redundancy costs.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

Limited direct impact on service users.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

There is a potential impact on academies and schools who buy back the service and use the outcomes of job evaluation to manage equal pay issues if the Council's resource is not sufficiently responsive and flexible to meet requirements for evaluations for new and changed jobs or does not adequately understand the background and context. This could create equal pay liabilities and may impact on the take up of sold services by schools and therefore the level of income to the Council.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

The Council needs to have an agreed, robust, clearly demonstrable and independent mechanism to consistently evaluate roles to manage equal pay issues and potential liabilities going forward.

If the Council continues to use Hay for job evaluation then we need to have a moderation process to retain accreditation. The current and proposed staffing arrangements meet these requirements. However, any further reductions in the service would impact on the level of flexibility, responsiveness and ability to support managers in relation to redesign and transformation of the Council.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

The proposals do not have a disproportionate, adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Risk 1: Risk of legal challenge and significant cost of award, legal fees and reputational risk.

Mitigating actions: Evaluation of grades using externally validated tools and robust application of this approach across the Council by knowledgeable and experienced staff who understand the organisation, mitigates the risk of significant and costly equal pay claims with associated reputational risk.

Risk 2: That the reduced service is not sufficient to support the Council's change and organisational redesign process within the required timescales going forward.

Mitigating actions: Mitigation of the risk of reducing the service further has been achieved by incorporating the job evaluation team within the wider HR service. This ensures a more joined up, consistent approach to service delivery and support to reorganisation, service redesign and restructures and ensures that the analysts have a better understanding of the service areas thus improving evaluation outcomes. This and the business partner role more widely will also improve access to the whole range of advice needed by managers and head teachers in undertaking these activities.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A25

1 SERVICE AREA

HR and Customer Services - Occupational Health and Wellbeing

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

1. Reduce costs of existing provision further - reduce insurance costs by £3k and reduce premises costs. Total saving to be confirmed.
2. Cease provision of the discretionary counselling service and signpost employees to other providers. (£46k saving).
3. Suggest we reconsider in the medium term:
 - a. Buy-in Occupational Health advice from the private sector. When we considered this in 2011/12 it was more costly as providers want to sell whole Employee Assistance packages.
 - b. Review the position with the NHS now Public Health have transferred into the Council – potential opportunity. When considered in 2011/12 it was more costly.
 - c. Share service with other Councils or jointly commission. We used to do this with City.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The team is responsible for ensuring that the Council has an effective strategic approach to the health and wellbeing of its employees and that this supports key strategic priorities of the Council as a good employer and in relation to its wider Public Health responsibilities. The Occupational Health team specifically provides advice and support on preventative and proactive programmes of activity in addition to advice and support on specific individual cases. This includes advice in relation to the requirements of the Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS) and reasonable adjustments for employees with disabilities in line with the Equality Act. The Council must ensure access to medical advice due to LGPS requirements etc. as a minimum service. The Council reviewed the Occupational Health Service in 2011/12 to consider outsourcing the whole package. At that time it was most cost effective to cease the mediation service, outsource counselling and redesign the in-house OHU service and renegotiate contracts. It is now suggested that we re-consider alternative service models. Increasing salaries for nurses and doctors make this more attractive but will increase potential costs of an outsourced service. There are other potential options available to us now. The counselling service is discretionary - we have tightened the criteria to limit access to the service to work related issues and restricted the number of sessions available but it is difficult to separate work and home issues. The proposal is that employees to be signposted to other routes to access the service or contribute to the cost of the service.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

366

NET
£000

151

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	49	0	0	49
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	49	0	0	49

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET? 32.5%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

4.4

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

0.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

None

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

1. Impact in terms of availability of flexible, trained and experienced staffing resources to deliver frontline services to citizens and the quality of service delivered.
2. Higher levels of absence and reduced levels of employee engagement may impact on service provision and customer satisfaction unless managed carefully.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

1. Potential impact on the level of income generated and customer satisfaction with sold service. Also potential reduction in costs of sold services.
2. If counselling is not available as a sold service this may impact on take up of Occupational Health services and income generation more widely as currently this is part of the offer. Competitors are likely to continue to provide this service.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

1. Move away from a resilience and preventative wellbeing approach to a less effective reactive response once issues have arisen will increase absence levels and associated costs.
2. May have a negative impact on morale and motivation of the workforce and levels of employee engagement.
3. May have a negative impact on achievement of Public Health workforce targets.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

The proposals apply equally to all employees, including those with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Risk: There is potential for the Council to reduce its ability to effectively and proactively manage absence leading to increased absence levels and associated costs; this may lead to an increased likelihood of personal injury and employment tribunal claims with reduced ability to defend claims with associated costs.

Mitigating actions: The Council needs to ensure it continues to have access to adequate and appropriately qualified, experienced and knowledgeable service provision to prevent this.

Risk: schools will cease to buy back this and other services if the offer is significantly reduced.

Mitigating actions: ensure the level of services provided to schools is maintained to encourage continued back and generation of income.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A26**1 SERVICE AREA**

HR and Customer Services - Workforce and Organisational Development Team

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

Review and refocus the Council's existing workforce and organisational development service to support corporate priorities and make £1 million in savings during 2014/15 by:

- Reprioritising the range of training available to focus on statutory requirements and key organisational and service targets
- Developing a commissioning model to purchase learning and development activity - working jointly with partners where possible. This will involve a core team of commissioners, a contract compliance function to ensure quality assurance supporting a small team of trainers retained to deliver specialist frontline training.
- Using the Nottinghamshire and East Midlands joint training commissioning portal for very generic training (e.g. fire safety, first aiders) where this is cost effective. The Council is still likely to want to retain control of some areas e.g. social worker training, post qualifying training and safeguarding training.
- Exploring joint service provision/commissioning with districts, other counties and health on more specialist training.
- We have already introduced a hierarchy of learning and development to utilise non-classroom based training and to maximise the use of e-learning, self-directed learning etc. This could be extended further across the board and promoted to encourage take up.
- Consideration of Futures taking on management of traineeships etc. as well as apprentices as part of a commissioned programme of support.
- Consideration of further integration of learning and development activity and budgets in departments e.g. Highways; ICT; Catering, Cleaning and Landscapes; MAPA training in Children's Services etc.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

This team is the integrated learning and development, workforce planning and organisational development team for the whole Council. In addition to commissioning and providing training the team supports managers in identifying future knowledge, skills and experience requirements and planning for ensuring that these are in place to ensure effective front line service delivery. In its organisational development role, the team also supports the cultural change of the organisation and supports the effective engagement of employees in day to day activity and transformation of the Council. Creation of an integrated Workforce and Organisational Development team for the whole Council generated savings of £2.2m. £600k of £1m 2014/15 target is already on track to be delivered by a combination of some of the activities set out above. Further development and application of these options will deliver the remainder. The next phase of this integration is to further rationalise services and move towards more cost effective methods of workforce development including greater commissioning of training rather than direct delivery where this is appropriate.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

2,288

NET
£000

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	1,000	0	0	1,000
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	1,000	0	0	1,000

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

N/A

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

42.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

4.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project) Redundancy costs.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

The Council needs to ensure it has multi-skilled and appropriately trained employees to deliver cost effective services. Effective employee engagement is important to secure support and to safeguard existing levels of customer satisfaction.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Development of joint commissioning arrangements are likely to benefit other partners. Reduction in spend on training, venues etc. may impact on local providers. Some partners use their access to Nottingham County Council's training service to meet core workforce development needs, which may be unavailable in the future.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Further reduction in resources could have a potential impact on employee and managerial ability and levels of confidence to enable fulfilment of roles and responsibilities. There is also a potential impact on employee morale and motivation. We need to ensure that the learning and development which is available is adequate to support a multiskilled, flexible workforce to deliver organisational change and secure savings. We also need to ensure we retain the ability to recruit, retain and grow our own staff in critical front line services where there are shortages of key skills nationally and locally. Effective leadership skills and behaviours are critical and we need to ensure managers are adequately supported in leading organisational change.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

The proposals apply equally to all employees and do not disproportionately or adversely negatively impact on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Risks: That employees do not have the necessary knowledge, skills and experience to undertake their roles and are not sufficiently flexible to meet service needs with reduced resources.

Mitigating actions: Using more cost effective methods of delivery of training, where appropriate; effective workforce planning and effective commissioning of training will mitigate the risk and impacts set out above and ensure that the Council has a flexible, appropriately skilled and experienced workforce which is able to adapt and respond to the changing needs of service users and context and environment within which we are operating.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A27**1 SERVICE AREA**

HR and Customer Services - Customer Service Centre (1)

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To make it easier for customers to contact the County Council in the most convenient way, by continuing to transfer public contact to the telephone or online web access, achieving savings of £365,000 by 2016/17.

This will include:

1. Continuing the programme of review with service areas to transfer basic call handling and enquiries to the web or Customer Service Centre (CSC) unless there is a clear business case otherwise - creating a consistent front door for access to services. This will use outputs from lean+ and service review processes and the channel shift project.
2. Using the Channel shift project to provide tools for services to be transferred to digital or more cost effective channels thus reducing resource requirements/freeing up capacity at the CSC (a 2-3 year project). Savings are potentially in departments and at CSC. Currently we are scoping potential savings and piloting use of tools across the Council. Potential savings at CSC from channel shift are 15/16 onwards.
3. Review the CSC structure to better integrate customer development and operational functions to ensure sufficient capacity and effective joining up between the operational and customer development functions to enable channel shift and to respond to the impact over time of increased use of digital channels for service access.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The Customer Service Centre is based at Annesley and provides access to, and in some cases directly provides, a range of front line services on behalf of the Council. This includes service access requests and enquiries via email, telephone and face to face from a variety of different venues throughout the County. We will review services to ensure they are accessible to all; provide value for money; offer efficient access to council services to consistent standards at all times and through routes accessible for the customer. To make best use of scarce and costly professional and technical staffing resources in departments we will channel basic enquiries, information requests and access requests through more cost effective channels; utilising specialist customer service skills where necessary. This approach will allow employees with specialist professional and technical skills to focus on more complex requests and releasing capacity and/or generating savings in departments. Initially this may result in requirements for increased resources in the Customer Service Centre which will reduce over time as activity is increasingly migrated to digital channels.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

3,732

NET
£000

3,614

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	45	200	120	365
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	45	200	120	365

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

10.1%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

92.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

10.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

Potential costs of making changes to software and systems used and some new applications. Potential web development costs. Details to be confirmed.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

1. Improved access to frontline services, ability to self-serve and increased customer satisfaction.
2. Reduced cost.
3. Consistent approach to customers with consistent standards - one front door.
4. Improved customer focus, feedback and customer information.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

1. Improved access to Nottinghamshire County Council and information, services and advice.
2. Improved levels of satisfaction and reputation of Nottinghamshire County Council with partners, business etc.
3. Potential for closer working and sharing of access to services - reduced waste and duplication, increased efficiency and potential savings for partners.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

1. Increased customer satisfaction and improved reputation for Nottinghamshire County Council
2. Reduced costs of access to services and basic service provision, freeing up professional and technical expertise and resources for complex service delivery and to meet complex needs.
3. Supports the delivery of cashable and non-cashable benefits in departments and frontline services.
4. Potential for generation of income.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

It is not believed that the proposal will have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Risk: That some citizens are disadvantaged or unable to access services easily.

Mitigating action: The Council needs to ensure customers retain a degree of choice and control as to how they access services whilst encouraging access via particular routes and channels. This will require a range of access routes to make sure no specific service users are disadvantaged, especially the most vulnerable. The business cases for customer services include provision of a number of ways to access services.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A28

1 SERVICE AREA

HR and Customer Services - Customer Service Centre (2)

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To sell the services available from the Council's Customer Service Centre or share service delivery with other public sector partners to identify £100,000 of saving opportunities by 2015/16.

1. In the short term generate additional income or other benefits by sold services and/or sharing of services with other public sector organisations. Use this as proof of concept and as a key milestone in determining whether the Council wishes to develop the shared service model further.
2. Continue to review the operation of the Customer Service Centre to further improve efficiency and generate further savings or release capacity for more intensive work such as triage, outbound calls to customers etc.
3. Consider options for development of a full shared service centre in the medium term with other Councils, health and other public sector partners. This will require separate approval, business case and project plan if this approach is supported.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The Customer Service Centre is based in Annesley and provides access to, and in some cases directly provides, a range of front line services on behalf of the Council. This includes service access requests and enquiries via email, telephone and face to face from a variety of different venues throughout the County. Over the past four years the efficiency and performance of the Customer Service Centre has improved significantly with the service performing well above average compared to other local authorities. Over the past four years, the budget has been decreased by 36% whilst enquiries have increased by 169%. The cost per contact has reduced from an average of £12.20 to £4.50. Further operational savings can be identified and additional income generated by selling services to other public sector organisations. If a full shared service centre is to be developed then this has potential for greater cashable and non-cashable benefits and will require a two to three year project to implement. In the short term, smaller scale sharing of services with districts etc. will act as proof of concept.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

3,732

NET
£000

3,614

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	50	50	0	100
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	50	50	0	100

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET? 2.8%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

102.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

0.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project) Upgrading and development of systems and review of processes.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

1. Improved access to frontline services, ability to self-serve and increased customer satisfaction.
2. Reduced cost and improved value for money for Nottinghamshire citizens
3. Consistent approach to customers with consistent standards - 1 front door.
4. Improved customer focus, feedback and customer information.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

1. Improved access to Nottinghamshire County Council information, services and advice.
2. Improved levels of satisfaction and reputation of Nottinghamshire County Council with partners, business etc.
3. Potential for closer working and sharing of access to services - reduced waste and duplication, increased efficiency and potential savings for partners.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

1. Increased customer satisfaction and improved reputation for Nottinghamshire County Council.
2. Reduced costs of access to services and basic service provision.
3. Cashable and non-cashable benefits in departments and frontline service delivery.
4. Potential for generation of income.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

These proposals are likely to improve access to services for citizens overall and are unlikely to have a disproportionate or adversely negative impact on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Risk: That with less control over service access it is difficult to maintain consistency of service standards from the Council's and partners' perspectives.

Mitigating Actions: We need to ensure adequate standards and consistency of customer service are maintained by the robust application of agreed customer service standards and best practice and maintenance of a degree of control/influence over how services are provided.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A29

1 SERVICE AREA

HR and Customer Services - Customer Service Centre - review of face to face service access

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

Review face to face access to services. Potential options being considered :

1. Reduce opening hours and coverage across the County
2. Continue the move into libraries, other partner premises etc. to reduce running costs
3. Jointly commission services with partners
4. Share service delivery with key partners such as districts.
5. Provide face to face access differently using digital technology
6. Cease face to face provision completely once appropriate alternative arrangements are in place.

Discussions are taking place with district partners to develop a jointly commissioned model to provide face to face support and access for Nottinghamshire citizens using shared premises and staffing and maximising the use of digital technology in hard to reach areas to enable all citizens to effectively access services; including the most vulnerable.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

Face to face is the most expensive way for customers to access services. Previously the budget was reduced from approximately £970k to £225k and the service transferred to the customer service centre to join up with other customer access channels. This has enabled economies of scale and a more co-ordinated and consistent approach to customers. Face to face provision is important in particular parts of the county and for particular vulnerable groups to ensure they are not disadvantaged or excluded from accessing services. The intention now is to look at "smarter" ways of delivering face to face customer access to front line services by working more closely across NCC services (e.g. libraries), sharing service provision with partners such as districts and using digital technology to support the delivery of services.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

3,732

NET
£000

3,614

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	100	0	0	100
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	100	0	0	100

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET? 2.8%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

11.5

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

5.5

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

Potential ICT costs if utilise digital solutions - funding set aside for this. Potential redundancy costs.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

Retention of face to face provision will ensure the most vulnerable, who may not be able to utilise other channels, are still able to access services. Face to face provision is rated highly by some customers with high levels of customer satisfaction so its retention is likely to be popular. This needs to be balanced with the cost of provision of service and fact that it will only be available at certain times. More seamless, joined up provision with districts is likely to be popular and reduce waste, duplication and inefficiency - providing better value for money for customers.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Sharing delivery and/or joint commissioning of this provision with district councils will generate benefits for both organisations as well as our customers. Increased flexibility at reduced costs with reduced waste and inefficiency would make it more cost effective to retain this channel. This could potentially lead to closer working and sharing of access to services with reduced waste and duplication, increased efficiency and potential savings for partners.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

1. Increased customer satisfaction and improved reputation for Nottinghamshire County Council.
2. It would enable us to retain an access channel which otherwise it would be too costly to do so whilst we encourage people to shift to digital channels if possible.
3. Using digital technology would encourage and allow us to educate citizens to enable channel shift.
4. This approach would ensure all service users can access services.
5. There is potential for generation of income.
6. There is a reputational risk if we cease provision.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

If support for face to face access to services was ceased completely it could disproportionately and adversely negatively impact on people with protected characteristics. These proposals therefore retain some face to face access to services so that the impact is not disproportionate or negative.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Risk: That we reduce face to face support to people who need this route to access services easily too quickly and to the point where particular groups of people are disadvantaged or unable to access services.

Mitigating Actions: the Council needs to ensure there are a range of access routes so as to not disadvantage particular groups of service users and ensure that our most vulnerable service users are able to access frontline services and allow customers to retain a degree of choice and control as to how they access services whilst encouraging and educating them to access services via particular routes and channels.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A30

1 SERVICE AREA

Transport, Property and Environment - Catering and Facilities Management - County Offices

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To revise the cleaning schedules at remaining County Council office buildings with new modernised office layouts which will deliver savings of up to £300k by 2016/17. This will lead to 12 full time post equivalent reductions. To reduce cleaning hours allocated to the County Offices by introducing revised hours and ways of working. To standardise office operating regimes for Nominated Property Officer, Nominated Property Contacts and key holders without impacting on the standards of service delivery. Standardising operating regimes will ensure the most efficient and effective service can be provided with a documented supporting Health and Safety compliant system.

In addition the rationalising of office accommodation will provide a reduction of on-going property related maintenance and utility costs of a further £300k by 2016/17. It should be noted that out of the £4.8m budget, £3.2m of costs is related to Business Rates, Depreciation, Rents and Utilities therefore savings represent 37%.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The roll-out of the ways of working programme, e.g. reduction on individual offices and the introduction of clear desk policies will allow a reduction in the cleaning hours required to maintain the County Offices of County Hall, Trent Bridge House, Sir John Robinson House, Sherwood Energy Village and Meadow House . This proposal excludes any potential savings in the daily operation of office services which may be available in other offices subject to further investigation. It should be noted that these reductions are in addition to an annual £300k cost reduction achieved over the period 2011/13 by reduced cleaning hours, amalgamation of post rooms, courier services and stationery provisions.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

5,347

NET
£000

4,658

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	300	200	100	600
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	300	200	100	600

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET? 12.9%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

47.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

12.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

Potentially some redundancy costs however it is anticipated these will be reduced by natural wastage of staff or redeployments.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

Some users may notice a slight difference on existing levels of service however it will be minimal and it is planned to increase customer communications and feedback via the tenant association groups.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Some of the offices have public access however these areas will remain a priority for servicing arrangements.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Service users are office based staff from all departments within the County Council other than already identified.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

It is not believed that the proposal will have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

The risks involved are ensuring the clear desk policy is rolled out and that new ways of working are adopted in all County Council Offices with continued buy-in from building occupiers. However, these are considered minimal and therefore no mitigating actions are proposed. Equally the savings can only be realised if the planned reduction in the property portfolio goes ahead.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A31

1 SERVICE AREA

Transport, Property and Environment - Property - Core Property - Staffing

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To restructure the Property Group to achieve £267,000 in efficiency savings.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

A review of the structure of the Property Group has been undertaken that seeks to rationalise work stream activities, setting clear parameters for work flow and identify opportunities for reducing the number of posts while improving overall service delivery. A total of seven posts have been initially identified for removal from the current property group structure. A further two posts may become vacant as leavers allow further changes to be implemented.

It is important to note that over 40% of the 134 posts within the property group are in some form linked to the capital programme of works and are considered to be posts that are fee earning , effectively generating a net surplus to the revenue budget of £300,000. The remainder of the Group undertakes core functions such as strategy development; ensuring compliance with statutory regulations and providing support to the essential operation of the Group. As a result in the short-term opportunities for extensive staff budget reductions is limited.

It should be noted that these proposed staffing savings are on top of a reduction of approximately 50% in staffing levels during 2010/11. The fee earning staff in design and operations will, over the next 2-3 years, continue to reduce due to the reduction in capital and revenue budgets. This will have a neutral effect on revenue budget except for the corresponding loss of contribution. At present circa 70% of the professional services delivered are procured externally and this may continue to grow

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

4,941

NET
£000

2,740

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving - staffing	167	100	0	267
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	167	100	0	267

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET? 9.7%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

134.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

7.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

Three posts are vacant posts leaving potentially four staff that will be displaced by the proposals. If redeployment within Nottinghamshire County Council is unsuccessful then a one off redundancy cost will arise during 2013/14. Two additional posts may become vacant. They will be removed from the structure due to the post holders securing new employment.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

The restructure has been conducted to preserve and enhance service delivery; there should be no negative impact on service users due to improved processes

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

There will be no negative impact. It is envisaged that on the design delivery side of the Group that staff numbers will expand and contract in line with the demand related to the capital programme and any successful bids for providing external services that generates additional income.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

The restructure has been conducted in a manner that aims to preserve and enhance service delivery; there should be no negative impact on service users.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

It is not believed that the proposal will have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

The restructure seeks to maximise the opportunity for the Property Group to perform effectively and efficiently, with the new management structure in place and work flows rationalised the next 12 months.

During the course of next year, more extensive asset management planning principles will be embedded and improved performance will deliver significant cost savings to the Council in terms of revenue and capital work. Revenue savings through a focused and objective management of the property portfolio combined with the increased return from land/strategy management will yield further savings to the Council.

Further savings are also possible once there is total integration of property related staffing and functions across the Council. These savings are presently unquantifiable but it is reasonable to assume savings in the region of £220,000 - £300,000 are possible once this review has been implemented.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A32

1 SERVICE AREA

Transport, Property and Environment - Property - Property staffing in non- property departments

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To centralise all property professionals from across the Council within the Property Group and streamline the service to achieve £250,000 in savings.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

A significant down- sizing, of the property group, approximately 50%, occurred during 2010/11 coinciding at a time of rising demand for property group services due to the School Capital Refurbishment Programme(SCR), the urgent need to rationalise the property estate and to secure capital receipts. Due to increased demand for help and support, a number of departments employed property professionals. With the Property Group now stabilised and the management structures refined to respond to present and future needs, the duplication of property staff across the organisation represents inefficiency. A two year action plan is being developed within Property that will involve the development of strategic asset management planning that will provide a clearer focus on how the property portfolio should be managed in the long term. This will assist in ensuring that property decisions are joined up across the organisation. It is considered that a holistic approach to property portfolio management will occur best if property staff are all integrated under the Property Group structure.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

N/A

NET
£000

N/A

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	0	50	200	250
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	0	50	200	250

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

N/A

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

N/A

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

N/A

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

If duplicated property posts cannot be redeployed within Nottinghamshire County Council then one off redundancy cost will arise during that at present is unquantifiable.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

The restructure of the property group will facilitate improved client liaison. Improvements will be demonstrated during the following 12 months and beyond.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

External organisations may have become familiar with a department contact. The change of arrangements will require careful communication to minimise any confusion until the new arrangements become embedded.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

The restructure of the property group and the focus for improvements has been conducted in a manner that aims to preserve and enhance service delivery; there should be no negative impact on service users.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

It is not believed that the proposal will have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

The restructure of the Property Group seeks to maximise the opportunity for the Group to perform effectively, efficiently and to rationalise work flows.

During the course of next year, more extensive asset management planning principles will be embedded and improved performance will deliver significant cost savings to the Council in terms of revenue and capital work. Revenue savings through a focused and objective management of the property portfolio combined with the increased return from land/strategy management will yield further savings to the Council. The success in achieving these improvements will assist in removing departmental anxiety over the loss of direct engaged staff. It should be noted that it is proposed that a phased approach to staff integration is adopted to build up confidence levels across the organisation. As posts are reduced there is a risk that departments affected could register the loss of the post as a budget saving which would double count the saving that has already been recorded under this proposal. To avoid this situation arising, it is proposed that posts identified are initially transferred into the Property Group along with the corresponding budget aligned with the post. Property will then review overall service delivery requirements and register any savings achieved through staff reductions, via the property staffing budget

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A33

1 SERVICE AREA

Transport, Property and Environment - Property - Planned Maintenance

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To reduce the planned building maintenance budget by £519,000 by 2016/17 from the works budget

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

There has been recent additional investment in planned maintenance in order to tackle urgent priority repairs particularly related to the need to ensure compliance with statutory requirements in such areas as Legionella testing; fire risk assessments and asbestos and via improvements work contained within the School Capital Refurbishment Programme (SCRCP) in 2013-15. As a result the most urgent need to tackle these priority work items has passed and the budget may be reduced. The Property Group will aim to meet statutory repair and maintenance requirements with a 10 % budget reduction. This is considered achievable. Any lower budget savings below 10% will be utilised to address priority 1 repairs achieving effectively as possible value for money.

It should be noted that £3m of the planned maintenance budget is already earmarked for SCRCP.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

5,037

NET
£000

5,037

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	0	0	519	519
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	0	0	519	519

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

10.3%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

0.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

0.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

None

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

Because of the worsening condition of the stock, there will be an increased risk of failure of heating and lighting systems and deterioration in the fabric of building which could result in closure of buildings. This would impact on service delivery and service users.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

School Capital refurbishment Programme will have seen a significant reduction in backlog but by no means complete removal of the outstanding urgent repairs. Priorities 2, 3 and 4 will move further up the hierarchy making it very difficult to keep primary schools operationally functional.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

There will be no funding for any refurbishment of administrative and front-line service buildings such as libraries, day centres and youth centres. These buildings will have an increased risk of building closures and higher day to day maintenance costs.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

It is not believed that the proposal will have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

At present the County Council has an estimated back-log for building maintenance of approximately £141m for priorities 1 and 2 in relation to works that should be undertaken in the next two years(the most urgent type of works). Even allowing for the School Capital Refurbishment Programme investment, there is £17 million of assessed need in relation to the corporate estate alone just for priority 1 which requires immediate attention. The current budget provision prior to the proposed reduction is not sufficient to prevent the escalation of priority 1 repairs re- occurring during the next two years. Nottinghamshire County Council's spend on planned maintenance compared to back-log maintenance, is less than half of the average in the sector which is approximately 9%+. This means that further budget reductions will increase the backlog and maintenance requirements both in the medium/long-term, leading to a deterioration in the condition of the buildings and increased costs to the Council in the long-term.

The important priority is to establish as soon as possible a repair and maintenance strategy that will identify what standard of condition can be achieved with an appropriate budget provision. An action plan is being prepared that will seek to have this developed within the next 12 months. This will help inform in an objective manner what impact the range of reductions will have on the property portfolio. It should be noted that the assumption is that no additional monies will be available for this budget which will leave the organisation with a decision whether to accept a deteriorating estate; a significantly reduced property portfolio or to consider alternative means of holding/funding property e.g. sale and leaseback

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A34**1 SERVICE AREA**

Highways - New Highways Contract

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

A new contract was awarded to deliver the following highway works:

- Resurfacing
- Surface Dressing
- Street Lighting Planned Column Replacement
- Carriageway resurfacing
- Road markings and studs
- Gully cleaning
- Earthworks, boundary works & land reclamation
- Vehicle safety barrier
- High friction surfacing

The new highways contract was awarded in January 2013 and started on 1st April 2013 for 10 years following a competitive procurement process.

The value of works expected to be delivered through the contract is £11.5M/year based on previous year budget allocations for the above works.

As part of the procurement process an analysis of the contract costs to current expenditure forecast a saving in the order of £2.17m/year. This will be delivered through the more efficient and cost effective delivery of planned capital highway works.

This will achieve a £1m saving to the capital programme and a revenue service saving of £1.17m through the capitalisation of that value of the carriageway patching currently funded from the revenue programme.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

These savings are already being made through the new contract.

Monitoring of the savings is through the highways contract management team.

Currently the Policy Committee decision is to reinvest the saving in highway maintenance.

This proposal will require the reversal of this policy committee decision to realise the saving.

Carriageway patching, currently revenue funded, will in future be funded by the highways capital programme with an allocation of £1.17M.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

-

NET
£000

11,500

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	1,170	0	0	1,170
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	1,170	0	0	1,170

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET? 10.2%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

5.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

0.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

No additional cost but contract management team needs to be maintained to ensure efficiency saving achieved. This is mainly funded through the capital programme.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

No direct impact on users from the efficiency saving and no service reduction from the 2012/13 position through this arrangement although during 2013/14 the road users and residents will have benefitted from an improved road condition from the re-investment of the £2.17m savings during 2013/14.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Reduced workload for Lafarge-Tarmac and their supply chain of £2.17m/annum of which 90% is contractually obliged to be spent locally.

No direct impact on other organisations from the efficiency saving and no service reduction from the 2012/13 position through this arrangement although during 2013/14 business in the County which rely on road based transport will have benefitted from an improved road condition from the re-investment of the £2.17m savings during 2013/14.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

No direct impact from the efficiency saving.

Potential impact from reduced employment opportunities through workload for Lafarge-Tarmac and their supply chain of £2.17m/annum of which 90% is contractually obliged to be spent locally.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

This proposal is an efficiency measure which is unlikely to directly affect service provision so does not negatively impact on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

This is an efficiency saving from competitive procurement therefore the service risks are minimal. There are two key risks to delivery of the efficiency saving:

1. The efficiency saving must be achieved through effective delivery of the contract. The works must be effectively planned through the Highways Programme, Design and Delivery Group. Staff resources in this group are mainly recharged to the highways capital programme through fees.

The contractor must be engaged in the planning of the programme and planning of each scheme at an early stage to deliver savings through effective resource management, works planning and innovation. Ensuring the co-location at Bilsthorpe is maintained is essential to achieving this. The contractor must deliver the works in a cost effective and efficient way whilst maintaining an acceptable quality of works.

To mitigate this risk the following arrangements are in place:

Strategic and operational boards are in place to over-view delivery of the contract and savings. The highways contract management team provide monitoring and challenge to arrangements to deliver the contract and performance of the contractor.

2. A reducing highways capital programme will reduce the level of savings that may be delivered

The efficiency savings described above are a percentage saved off the total value of the works. If the total value of works ordered through the contract is reduced there will be less work from which to make a saving.

As the majority of the work delivered through the contract is from the highways capital programme any significant reduction in the highways capital budget will reduce the level of savings that can be achieved through the contract.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A35

1 SERVICE AREA

Highways - Highway Operations Efficiency Project

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

This proposal pulls together several measures to reduce the cost and improve the efficiency of works delivered by the in-house works teams comprising the Highway Operations Group. These will allow budgets to be reduced without impact on service delivery.

These measures include:

- (a) Increased productivity of in-house works teams and reduced overheads
- (b) Reduction in the use of plant and reduction in transport costs;
- (c) Reduction in absence due to industrial injuries through review and control within the Health and Safety Management System (ISO18001);
- (d) Review and reduction of the Highway Emergency Response Service;
- (e) Reduction in the number of highway depots

Staff reductions relating to these efficiencies are estimated at 20 posts (Full Time Equivalents)

At the same time as preparing the savings measures a review of the future workload of the operations group has been undertaken. The Highways Operations Group operates as an in-house contractor and its workload will change as budgets change in addition to the savings and efficiencies measures.

Therefore the staff reductions shown in this Outline Business Case (OBC) is the total effect of reductions from the efficiency savings from this OBC together with reductions as a result of reduced workload to Highway Operations. It is important to bring these factors together here so that a clear message is available for the staff involved and to maximise redeployment opportunities by making the changes together.

The budget changes that will reduce future work load are mainly those relating to government grants for capital funding including a one-off grant of £2M in 2013/14 reducing to £1M in 2014/15 and then removed, considerable uncertainty about the capital Integrated Transport Measures (improvements) grant from 2015 onwards and arrangements for the Single Local Growth Fund. Some workload is reducing as types of highway improvements are changing – for example greater use of inter-active speed signs instead of traffic calming (road humps) reduces construction workload. Pressures on the revenue funded highways budget will continue to increase for example energy price increases will divert funding from highway works even with an ambitious energy saving programme planned, and the one off funding for carriageway repairs in 2013/14 of £1M is removed.

In total 69.3 posts are to be removed from the establishment however the Highways Division has been planning for most of these reductions for some time and 41 posts are therefore currently held vacant to off-set these reductions. Although the forecast for government grant from 2015 is less clear and the current best estimates have been used in the urgent review of future workload that is now brought together in this business case.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The Highway Operations Group operates as a separate internal contractor and holds no budgets directly. All staff costs are recharged to works budgets on the basis that if the in-house Operations Group did not deliver the works an external contractor would need to be procured with broadly the same works costs. The Highways Operations Group therefore operates a trading account which includes internal and some external work. Internal highways work is approximately split 50:50 between revenue and capital funding.

The already planned budget changes and forecast uncertainty for future government grant will reduce the maintenance and improvement works that can be delivered for the highway network and reduce the available workload for the Highways Operations Group.

The efficiency work streams identified in this proposal are all aimed at reducing the cost of delivering works to enable works budgets (not held by this group) to be reduced to realise the saving with no minimal on service delivery, but will lead to a staff reduction of 20 posts.

For each of the work streams identified, the detailed rationale/actions are:

(a) Improved productivity and reduced overheads. This saving will be realised by reducing the hourly rate charged to works. This is anticipated to be achieved during 2013/14 at a 7.4% reduction from the 2012/13 labour cost baseline. Staff reductions were made prior to 2013/14 in anticipation of this and for 2013/14 a part year effect will be shown in an increased trading account return.

(b) Plant and transport used in the delivery of highway functions has been reviewed and is in the process of being reduced. Further increased utilisation of plant and transport is intended to realise a cost reduction of approximately 5% from 2014/15.

(c) The number of H&S incidents as a result of works undertaken has continued a trend of reduction since the introduction of the ISO18001 across the Group. This trend continues and through robust management and training, it has been identified that cost reduction through a reduction in absence related to industrial injuries can be achieved. No staffing reductions are expected through this work as absence cover is generally made through external provision, but a cost reduction will be achieved.

(d) Currently Highway Operations Group provides the service to respond to and resolve incidents affecting the highway network both within and outside of working hours, for example supporting emergency services at Road Traffic Collisions or making safe highway defects reported out of hours. A review of current resource arrangements and cover has identified scope to reduce resources without significantly affecting the service provided. It is anticipated that this will realise cost reduction of approximately 8%. No staff reductions expected from this measure as it is currently delivered through overtime/standby, but a cost reduction will be achieved.

(e) Highways operations are currently delivered from nine depots across the county. A further reduction in the number of operational depots will reduce fixed overhead costs but may need some initial investment.

Note the figures below represent Highways Operations turnover for 2013/14, so that the saving may be seen against the turnover. Highway Operations Trading Account operates as a zero budget, and in fact delivers a £260k net surplus back to NCC in the year

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

27,700

NET
£000

27,700

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	900	0	100	1,000
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	900	0	100	1,000

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

3.6%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

338.8

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

69.3

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

Potential redundancy costs have been mitigated by the pro-active management of 41 vacancies to reduce these costs.

For the efficiency work-streams (a)-(d), this work is already in-hand within the Group and are expected to be delivered utilising existing resources but may in the future require some additional commercial resources.

For work-stream (e), there will be some additional investment required to accommodate transferring staff, however it is anticipated that any capital required would be offset against the capital receipts for the release of closed sites and savings made through reduced operating costs.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

There are service risks from the reduced funding for future highway maintenance and improvements which will be partially mitigated through the current processes of planning and prioritising these works. However there is a risk that the future level of highway maintenance and improvements will fall further below public and road user expectations for the service.

The impact on service users from the efficiency saving measures will be minimal as they relate mainly to operational processes.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

The current highways depot lease arrangements with Ashfield and Broxtowe District Councils will also be reviewed.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Minimal impact on other County Council service areas and risks and implications of reducing staff is mitigated by the advance planning in the Highways Division to retain a vacancy level of 41 posts in the group.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

This proposal is an efficiency measure which is unlikely to directly affect service provision so does not negatively impact on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

There are service risks from the reduced funding for future highway maintenance and improvements which will be partially mitigated through the current processes of planning and prioritising these works. However there is a risk that the future level of highway maintenance and improvements will fall further below public and road user expectations for the service.

Service risks from the efficiency savings are minimal as they relate to reducing cost whilst providing the same service.

The cumulative effect of reducing capital funding and revenue funding and work-load increases the risk that the full efficiency will not be achieved.

The key risks to delivery of the efficiency saving are

1. The efficiency savings are a percentage saved off the current total value of the works undertaken. If the total value of works ordered from Highway Operations is reduced there will be less work from which to make a saving. Therefore any significant reduction in the highways budget funding works delivered by the Highways Operations Group will reduce the level of savings that can be achieved. So for example a 10% reduction in the capital and revenue budgets would lead to 10% less work to be delivered more efficiently and cost effectively, this would lead to a potential short-fall in the saving of £102,000; this risk could be reduced if additional external work could be found and delivered but this is subject to open market conditions and cannot be guaranteed.
2. Work stream (a) has a staffing implication risk of up to a further 10 FTE if not balanced by an increased external turn-over – this is now included in the total staff implications for this business case.
3. It is not anticipated that there are any significant risks to delivering the savings proposed in work streams (b)-(d).
4. There is a risk that work stream (e) will not be delivered if:
 - (i) any new sites needed are not available,
 - (ii) the capital business case does not create a positive cost benefit, or
 - (iii) capital funding is not available.

The risks and implications of reducing staff is mitigated by the advance planning in the Highways Division to retain a vacancy level of 41 posts in the group. A close review will be continued for the emerging details of the government grant funding for highways and the overall implications of budget changes, savings and efficiencies. This is essential to maintain a highway operations group staff level that matches the base work-load supported as necessary through the current sub-contract framework. It should be noted that currently sub-contract work is reduced to a minimum.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A36**1 SERVICE AREA**

Highways - Carriageway pot hole and patching repairs

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

This proposal is to deliver efficiency savings through the introduction of a more effective pothole repair and patching service. This will reduce costs incurred through repeat visits to temporary repairs.

Carriageway patching and pot hole repair is the third highest area of expenditure within the routine revenue highways budget at some £2.9M a year.

It is also the subject of almost 7,000 enquiries to the authority every year.

Two thirds of all carriageway defects (including potholes) are found by Highway Inspectors with the other third reported by customers.

Whilst there will always be the need to fill some of these potholes urgently, under this proposal a higher proportion will be repaired through a planned programme of work.

The additional funding in 2013/14 of £1M for pothole repairs is being used to transform the process to enable more potholes to be repaired "right first time" through batching together patching works in urban areas and more effective planning of works as new processes are being developed.

In future years the new process will reduce costs and therefore the budget for pothole and patching repairs.

This will be achieved through increased efficiency and over a slightly longer period reduced return to previously temporary repairs.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The County Council's current policy and practice results in many carriageway defects (including potholes) being classified as requiring repair within 24 hours.

Delivery of repairs may only be undertaken within 24 hours on a temporary basis as there is no opportunity to batch together the repairs and no opportunity to plan the resources (plant, labour and materials) needed to undertake permanent repair works.

Through a review of the current policy and practice it is proposed that many of the carriageway defects may reasonably be classified as requiring repair within a longer time period up to 28 days. This will allow works programmes to be planned and resourced to undertake these as permanent repairs or done right first time.

Many adjacent local authorities have already changed their policies and procedures to move towards this approach including Derbyshire, Leicestershire and Northamptonshire.

Some repairs will need to be undertaken more urgently and may remain temporary to achieve a shorter repair time.

Also if quantities of repairs exceed the resources available for permanent repair programmes these also may need to be temporarily fixed – for example immediately following a severe winter.

As the new process is established current policies and procedures will be updated.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

3,656

3,656

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	0	100	100	200
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	0	100	100	200

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

5.5%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

0.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

0.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

There are some one-off costs through investment in plant to undertake inlay patching (mini-planers etc.) but these costs are contained within the Highways Operations trading account. The savings achieved will be deferred as shown in the profile of the estimated savings.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

Service users may experience an increased time between reporting a pot hole and repair as a planned approach to works will extend the time for repair from a few days to a few weeks.

As many carriageway defects (including potholes) can be present for some time before they are reported or inspected there is unlikely to be any increased risk to service users.

Right first time means that each repair will take slightly longer but return visits will largely be eliminated so overall disruption to road users will reduce.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Any other organisation that uses the Nottinghamshire road network will be impacted as per the above.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Any other part of the County Council that uses the Nottinghamshire road network will be impacted as per the above.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

This proposal is mainly an efficiency saving without direct impact on service delivery with a risk of impact to drivers and cyclists therefore unlikely to disproportionately negatively impact on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

i) Many defects are present some time before reporting or inspection and personal injury from carriageway defects will continue to be monitored and reviewed.

ii) A change of policy is needed to reflect this proposal.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A37**1 SERVICE AREA**

Highways - Highway Safety Shared Service

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

This proposal is to remove the current County Council contribution to the existing Highway Safety shared service through further development of the shared service to avoid any service reduction.

Currently, the County Council, City Council, the Highways Agency and Police jointly fund and work in partnership to manage the speed of drivers in Nottinghamshire and influence inappropriate driving behaviour, such as not wearing a seat belt. This includes the cost of running the fixed safety (speed) cameras and associated enforcement.

The County contributes £400k to this shared service and this proposal is to remove this contribution of £400k subject to negotiation with the other partners.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

For some traffic offences the police are able to offer road safety educational courses instead of an endorsement of the licence. The cost to offenders is the same but instead of a fine a charge for the educational course is raised.

These arrangements are currently operating for some speeding offences and generating an income to the Partnership for reinvestment for casualty reduction measures to continue.

It is proposed by the shared service to extend this arrangement for other moving traffic offences including red light violations, driving with a mobile phone and not wearing a seat belt.

The increase in diversion from fines to charges for educational courses for a wider range of traffic offences will result in an increased income to the shared service.

It is therefore proposed to reduce in the amount of revenue provided by the County Council by £400k and utilise income from speed and road awareness courses to compensate for this.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

1,026

NET
£000

1,026

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	200	100	100	400
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	200	100	100	400

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET? 39.0%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

0.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

0.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

Any one off costs associated with this proposal will be contained within the shared service budget.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

Evidence from the diversion of some speeding offenders to educational courses reduces re-offending. Therefore there is a potential benefit to service users from this proposal by further reducing traffic offences which may also reduce road traffic collisions.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Partners in the shared service may also benefit from this approach and be able to reduce their contributions.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

There are not anticipated to be any adverse impacts on other parts of the County Council.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

This proposal is a change in an alternative offer to driving offenders and is unlikely to disproportionately negatively impact on people with protected characteristics

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

There are not expected to be any risks to service users or the County Council from this proposal.

Risks to delivering this saving are

1. A reduction in funding available to other partners which may reduce the opportunity for this scale of saving to the County Council;
2. A reduction in the number of this type of traffic offence reducing the income from the educational courses;
3. A change in legislation could affect the police's opportunity to divert offenders into road educational courses.

There is no realistic mitigation to these risks the most significant considered to be the risk of reduced funding to partners.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A38

1 SERVICE AREA

Highways - Central Processing Unit (CPU) Parking Shared Service

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

This proposal relates to the expansion of the current arrangements to process parking tickets – penalty charge notices. It does not cover the arrangements to operate the Civil Enforcement Officers (traffic wardens) or the issue of the penalty charge notices which are subject to separate joint arrangements between the County and District Councils in Nottinghamshire.

The Nottinghamshire Central Processing Unit currently processes Penalty Charge Notices (parking tickets) on behalf of Derbyshire and Lincolnshire County Councils.

This shared service reduces the process cost per notice to process for all the partners including Nottinghamshire through economies of scale.

The proposal is to extend the service across other councils such as Leicestershire and Wakefield Metropolitan Borough to achieve further economies of scale for all partners including Nottinghamshire.

There may also be opportunities for sharing with Councils further afield which are looking to reduce their costs.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

Nottinghamshire Central Processing Unit has one of the lowest unit costs for processing Penalty Charge Notices in the country.

Sharing the service with more councils reduces these costs by 50p/PCN and would initially be achieved within existing staffing establishment.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

NET
£000

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	0	25	0	25
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	0	25	0	25

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

N/A

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

0.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

0.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

Set up costs would be met by the additional authorities sharing the service including tendering and legal costs incurred in establishing contracts.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

None. Drivers receiving parking tickets are unaware of where the ticket is processed.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Service users in sharing authorities contacting Central Processing Unit would receive a consistent high quality response.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

There would be an increase in reputation for Nottinghamshire in leading a successful shared service for processing PCNs

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

This proposal is an efficiency saving without direct impact on service delivery and therefore will not negatively impact on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

This is mitigated through a well-established and cost effective service provided through the Highways division.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A39**1 SERVICE AREA**

Highways - Urban Traffic Control Shared Service

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

The control of traffic signals across the County is through a shared Urban Traffic Control (UTC) centre with the City Council. This provides changes to traffic signal timings and operation as traffic flows change across the City and County and also provides a fault monitoring service.

The level of service needed from the UTC to manage the County traffic signals is reducing so there is an opportunity to renegotiate the UTC arrangements with the City to save 50k from the current £190k cost.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

Following the intelligent traffic initiatives developed by the County, there is less reliance on the City managed UTC centre.

Examples of these initiatives include

1. A new fault management system which automatically transfers faults from the system controller (computer) to the maintenance engineer without the need for the UTC desk operators having to process the fault.

The fault management system is also web based to allow monitoring of the fault repair from anywhere including mobile devices.

2. Dual control using SCOOT (area wide automatic variation of traffic signal timings to changing traffic flows and delays) and MOVA (junction specific variation of traffic signal timings to changing traffic flows and delays) at key junctions. This manages the traffic automatically and more effectively than the manual intervention by UTC desk operators previously used.

The reduction in payment to them for this service is reflected in this proposal

**4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT
BUDGET?**GROSS
£000

190

NET
£000

190

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	50	0	0	50
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	50	0	0	50

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET? 26.3%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

0.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

0.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)
 One off costs have mainly already been incurred by the County.
9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?**ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES**

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

None as the same service will be delivered at a reduced cost.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Reduced contribution to shared service with Nottingham City Council.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

None

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

This proposal is mainly an efficiency saving without direct impact on service delivery and will not negatively impact on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

This proposal takes advantage of new technology to provide the same service at a reduced cost so risks are minimal for service users and the County Council.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A40

1 SERVICE AREA

Highways - Robin Hood Line Subsidy

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

The Robin Hood Line operates between Nottingham, Mansfield and Worksop

Monday to Saturday trains run from 5.40 am to 10 pm up to half hourly to Mansfield Woodhouse and hourly to Worksop.

The Sunday service runs from 8 am to 8 pm every one and a half to two hours and only to Mansfield Woodhouse.

The County Council currently pays a £80k per annum subsidy to the Department for Transport (DfT) for providing the Sunday service on the Robin Hood Line.

This arrangement comes to an end at 31st March 2015 and any on-going subsidy to the commercial service then be met by the DfT

There is not expected to be a reduction in service provision through this proposal.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

Saving through planned end to subsidy arrangements following which subsidy will be provided by DfT

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

80

NET
£000

80

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	0	80	0	80
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	0	80	0	80

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

100.0%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

0.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

0.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)
No one-off costs.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

The service is expected to continue to run and there will be no impact on service users.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

The service is expected to continue to run and there will be no impact on other organisations.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

None

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

This proposal is a cost saving without direct impact on service delivery and will not negatively impact on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

There is a risk to service users if DfT do not maintain any subsidy needed to support the commercial service.

This risk is mitigated in that the County Council may review its position at that time.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A41**1 SERVICE AREA**

Highways - Street Lighting Energy Saving Project

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

This proposal is to reduce the cost of street lighting energy to the Council.

Street Lighting energy cost is the highest service cost in the highways revenue budget at £4.5M a year which makes up 15% of the total highway revenue budget.

This proposal is therefore to reduce energy use on street lighting through increased use of 1500 LED (energy efficient) lanterns per year and dimming 1750 high power street lights per year.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

In the last three years, advances in energy saving lighting sources and the reduction in their cost have been significant, and alternative measures to part-night lighting are now viable in order to meet the required energy and carbon dioxide (CO₂) cost savings.

The measures comprise of converting lights to LED when their columns are due for replacement and dimming lights.

1. LED lanterns

To increase street lighting energy saving through the use of modern technology without the need to switch off lights. LED (low energy) lanterns are now fitted as standard in all street lighting column replacement schemes in the highways capital programme.

LED lanterns give an energy saving of between 35 - 50% energy per column.

However, the cost of installing the equipment makes these only viable on new installations and capital replacements. It would not be cost effective to introduce LED into equipment that has been replaced within the last five years currently.

Further investigation into the viability of fitting LED (low energy) lanterns to existing street lighting columns is being undertaken.

2. Dimming

Dimming will be considered between the hours of 22.00 – 07.00am.

Dimming on high wattage columns offers a payback in 1 - 2 years with dimming units on 250W lanterns saving about 60% per year in energy per column.

It is noted that the impact of dimming is minimal with many residents and road users unaware that lights have been dimmed.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

4,456

NET
£000

4,456

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	300	500	700	1,500
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	300	500	700	1,500

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

33.7%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

0.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

0.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

One off costs of installing LED lanterns and dimming switches may be contained within existing highways capital allocation for street lighting.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

Service users will benefit from the cancellation and reversal of part night lighting.

Impact on service users from LED and dimming are minimal with LED generally supported by residents in trial locations in Nottinghamshire and no comments have been received from residents and road users regarding the dimming trial site.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Some other organisations may benefit from the cancellation and reversal of part night lighting.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

It is unlikely this proposal will impact on other parts of the County Council.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

An Equality Impact Assessment would be required to gauge potential effects of the proposal on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

As these proposals maintain current lighting provision but introduce more efficient energy use through LED lanterns or dimming of lanterns the service provided to users are maintained.

A planned programme of dimming and LED installation over three years at least will mitigate resource and procurement risks.

This level of savings assumes a significant acceleration of both the LED and dimming programmes to be delivered. But there is a risk that the acceleration to the LED and dimming programmes will not be achieved in the timescale shown.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A42**1 SERVICE AREA**

Highways - Planning Access and Commissioning Income

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

This proposal reflects an anticipated increased of income to the County Council of £33,000, resulting from increased housing development activity.

Most new housing developments enter into a legal agreement with the County Council (a "section 38 agreement") where by the developer agrees to construct roads serving the new development to the County Council's standard. A fee is paid to the County Council to cover the cost of inspecting the roads during their construction to ensure the appropriate standards are met. On completion of the development and if the roads have been constructed to the necessary standard the County Council under the agreement adopts the roads as publicly maintainable highway.

This proposal assumes the additional inspection may be undertaken within current staff resources.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

Government and all local authorities are currently promoting economic growth including increased house building.

The District Council Local Development Frameworks reflect increased house building.

This proposal therefore reflects the increased income assuming the additional inspection may be undertaken within current staff resources.

**4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT
BUDGET?**GROSS
£000

339

339

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	10	10	13	33
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	10	10	13	33

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET? 9.7%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

15.5

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

0.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

None

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

There is no impact on service users as this proposal reflects an expected increase in demand for an income generating service.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

There is not expected to be an impact on other organisations from this proposal.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

There is not expected to be an impact on other parts of the County Council from this proposal.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

This proposal relates to income from developers therefore does not negatively impact on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

There is not expected to be a risk to service users or the County Council from this proposal.

There are risks to the delivery of this proposal:

1. The predicted increase in house building / development activity may not occur;
2. The additional inspection may not be possible to deliver with existing staff resources.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A43**1 SERVICE AREA**

Highways - Management Income

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

This proposal is to seek to increase income from existing service areas where charges are made or costs recovered.

1. Increasing sample inspections of utility companies working on the highway £20k (currently £225k/year)
2. Proactive chasing of utility companies to repair defects £10k (currently £5k/year)
3. Additional skip licences issued £20k (currently £110k/year)
4. Recovering more costs incurred by repairing damage from third parties £30k (currently £100k/year)

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

1. Utility works - the number of sample inspections that the authority can do is set by national legislation and the proposal is to ensure that this number is achieved compared with a deficit of £34k last year and £9k the year before.

Achieving these sample inspections will also lead to more costs being recovered from utility works where further repairs are needed.

The process improvements in the Inspection service have released capacity so that these samples can be achieved.

2. A similar approach is proposed to increase the income from serving notices on utility companies to repair their defective work
3. Additional skip licence income would be achieved through increasing building work requiring skips on the highway.
4. Process improvements for recovering debt and costs incurred by the authority in repairing the highway following accidents will lead to more costs being recovered from insurance companies.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

440

NET
£000

440

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	20	30	30	80
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	20	30	30	80

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

18.2%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

0.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

0.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

Provision of improved technology for Highway Inspectors is essential to the efficient delivery of these proposals at a cost of £10000.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

There would be fewer incidents involving poor reinstatements of roads following utility works.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Utility companies will be held to greater account for the quality and prompt completion of their reinstatement.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Other parts of the County Council are not expected to be affected by these proposals.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

This proposal relates to increased income from utility companies, skip hire companies and those damaging highway apparatus and is therefore unlikely to disproportionately negatively impact on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

There are minimal risks to service users and the County Council through this proposal as it relates mainly to operational efficiencies.

The condition of the County road network will be improved due to fewer instances of poor utility reinstatements. As a consequence there will be less disruption to journeys.

The main risk to delivering this proposal is insufficient staff resource.

A lower than expected upturn in building work would impact on the skip income.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A44

1 SERVICE AREA

Highways - Safety Signals and Lighting Income

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

This proposal identifies income opportunities of £13,000:

Through delivery of road safety audits for other Councils when demand exceeds their capacity £3,000

To carry out MOVA (traffic signal controller) design for other Councils due to the County Council's expertise in this area £10,000

These proposals assume this additional work can be delivered with the existing staff resource.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

To generate income through assisting neighbouring highway authorities utilising Nottinghamshire County Council capacity and expertise without additional staff resource.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

NET
£000

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	13	0	0	13
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	13	0	0	13

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

100.0%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

0.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

0.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

None

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

No impact as proposal is providing a technical service to another Council.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

No impact as proposal is providing a technical service to another Council.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

No impact as proposal is providing a technical service to another Council.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

This proposal relates to income from other local authorities therefore does not negatively impact on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

There are no risks to service users or the County Council arising from this proposal.

There is a risk this proposal may not be delivered if the workload within the other authorities reduces or they make alternative arrangements or it can-not be delivered through existing staff resources.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A45

1 SERVICE AREA

Highways - Safety, Signals and Lighting Revenue Staff Reductions

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

This proposal is to reduce revenue funded staff levels and costs across the group. This proposal also considers staff requirements for future capital and revenue programmes and assumes some improvement through business process review and change. Delivery of front line service is prioritised but it is expected that investigation of complex customer enquiries will take longer and capacity to further develop the service is removed. Some road safety service will be reduced through this proposal.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

Business processes will be reviewed in all these groups to achieve these savings through efficiencies where possible, and this work has already been carried out in the area of Street Lighting inspections. However some service reduction is inevitable with a reduced resource across the division to support customer enquiries and effective future planning of service delivery. Staff working on Capital and Revenue funded highway services will be reduced in Highway Safety Signals and Lighting Group by £380,000 (10 posts)

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

2,173

NET
£000

1,505

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	143	237	0	380
LESS Loss of Income	-10	-20	0	-30
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	133	217	0	350

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

23.3%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

57.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

10.3

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)
Potential redundancy costs

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

There is likely to be a reduction in the customer service that the Division can offer and a reduction in the effective future planning of service delivery for example, Road Safety Education.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Reduced customer service

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Reduced customer service

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

The County Council's HR policies and procedures manage the potential impact on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

All groups are planning mitigation measures for their service areas where possible. The proposed staff reductions are based on forecast Capital and Revenue budget reductions which are subject to review by government for grant allocations and through the Council's budget process

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A46

1 SERVICE AREA

Highways - Highway Programmes Design and Delivery

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

This proposal considers staff requirements for future capital programmes and assumes some improvement through business process review and change.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

Staff working on the capital programme will be reduced in Highways Programmes Design and Delivery by 7 posts (£175,000). This reflects anticipated reduction in the capital budgets available for highways and forecast future government grant

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

2,757

NET
£000

circa £2,000

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	175		0	175
LESS Loss of Income	-175	0	0	-175
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	0		0	0

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

N/A

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

72.4

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

7.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)
Potential redundancy costs

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

Reductions to the highways capital programme through government grant and the Council's budget process will impact the condition and opportunity to improve the highway network

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Reduced customer service

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Reduced customer service

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

The County Council's HR policies and procedures manage the potential impact on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

All groups are planning mitigation measures for their service areas where possible. The proposed staff reductions are based on forecast Capital budget reductions which are subject to review by government for grant allocations and through the Council's budget process

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A47

1 SERVICE AREA

Highways - Planning, Access and Commissioning Group Staff Reductions

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

This proposal is to reduce staff levels and costs across the group.

This proposal assumes some improvement through business process review and change.

Delivery of front line service is prioritised but it is expected that investigation of complex customer enquiries will take longer and capacity to further develop the service is removed. The full effect of this proposal is being assessed in detail.

This proposal also considers staff requirements for future capital and revenue programmes

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

Business processes will be reviewed to achieve these savings through efficiencies where possible. However some service reduction is inevitable with a reduced resource across the division to support customer enquiries and effective future planning of service delivery. Staff working on revenue funded highway services will be reduced by 12 FTE (£459K) not including Countryside Access staff (subject to an additional OBC). Staff working on capital services will be reduced in the group by 2.5 posts (£92k)

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

2,467

NET
£000

2,128

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	267	284	0	551
LESS Loss of Income	-92	0	0	-92
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	175	284	0	459

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

21.6%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

66.1

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

14.5

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)
Potential redundancy costs

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

Reduced capacity to protect the highway network from the adverse impacts of development activity and to support economic growth.

Reduced potential to implement Highway Asset Management system improvements to improve business process across the Division and customer interactions.

Reduced capacity to undertake Flood Risk Management activities. Reduced capacity to develop programmes and bid for supporting funding for transport programme delivery.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Reduced highways planning advice and support for Government development / economic growth agenda. Reduced capacity to undertake coordinating Flood Risk Management role.

Reduced capacity to undertake coordinating Flood Risk Management role.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Less proactive advice for members over housing and development matters.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

The County Council's HR policies and procedures manage the potential impact on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

The main risk for the County Council is:

A reduced customer service in particular a reduced ability to respond to District Councils on highway planning matters. Reduced capacity to generate income. Mitigation against these risks is being investigated but is expected to be minimal. The risk of delivering this proposal is minimal subject to County Council policy and procedures for staff restructuring and compulsory redundancies. Proposed staff reductions are partly based on forecast capital and revenue budgets which are subject to review by government for grant allocations and through the Council's budget process

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A48

1 SERVICE AREA

Highways - Highways Management Revenue Staff Reductions

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

This proposal is to reduce capital and revenue funded staff levels and costs across the group.

This proposal assumes some improvement through business process review and change.

Delivery of front line service is prioritised but it is expected that investigation of complex customer enquiries will take longer and capacity to further develop the service is removed. There would be a reduction in the number of Highways liaison staff, Highway Inspector and Coordination of roadworks staff.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

Business processes will be reviewed to achieve these savings through efficiencies where possible and this work has already been carried out in the area of Highway Inspections. This proposal also considers staff requirements for future capital and revenue programmes.

Staff working on revenue funded highway services will be reduced in Highway Management Group by 18.3 FTE (£503,000).

The proposed staff reductions are based on forecast Capital and Revenue budget reductions which are subject to review by government for grant allocations and through the Council's budget process

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

2,385

NET
£000

2,138

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	204	324	0	528
LESS Loss of Income	-12	-13	0	-25
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	192	311	0	503

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET? 23.5%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

104.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

18.3

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)
Potential redundancy costs

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

There will be a reduction in the customer service.

In particular many of the issues dealt with by the District Manager teams are complex, high profile and involve other organisations with resolution dependent on community engagement on site.

There will be a reduction in the effective future planning of service delivery.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Reduced customer service.

These staff reductions will also reduce coordination of street-scene activities with District Councils.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

A reduced customer service and less effective planning.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

The County Council's HR policies and procedures manage the potential impact on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

The risks to service users and the County Council are:-

A reduced customer service and less effective planning.

This risk could be much more significant if measures to reduce demand on the service or enable customers to access services through other channels (e.g. Web) are not successful.

Many of the issues dealt with by the District Manager teams are complex, high profile and involve other organisations with resolution dependent on community engagement on site.

These teams also drive coordination of street-scene activities by District Councils which would be put at risk with staff reductions.

The risk of delivering this proposal is minimal subject to County Council policy and procedures for staff restructuring and redundancies.

The proposed staff reductions are based on forecast Capital and Revenue budget reductions which are subject to review by government for grant allocations and through the Council's budget process

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A49**1 SERVICE AREA**

Finance and Procurement

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

The Finance and Procurement teams have over the past twelve months undergone a significant process of restructuring, which will deliver full year savings of £700,000 in 14/15. This proposal is to make further headcount reductions of between 10-15 posts, by improving systems and processes, and enabling managers to do more for themselves. This will save another £500,000 between 15/16 and 16/17.

The Finance team have undergone a significant period of change over the last 12 months. Following the production of the Financial Management Improvement Plan in December 2011, a number of initiatives have been introduced to improve the performance of the service, particularly from a customer perspective. The most significant of these has been the implementation of a new structure; the 2 most senior levels of which were completed at the end of 2012 with the remaining tiers completed in April 2013. This has seen an overall headcount reduction of c20 posts and will save c£700,000 in 14/15.

The reality is that any further savings over and above those already being delivered by service restructuring can only come from additional headcount reductions. Given the need for the Finance and Procurement teams to support the delivery of savings elsewhere within the Council, it is proposed that further reductions in capacity will not be viable until 2015/16. Hence the savings proposed are profiled to take effect in 2015/16 and 2016/17.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The proposed reduction in Finance and Procurement capacity is based on the premise that Support Services must make an appropriate contribution towards the Council's overall savings target to minimise the impact on front-line service delivery.

Given that 80%+ of the Divisions costs are staffing related, any reductions in costs can only be realised through staffing reductions. The restructuring of the Division will deliver an initial c50% of the planned 30% reduction, with the remaining 50% planned for later in the existing MTFS time-line.

Whilst significant progress has been made over the last 12 months, further change is necessary both to embed the improvements that have been delivered, whilst also implementing further changes to structures, systems and processes that will allow the Division the scope to "do more with less" in the future. These changes will take time to implement and embed, and must be delivered alongside broader organisational change. This is the reason for the specific profiling of the savings being suggested in section five.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

6,253

NET
£000

4,204

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	700	250	250	1,200
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	700	250	250	1,200

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET? 28.5%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

124.1

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

40 *

* As part of the Finance & Procurement restructure, a reduction of 25 FTEs has already been implemented. A further 10-15 FTE reductions are expected to be delivered in the period 2015/16 to

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

None other than any associated redundancy costs. Based on a potential further reduction of 10 -15 posts, estimated redundancy costs could be c£150,000 - £230,000 which could be spread over two years.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

The size, scope and technical requirements of the service are driven by the Council's size and complexity, which if diminishing in overall terms would mean a reduced requirement for Finance and Procurement support. The required reductions could therefore potentially occur through reduced demand. This reduced demand is unlikely to materialise however in the short term, as the Council transitions to a new operating model and service offer.

The vision for Finance and Procurement is a smaller team but one which is more strategically focused, and with a higher density of qualified staff. It may also need to have a different skill set i.e. if the authority were to adopt a greater use of commissioning services; this requires staff with a different capability and commercial emphasis than is currently the case. This will nevertheless, be dependent upon other organisational wide factors, such as:

- the Council's operating model
- continued move to manager self-service, particularly for budget monitoring/forecasting
- the reduction in operational and transactional processing that should be achievable from investment in technology, and on-going business improvement and service re-design.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

The opportunity for sharing services with other organisations provides another potential route for reducing costs whilst maintaining an appropriate level of capacity and capability. These will be explored over the coming months and options will also form part of the organisational wide review of Support Services.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

As per impact on other organisations

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

It is not believed that the proposal will have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Risks:-

- Failure to reduce transactional processes
- Organisation does not adopt required culture change i.e. self-service
- Inability to attract and retain suitably qualified and experienced staff
- Failure to deliver alternative delivery models e.g. shared services?
- Inability to deliver adequate professional support

Mitigations

- Business process change and re-design
- Further support and training to managers to implement necessary changes
- Maintenance of in-house/shared training programmes
- Building on relationships with other authorities to develop potential options for change and robust business cases
- Ensuring organisation strikes right balance of savings proposals i.e. front-line v enabling services

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A50

1 SERVICE AREA

IT broadband network and services contract

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

The proposal is to review broadband connectivity and service options in time for when the current contract expires in October 2015.

Costs are driven by the number of properties that require a broadband connection to the County Council network, data security requirements, the speed of broadband connections, the broadband technologies used, the demand for web connectivity and the level of resilience and business continuity required. These will all be reviewed and re-assessed in time for when the current contract expires.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

To undertake a review of the IT broadband network and services required by the County Council and schools. The current IT broadband network and services are delivered to both corporate and school sites, enabling the sharing of fixed costs. Technology options change all of the time, as do pricing strategies, and so whilst the current private IT network provides a modern, resilient and fit for purpose solution, more cost effective options may be deliverable as part of a future invest-to-save programme.

Although significant savings have been made through a shared arrangement with schools, there are increasing risks that more schools will opt for different, cheaper solutions leaving more of the fixed costs on the County Council.

The review will need to consider:

- The number, location and ICT use of sites requiring a broadband connection
- Connectivity and security solutions, prices and options
- Arrangements for schools
- Future use of the second data centre (Node 4) for business continuity requirements
- Cloud opportunities

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

2,230

NET
£000

2,230

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	0	0	350	350
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	0	0	350	350

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET? 15.7%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

0.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

0.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

Dedicated project management and technical ICT resources will be needed to best plan for a replacement of the current contract arrangements.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?**ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES**

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

Not applicable at this stage.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

The network and services are currently shared with schools. Any changes will affect them and will be subject to full consultation.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

It is too early to establish the level of impact as this will be assessed as part of the review. The key decisions will include proposals for schools, levels of business continuity required, security considerations and technology options.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

It is not believed that the proposal will have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Risk: there are significant fixed costs of the network contract and only marginal savings are delivered through corporate site closures.

Mitigation: this needs to be factored into corporate property closure decisions.

Risk: school academies are being targeted with alternate solutions, leaving Nottinghamshire County Council with a bigger share of the fixed costs if schools leave the network

Mitigation: to promote the value added services that are available through the network and perhaps introduce a connection premium for off-network schools that access Nottinghamshire County Council systems.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A51

1 SERVICE AREA

Off-site access to IT systems

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To identify new, cost effective solutions to replace the existing IT systems that allow County Council employees to work from home and at different workbases, saving £250,000 by 2014/15. The initial stage is to identify a cheaper way of delivering access to County Council IT systems from home (the online@home service) and to migrate existing users to that lower tariff service.

The second stage is to review all of the remote access solutions that we have to ensure they are fit for purpose and represent value for money and then to support staff in migrating to the best fit solution for their role.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The current online@home service uses a BT solution that is being decommissioned by November 2013. There is therefore some urgency to migrating to a different solution, and the opportunity will be taken to identify a cheaper on-going cost.

The remote access solutions into the County Council's IT network have been developed over a number of years; not all are the best fit for purpose for the users that have them and emerging technologies and tariff changes provide opportunities for savings.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

-

NET
£000

-

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	250	0	0	250
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	250	0	0	250

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

N/A

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

0.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

0.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

There are project management costs and device costs associated with achieving the first stage.

There will also be project management costs for achieving the second stage, and possible other costs too.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

None

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

A number of external IT suppliers have remote access to provide support functions for a range of IT systems and so could be affected by any proposed changes. Likewise, some public sector partners may also be impacted if changes to remote access solutions are changed.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

It is too early to be precise but there may be significant impact on users if some current products are withdrawn, no longer offered to some users, operate differently etc.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

It is not believed that the proposal will have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Risk: The current BT ADSL solution is being withdrawn in November and so there could be service loss if an alternate solution is not sourced quickly.

Mitigation: The focus of stage 1 is to achieve an improved lower cost solution.

Risk: any budgetary savings would be in departmental budgets and so there is a risk that these are not realised.

Mitigation: involve Finance officers in the calculation of savings so that they can recover them.

Risk: that users are reluctant to give up home broadband connections when more suitable alternatives are available.

Mitigation: engagement of departmental business leads in the process so that they can drive through the changes and savings.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A52

1 SERVICE AREA
IT system licences

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To end the annual renew of the licence for the legacy payroll IT system (Cyborg) for 2014-15 as all County Council payrolls have been moved to the Business Management System, saving £80,000 in 2014/15.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

Now that all payrolls are run from the Business Management System there will no longer be a requirement to renew the support and maintenance licences for the Cyborg system.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

311

NET
£000

311

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	80	0	0	80
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	80	0	0	80

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

25.7%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

0.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

0.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)
None identified

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

None

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

None now that all external payrolls are run from the Business Management System.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Payroll Services have confirmed that there is no requirement to renew this software maintenance and support licence.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

It is not believed that the proposal will have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

No risks associated with not renewing the licences.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A53

1 SERVICE AREA

ICT equipment replacement programme

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To save £100,000 on the County Council's computer equipment replacement programme in 2015/16. Savings of £100k are planned for 2015/16 on the basis of improved pricing and fewer users requiring desktop and laptop computers. There are no savings proposed for 2014-15 as the budget has already been committed to support the accelerated upgrade to Windows 7 and Office 2010 across the whole IT estate by the end of December 2013.

This budget has already been reduced by £300k over the last three financial years.

A review of "thin client" desktop computers (whereby all of the software is located on central servers rather than the desktop itself) is currently being investigated through an external partner, but this is likely to better support a flexible working strategy rather than support cash savings.

A more rigorous assessment of employee ICT equipment requirements (as part of a new Ways of Working initiative/property strategy) and an influx of Bring Your Own Device (BYOD) options might reduce ICT equipment costs in future.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

This budget funds the replacement of desktop and laptop computers across the County Council in order that they remain fit for purpose. Opportunities for future savings will be shaped by the number of staff, the work styles that are adopted and the types of equipment used.

By procuring our ICT equipment at e-auction with other public sector bodies we are already driving best value pricing and have been assessed at being in the upper quartile for value for money in this area.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

669

NET
£000

669

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	0	100	0	100
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	0	100	0	100

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET? 14.9%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

0.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

0.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

None identified at this stage. The cost of the "thin client" review (use of central servers that host all of the software) is being funded from existing budgets.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

None.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

None.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

No impact is anticipated at this stage provided staffing numbers reduce to a level consistent with the IT equipment replacement budget.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

It is not believed that the proposal will have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

None at this stage.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A54

1 SERVICE AREA

Business Support and Development staffing reductions

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To review the business support and development provided to the Environment and Resources department and identify options to reduce current staffing levels by at least 30%.

Some of the staff in this structure are implicated in other OBC's Including the Strategic Management Framework and Property proposals.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

It is clear that the authority should review those support functions which are replicated within each department and which could potentially be consolidated and reengineered, i.e.

- Current performance monitoring and reporting mechanisms
- Current business planning processes
- Existing risk, safety, emergency management and business continuity arrangements – suitability and sufficiency
- 'Administrative' and 'Executive' business support functions
- Business Transformation Support
- Departmental property responsibilities
- Committee/political support processes
- Complaints / FOIA etc. coordination and presentation (residual activity)
- Reception and facilities mgt functions (i.e. stationery and equipment etc.).

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

1,645

NET
£000

1,645

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	60	0	0	60
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	60	0	0	60

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

3.6%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

33.07

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

2.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

None

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

None

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

None

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

None

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

It is not believed that the proposal will have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

None

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A55

1 SERVICE AREA

Transport, Property and Environment - Transport & Travel Services - Staffing

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To restructure the service and remove 12 posts.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

Better use of Information Technology, procedural reviews, more efficient ways of working and reduction in the number of teams through reconfiguration of roles will enable effective service delivery.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

1,380

NET
£000

1,380

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	150	150	300
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0
NET SAVING	150	150	300
WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?			22.0%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

62.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

12.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)
Redundancy / Pension strain costs - to be identified.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

May impact on assessing network changes, implementing service changes and responses to enquiries from service users including community transport clients.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

May reduce the opportunity to secure external funding, implementing service changes and partnership working with the bus operators and community transport operators.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

May affect the management and delivery of transport services for young and older people and the response to enquiries.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate/adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender, reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and orientation. If so how?

None.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

(a) Risk - the reputation of the County Council may suffer through the inability of staff to respond to enquiries within current service standards.

(a) Mitigation - to review service standards and procedures.

(b) Risk - reduced capacity will affect the capability to respond quickly to market changes and new initiatives including researching and bidding for external funding.

(b) Mitigation - to develop new service plans and priorities.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A56

1 SERVICE AREA

Highways – Establishment of fund for replacing life-expired Integrated Transport Measures

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

Over the last five years £32.25m of capital funding has been spent on Integrated Transport Measures such as pedestrian crossings, traffic signals, accident remedial schemes, interactive speed signs and weight limits. A proportion of these assets have a limited life span so it is proposed to allocate part of the Local Transport Plan capital funding to ensure these schemes can be replaced with an equivalent reduction in the Highway Maintenance Revenue budget.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

Highway Assets such as street lighting, traffic signs, traffic signals and red surfacing have a limited life span and need replacing. As an example over the last five years there have been over 400 interactive speed signs introduced and the electrical components within the signs need replacing every five years. This is currently funded from Highways Maintenance Revenue budgets. This proposal would fund the replacement of these assets from within the Local Transport Plan Capital allocation. An allocation of £600k from the Local Transport Plan funding for 14/15 of £7.5m would equate to a reduction in the overall Highway Maintenance Revenue budget.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

35,182

NET
£000

28,196

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	200	200	200	600
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	200	200	200	600

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

2.1%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

0.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

0.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

None

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

There would be a reduction in the number of Integrated Transport Measures introduced because part of the Local Transport Plan capital funding would be spent on replacing old schemes rather than providing new schemes. This would have a knock on effect on road users and communities who were expecting improvements within their area. Conversely, there would be an improvement in the environment of the County because worn out assets would be replaced rather than left to deteriorate due to lack of funding.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

There may be a limited impact on businesses and other community groups expecting improvements such as pedestrian crossings or measures to reduce traffic congestion. This would be offset by a more attractive road environment- particularly if replacement of the assets were to be combined with a de-cluttering exercise.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Limited impact.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

An Equality Impact Assessment would be required to gauge potential effects of the proposal on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Risk to service users

The risk associated with reducing the number of Integrated Transport Measures could only be mitigated by careful prioritisation of the remaining programme.

Risk to County Council

Minimal with an expected improvement in the road environment.

Risk to delivering these savings

Limited risk providing the remaining programme of Integrated Transport Measures is discussed with Members and communities at an early stage.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A57

1 SERVICE AREA

Highways – Reduction of Discretionary Spend

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

This proposal reduces Non-Salary Budgets reflective of a reduced establishment and the current budgetary position.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

This proposal reduces non-salary staff cost budgets across the Highway Management, Highways Planning, Access and Commissioning, and Highways Safety, Signals and Lighting groups. The proposal is to reduce staff training, equipment and mileage budgets. This will effectively suspend equipment provision and renewal, staff training beyond a high bar mandatory level and reduce travel to absolutely essential levels only.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

702

NET
£000

702

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	100	100	100	300
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	100	100	100	300

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

42.7%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

0.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

0.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

None

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

Reduced ability to attend non-essential meetings

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Reduced ability to attend non-essential meetings

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

None

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

This proposal is an efficiency measure which is unlikely to directly affect service provision so does not negatively impact on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Service risks are minimal.

Low level risks exist around

1. Reduction in travel to essential levels may not meet customer levels of expectation
2. Reduced levels of staff training may mean reduction in staff morale and career development opportunities
3. Reduced equipment budgets may mean essential items when life expired are not replaced.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A58

1 SERVICE AREA

Highways – Use of Commuted Sums

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

The proposal is to utilise commuted sums paid by developers as part of the Highway Adoption process to create a saving in Highways works revenue budgets

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

Developers are required to pay commuted sums for items of highway maintenance value in accordance with the Highways Regional Design Guide. The figure of £250k being transferred annually to maintenance is considered sustainable, considering the expected growth in development activity over the next four years.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

35,182

NET
£000

28,196

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	250	0	0	250
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	250	0	0	250

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

0.9%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

0.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

0.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

None

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

None

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

None

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

None

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

This proposal is an efficiency measure which is unlikely to directly affect service provision so does not negatively impact on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Service risks are minimal.

A medium level risks exist around

1. Ability to sustain the £250k per annum transfer which depends on future levels of development activity.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A59

1 SERVICE AREA

Highway - Programmes Design and Delivery

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

The new highways contract requires the contractor to follow the Councils current schedule for gully cleaning for two cycles to establish data on the levels of silt being removed and to confirm location data etc.

Following this the contract will be operated on an outcome specification which requires a similar number or fewer gullies to be reported on and attended to within a determined timescale. The contractor may depart from the schedule as necessary to achieve this outcome at minimum cost to the County Council.

This proposal is to allow the contractor to depart from the schedule at an earlier date but restricts that departure to those gullies being reported as less than 25% full on inspection/cleaning.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The proposal is being considered so as to reduce revenue spend in the service area through a controlled approach targeted at gullies least at risk of blocking.

The proposal is consistent with the aims of the contract which allow the Council to set the required standard and enable the contractor to achieve that in the most efficient and effective way saving the Council money

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

35,182

NET
£000

28,196

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	50	0	0	50
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	50	0	0	50

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

0.2%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

0.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

0.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

None

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

The impact should be minimal as the affected gullies will be identified as being at less risk of blocking

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

It will be necessary to negotiate with Lafarge Tarmac, a variation to the scope of the recently awarded the contract.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

None

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

This proposal is unlikely to negatively impact on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

There is a risk of an increased number of blocked gullies on the network at any one time and a small risk of increased flooding.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A60

1 SERVICE AREA

Planning - Conservation

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To merge the Conservation Team with the Planning Policy Team, removing a team manager post and saving £50,000 during 2014/15.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The Conservation team covers archaeology; historic buildings; ecology; biodiversity action plan; local nature partnerships; historic environment record; Greenwood Community Forest; and delivery of Local Improvement Schemes. The workload is both statutory and non-statutory and also encompasses delivery of grant-aided projects.

The rationale for the proposal is to make the service more efficient by merging management roles.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

620

NET
£000

458

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	50	0	0	50
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	50	0	0	50

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

10.9%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

11.1

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

1.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

None

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

Service would still fulfill its statutory roles. Project work with community groups would still be undertaken.

OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Partnership working would still continue, although this would be on a reduced basis.

Realisation of opportunities to access external funding is likely to be more limited.

OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

None

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

It is not believed that the proposal will have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

The ability to work on wider partnerships and on externally funded projects will be reduced. This will be mitigated by ensuring that the most important partnerships and external funding opportunities are prioritised for support.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A61

1 SERVICE AREA

Legal Services

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To create additional internal capacity (four solicitors and three support officer posts) in the team dealing with children's social care legal cases, reducing use of external legal firms. To use new technology and to streamline internal processes reducing administration support and other legal roles by seven full time equivalent posts.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

(1) To reduce spend on external service providers by bringing the work back 'in house'. By employing solicitors directly we aim to reduce the cost and improve the quality of the service. (2) To review legal work types undertaken to ensure the service is used only for providing legal advice and support and not administrative procedures, to better use available technology to reduce the amount of administrative support required for the service and to consolidate some legal work areas to reduce posts.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

4,031

NET
£000

3,912

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	246	408	12	666
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	246	408	12	666

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

17.0%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

50.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

Net nil 0.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)
None identified

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

The quality and consistency of the child protection legal service should see improvements as it is brought in line with the rest of the in house operations. Reducing other staffing will be dependent on ICT/ process changes and will take time to adjust to.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

None - courts should see improved service when all solicitors are working from a common framework

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

See service users

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

It is not believed that the proposal will have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

(1) The success of these proposals rely on various ICT and process changes being implemented, e.g.improved secure file transfer and appropriate local bulk scanning solution. These efficiencies should make the proposed service delivery model viable.

(2) Staffing changes will take time to implement and new business processes will take time to become established but after that some further efficiencies may be found from the levels of business and administrative support staff required for the service, especially child care work. Reducing staff in other areas may result in some types of work not being done which previously was and staff having to undertake more administrative tasks themselves. At times there may be insufficient staff numbers to deal with peaks of work which may have to be outsourced or temporary staff engaged to deal with it.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A62

1 SERVICE AREA
Democratic Services

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To stop holding Member Forum Meetings and to reduce the amount of Democratic Services support required to facilitate meetings generally to enable a reduction in staffing. Member Forums cease in their entirety so no administrative support for their papers/venues etc is required from Democratic Services.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

To rationalise support to Members offered by Democratic Services.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

1,020

NET
£000

1,018

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	27	0	0	27
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	27	0	0	27

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

2.7%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

23.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

1.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)
None identified.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

Elected members will no longer have these meetings available to meet and discuss issues with community groups and other civic leaders.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

None identified.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Other front line departments attend Member Forums (e.g. Economic Development and Community Safety) so there may be additional savings or issues arising in those areas.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

It is not believed that the proposal will have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Although the meetings will cease, elected members will still be able to engage effectively with their local communities by one to one meetings with community groups, other civic leaders or individuals.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A63

1 SERVICE AREA

Democratic Services

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To reorganise the civic office support staff and reconfigure support activities for the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Council (including transport) to a minimum required for appropriate representation at civic events and functions and to optimise use of the civic suite.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

To make more efficient use of resources within Democratic Services.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

1,020

NET
£000

1,018

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	87	0	0	87
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	87	0	0	87

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

8.5%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

23.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

2.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)
None identified.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

The Chairman and Vice Chairman's diary dates will still need to be managed for appropriate civic functions to which they are invited or act as host. These will be much reduced and there will be no major civic events provided by the Council and arranged by the Civic Officer and no administration of the annual charity fundraising events for the Chairman's chosen charity. The civic car will be disposed of and the Chairman and Vice Chairman will drive themselves to some engagements and for more formal events appropriate chauffeur services will be procured externally.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

As for service users.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Closure of the civic office will reduce some budgets but there will still be some civic duties to deal with and support for these will be required from Democratic Services.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

It is not believed that the proposal will have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

There is a minor risk that Democratic Services will have difficulty accommodating additional duties arising from the civic office closure. However, this work will be reduced in scale and will be prioritised.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A64

1 SERVICE AREA
Democratic Services

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To provide governance and democratic support services to the Police and Crime Panel and the Police and Crime Commissioner.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

To generate income by using capacity at the margins and existing internal expertise to provide governance services to outside bodies (PCP and PCC)

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

1,020

NET
£000

1,018

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	81	0	0	81
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	81	0	0	81

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

8.0%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

23.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

0.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)
None identified.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

None as the service will be delivered in the margins of existing capacity.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

A good quality governance support service will be provided by Democratic Services staff to the Police and Crime Panel and the Police and Crime Commissioner.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

See service users above.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

It is not believed that the proposal will have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

There is a risk that the service provided by Democratic Services staff to the Police and Crime Panel and the Police and Crime Commissioner will be more resource intensive than anticipated. However, this will be managed by actively defining and monitoring services offered.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A65

1 SERVICE AREA
Democratic Services

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To save £43,000 by only publishing committee papers online for those Councillors who have iPads and to move to an electronic only version of the Council diary.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

To reduce expenditure on the printing and postage costs of producing hard copies of committee papers and the annual Council diary and by optimising use of ICT hardware.

This proposal will not impact any legal requirement to issue a hard copy of notice of meetings to Members for Council or Committee meetings.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

1,020

NET
£000

1,018

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	43	0	0	43
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	43	0	0	43

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

4.2%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

23.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

1.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)
None identified.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

There will be an initial impact on Members until they familiarise themselves with this new approach. Although hard copies will no longer be circulated to libraries, communities will be able to access reports and agendas in Libraries electronically. A limited number of hard copies (6) will be available at meetings for the public. The Council meetings diary will be available electronically for Members and the public.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

None - Access will be available via the website as at present.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

There may be an impact on staffing levels in Central Print and officers attending meetings will require access to an iPad and IT support.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

It is not believed that the proposal will have a disproportionate /adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics.

Large print or Braille copies would be available on request through the Customer Service Centre

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

a) Members and officers may print reports out on other printers which cost more. This will be mitigated by monitoring print volumes through new printing devices. b) There is a risk that levels of ICT understanding amongst users or technology problems may adversely impact the conduct of meetings and decision making. To mitigate this, detailed ICT business requirements will be stipulated (eg. the ability to make notes on reports) and additional training and support will be provided to users. c) An electronic online diary is available with all relevant council meetings and information can be obtained from Democratic Services.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A66

1 SERVICE AREA

Complaints and Information Team

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To streamline the corporate complaints process by standardising responses to routine complaints and developing a more proportionate response to more serious or complex issues. To reduce the overall number of full time equivalent posts by three saving £113,000.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

To establish a more efficient and streamlined corporate complaints process.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

662

NET
£000

662

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	113	0	0	113
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	113	0	0	113

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

17.1%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

16.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

3.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

None

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

Service users will receive standardised responses to routine corporate complaints. The more serious complaints will receive bespoke responses. The statutory social care complaints process will be unaffected.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

None

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

The Customer Service Centre and service areas may see a rise in the number of direct contacts related to complaints.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

It is not believed that the proposal will have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

There is a risk that service users will be dissatisfied with the more standardised responses to routine complaints to be offset by an explanation of the rationale for change and the context within which it sits. There is the potential for an increased workload for managers in other services.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A67

1 SERVICE AREA

Office of the Chief Executive

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To save £51,000 during 2014/15 by streamlining business support arrangements in the Office of the Chief Executive by reducing the number of Business Support Officer posts by two full time equivalent posts.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

To make business support arrangements more efficient by reorganising existing capacity.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

240

NET
£000

240

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	51	0	0	51
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	51	0	0	51

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

21.3%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

7.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

2.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)
None identified.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES
(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)
None

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS
None

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL
The functions currently carried out within the Office will be accommodated within proposed new staffing levels and should have no adverse impact on service provision.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

It is not believed that the proposal will have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Certain functions will be streamlined and other work will be reallocated within the remaining Business Support Officers and PA's as required.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A68

1 SERVICE AREA

Corporate Strategy - Policy, Performance and Research

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To refocus and make efficiencies in the policy, performance, information and research functions. This will lead to a reduction of 7.5 full time equivalent posts and save £246,000 in 2014/15.

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

The service will focus on supporting the implementation of the Strategic Management Framework and delivering policy, information and research work in a more streamlined manner. This will include:

- Integrating existing processes so that there is a single approach to strategic management rather than the current separate functions
- Centralising performance functions across the Council with efficiencies in staffing. The Policy, Planning and Corporate Services (PPCS) performance function will fall within this
- Ensuring that managers have greater access to information about their service, its performance and context, and support to analyse, plan and respond to it
- Improving the availability of consistent data and statistics through a central research repository, enabling staff and managers to self-serve, and focusing in-depth analysis only on priority areas and projects
- Targeting and prioritising the provision of local intelligence and national policy information and changing the way this is delivered. This will involve closing the Local Government Library and ceasing the Oracle information service.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

858

NET
£000

858

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	246	0	0	246
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	246	0	0	246

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

28.7%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

16.5

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

7.5

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

None identified.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

Service users are predominantly managers and Members. The proposals should result in a more customer focused service to support these service users in their roles. This may also lead to small efficiencies and time savings for service users as the service improves to greater meet their needs. Elements of the research work undertaken by the Council will only be given to priority areas this may impact on some managers if the work is not able to be

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

The service provides a range of information to other organisations. It is intended that information and open data will continue to be made available with greater automation to reduce the officer time involved. Other organisations making specific enquiries may receive a slower response as there will be less capacity available and greater priority will be placed on service needs.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Provision of a more focused service is intended to support the overall management of the Council, as One Council. This will result in greater oversight and co-ordination of issues impacting on the Council.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

It is not believed that the proposal will have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Lack of engagement with the service and replication in departments - There is a risk that the value of the service will be compromised if service users do not buy-in to the revised service offer and/or leadership teams commission additional services from other staff. The service will need to engage with leadership teams to ensure that the needs of service users are managed and met.

Loss of resources through the cessation of the local government library - There is a risk that some valuable resources and reference material may be lost through the cessation of this service. It is intended that services be consulted on any residual resources required (hard copy or electronic) and that a small reference point be established in proximity to the service to continue to offer these materials.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A69

1 SERVICE AREA

Communications and Marketing

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To further transform communications and marketing activity to be more audience focused, more efficient and more cost effective. The approach will include reducing mass distribution and introducing more targeted communications. County News and the Council Tax leaflet, which go to all households, will both be stopped along with the existing What's On guide. They would be replaced with a variety of more targeted, cost effective products including an annual Council guide which is distributed to all households, targeted guides for families and older people and a reduced What's On guide. The proposal also includes the development of an e-marketing strategy to allow better email targeting and allow residents to self-select information. This will also reduce the need for service-specific promotional leaflets and posters. Any remaining service budgets used for promotion will be centralised. In addition, the staff magazine, Frontline, will be phased out as other internal communication and engagement mechanisms improve. **Proposal previously agreed – no further consultation necessary**

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

To make more effective and efficient use of the communications and marketing budget through audience specific targeting.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

870

NET
£000

870

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	178	0		178
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	178	0	0	178

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

20.5%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

13.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

0.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)

None identified.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

Improved ability for residents and service users to choose the information they wish to receive from the Council - more targeted and customer orientated (relevant and useful) information and promotion will be provided. Better value for money for tax payers through more efficient communications and reduction in marketing spend.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Opportunities for partners and businesses to use the Council's channels to get across other public sector or business messages.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

An increased One Council approach. A better 'core' communications offer to Council departments, which will also support services to save money. Less service specific communications and more audience-focused promotion - supporting better cross-marketing of services and avoidance of need.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

It is not believed that the proposal will have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Budget available for campaigns will reduce so if services require promotional activity beyond available resources, they will need to find alternative ways to fund.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A70

1 SERVICE AREA

Communications and Marketing

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

Alternative delivery of translation and interpretation services, by contracting The Language Shop (part of the London Borough of Newham Council) to provide an improved and less expensive service (instead of the current in-house service). This was approved by Policy Committee in May.

Proposal previously agreed – no further consultation necessary

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

More cost effective provision of the translation and interpretation service.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

604

NET
£000

604

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	55	0	0	55
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	55	0	0	55

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

9.1%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

1.8

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

1.8

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)
None identified.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

No negative impact anticipated - service users will still have interpreters provided. An EIA has been completed. Interpreters will be supported and have an opportunity to apply to work for the Language Shop and it is anticipated the vast majority will do so.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Only partners using the service will be affected - adequate notice will be given so partners can find an alternative supplier.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

Service improvements will be gained with no increased cost for translation and interpretation e.g. online ordering portal, better management information, more efficient service delivery. Opportunity for reduced costs in the future.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

An Equality Impact Assessment has been produced and published on the County Council's website. No negative impact is anticipated on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

The contract will need to be closely monitored to ensure effective delivery.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A71

1 SERVICE AREA

Communications and Marketing

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To make the most of the Council's assets by generating income through Council-owned advertising channels and Council-initiated sponsorship opportunities. This might include selling advertising on the Council's website, lamp post banners, roundabouts, publications, digital TV screens etc. The mechanisms for realising the benefit of income generation through advertising and sponsorship will need to be determined. A paper on the Council's income generation strategy for advertising platforms was approved by Policy Committee in September.

Proposal previously agreed – no further consultation necessary

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

To maximise the income generation potential of the Council's assets.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

604

NET
£000

604

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	24	24	24	72
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	24	24	24	72

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

11.9%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

12.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

0.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)
None identified.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

Exposure to a wider variety of messages e.g. by partners and advertisers. Better value for money communications for the tax payer through advertising revenue (as income generated through advertising will be used to offset other communications costs).

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Opportunities for partners and businesses to use the Council's channels to get across other public sector or business messages i.e. good value for money advertising and sponsorship opportunities.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

An increased One Council approach to income generation - ability to produce more attractive 'packages' of advertising which will generate the best return on investment for services/Communications and Marketing

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

It is not believed that the proposal will have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Market factors may influence income generation potential. Selling of advertising space needs to be adequately resourced. The models through which advertising should be sold need to be finalised and might include direct selling by in house staff, contracting an agency to sell the space or a combination of the two.

SUMMARY PROPOSAL

Proposal Ref.

A72

1 SERVICE AREA

Policy Planning and Corporate Services - Department-wide

2 WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL?

To reduce the management structure in the Policy, Planning and Corporate Services Department by one Group Manager post in the Communications and Marketing Division and to make further, as yet unquantified, reductions by redesigning management roles and responsibilities in light of revised levels of operation within the Department. Specific numbers of post reductions will be clearer once the review is completed.

(Note: Net budget shown is for departmental management comprises Chief Executive, Corporate Director and Corporate Legal. Other management costs are spread across the individual group budgets. FTEs shown are for permanent staff Corporate Director to Team Manager.)

3 WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?

Rationalisation of management structures to support organisational design principles.

These savings are in addition to those contained within service specific proposals for the PPCS Department.

4 WHAT IS THE PERMANENT BUDGET?

GROSS
£000

565

NET
£000

565

5 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED NET SAVINGS TO THE BUDGET?

	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	Total £000
Gross Saving	50	0	0	50
LESS Loss of Income	0	0	0	0
LESS Costs of Reprovision	0	0	0	0
NET SAVING	50	0	0	50

WHAT ARE THE NET SAVINGS AS A % OF NET BUDGET?

8.8%

6 WHAT IS THE CURRENT PERMANENT FTE STAFFING?

22.0

7 WHAT ARE THE PROPOSED PERMANENT FTE REDUCTIONS?

1.0

8 COSTS (significant one off costs associated with implementing the project)
None identified.

9 WHAT IS THE IMPACT?

ON SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

(including considerations relating to deprivation & equality)

Service users are unlikely to be directly impacted by the reduced management capacity.

ON OTHER ORGANISATIONS

As for service users.

ON OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

As for service users.

10 INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics, (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation). If so how?

It is not believed that the proposal will have a disproportionate / adverse or negative impact on people with protected characteristics.

11 RISKS AND MITIGATING ACTIONS

Reduced capacity to respond to opportunities / threats at service level. Mitigated by a stronger focus on prioritisation and risk management.