

Appendix B

Business Cases for Alternative Budget Reduction Proposals

BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	Corporate
Budget Reduction Title:	Additional Vacancy Management factor to achieve greater efficiency including limiting the present use of agency staff and consultants

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

The Administration has proposed to apply a vacancy factor at a rate of 1.5% (£0.800m saving) to all mainstream employee budgets based on the assumption that some posts will become vacant or be held vacant during 2019/20 due to staff turnover.

To assist in reducing the number of agency staff and consultants used across the Council, it is proposed that this saving could be extended further and that a vacancy rate of 2.5% should be applied to all Council mainstream employee budgets in 2019/20. This additional 1% would generate a saving of a further £0.550m.

Furthermore, it is proposed to further extend this in future years by additional 0.5% per annum taking the vacancy rate to 3% in 2020/21 and 3.5% in 2021/22. This increase would generate savings of circa £0.270m in each financial year.

2018/19 Service Budget and Establishment	£000
Employees	54,000
Other Operational Expenses	0
Income	0
Total	54,000

Current Forecast (under) / overspend	0
---	---

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)	0
---	---

	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	(550)	(270)	(270)
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	0	0	0

Is your proposal a 'one-off' in 2019/20 or is it ongoing?	Ongoing
--	---------

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following?

Property
None.
Service Delivery
There is no anticipated impact on service delivery. Service staffing budgets will be managed within available resources
Future expected outcomes
None.
Organisation
There is no anticipated impact on the organisation. Service staffing budgets will be managed within available resources
Workforce
None.
Communities / Service Users
None.
Oldham Cares
There is no anticipated impact on Oldham Cares apart from Council staffing budgets within Adult Social Care carrying and managing the vacancy factor.
Partner Organisations
None.

Who are the key stakeholders?

Staff	Yes
Elected Members	No
Residents	No
Local business community	No
Schools	No
Trade Unions	No
External partners (if yes please specify below)	No
N/A	
Other Council departments (if yes please specify below)	No
N/A	
Other (if yes please specify below)	No
N/A	

Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements

Potential reduction in the number of interim and agency staff used across the authority which may reduce expenditure.

Section C**Key Risks and Mitigations**

Risk	Mitigation
Service budgets will overspend in 2019/20 due to non-achievement of the vacancy management target.	There is an expectation that a percentage of posts will be vacant in year through natural turnover of staff, and services through to directorates will manage recruitment and cover arrangements accordingly.
Individual budget areas with low staff turnover will fail to meet the vacancy target.	Information on the achievement of vacancy management targets will be made available at service and directorate level to allow a wider analysis of progress against targets and allow offsets between over and under achieving service / directorate areas.
N/A	N/A

Key Development and Delivery Milestones

Milestone	Timeline
Vacancy management targets are calculated and allocations communicated to service and budget managers	January 2019
Vacancy management targets are reviewed in line with any organisation change prior to the commencement of the 2019/20 financial year	November 2018 - February 2019
Vacancy management targets are applied to individual budgets prior to the commencement of the 2019/20 financial year	March 2019
Production of vacancy management information is built into financial monitoring procedures	March 2019

Section D

Consultation required?	No
-------------------------------	-----------

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	N/A	N/A
Trade Union	N/A	N/A
Public	N/A	N/A
Service Users	N/A	N/A
Other	N/A	N/A

Equality Impact Screening

Is there potential for the proposed budget reduction to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following?

Disabled people	No
Particular Ethnic Groups	No
Men or Women (including impacts due to pregnancy / maternity)	No
People who are married or in a civil partnership	No
People of particular sexual orientation	No
People who are proposing to undergo, undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People on low incomes	No
People in particular age groups	No
Groups with particular faiths and beliefs	No

EIA required? (choose YES if any of the above impacts are YES)	No
---	-----------

Section E

Finance comments
As with the Administration's proposal to introduce a 1.5% Vacancy Factor, this proposal to increase the Vacancy Factor to 2.5% in 2019/20 and further in future years represents a change in the costing methodology for staffing budgets across the organisation. Any introduction of a Vacancy Factor carries risks of non-delivery and service overspend as detailed in Section C of this pro-forma and the higher the applied Vacancy Factor, the higher the associated risk to financial and service performance.

Signed RO	03/01/2019
------------------	------------

Signed Finance	03/01/2019
-----------------------	------------

BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	Civic and Political Support
Budget Reduction Title:	Reduction in the number of Councillors from 60 to 40 and a review of the Electoral Cycle

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

The proposal is a reduction in elected members from 60 to 40 and review of the current electoral cycle.

The current basic allowance is £0.009m per annum (plus associated national insurance costs) and therefore this would represent a saving of £0.190m per annum. There would also be an associated £0.100m saving in Members' budgets as a result of the reduction in the number of Councillors.

Currently, in three out of every four years, a third of Councillors are required to be elected. In the fourth year, there is no local election. Councillors serve a four year term of office. There are currently 60 Councillors serving 20 wards with 3 members per ward.

Current legislation does not permit Metropolitan Councils, such as Oldham, to have elections on a biennial basis and the recommendation requires representations to be made to the Secretary of State to give this additional power.

The Council would require an Electoral Review to execute the proposal. The review would be carried out by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE). The objective of the review would be to consider and identify the appropriate number of Councillors for each ward. There would be a need for a review application to be made to the LGBCE outlining the reasons why the review is required. The Commission follow a timetable which is approximately 10-14 weeks long. Based on the timelines from the Boundary Commission this process would take at least 12 months from the Council approving the principle decision. It should be noted that the recommended decision of the LGBCE may be different from that presented in this report. If agreed, there would also be a change to the frequency pattern of local elections, resulting in a saving of one local election every four years.

2018/19 Service Budget and Establishment	£000
Employees	1,018
Other Operational Expenses	0
Income	0
Total	1,018

Current Forecast (under) / overspend	0
---	---

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)	60
---	----

	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	0	(290)	0
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	0	(20)	0

Is your proposal a 'one-off' in 2019/20 or is it ongoing?	Ongoing
--	---------

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following?

Property
None.
Service Delivery
None.
Future expected outcomes
None.
Organisation
None.
Workforce
None.
Communities / Service Users
There would be a reduction in the number of Elected Members representing Oldham communities.
Oldham Cares
None.
Partner Organisations
None.

Who are the key stakeholders?

Staff	No
Elected Members	Yes
Residents	No
Local business community	No
Schools	No
Trade Unions	No
External partners (if yes please specify below)	No
Other Council departments (if yes please specify below)	No
Other (if yes please specify below)	No

Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements

Budget reduction.

Section C

Key Risks and Mitigations

Risk	Mitigation
By reducing the number of Councillors from 60 to 40 it has the potential to limit the access constituents currently have with Councillors. Members will need to consider their approach to managing their constituency workloads. A reduction in the number of Councillors may also impact on the number of outside bodies' places that Oldham Council currently have.	Support would need to be put into place for Members if there were a reduction to enable a successful transition to new ways of working. One way would be through the Local Leader's programme.
Each Member will have to review their constituency base and their workload arrangements.	Support required for Members to allow the review.
There may be potential implications for ways of working within the District Partnerships.	Support required for Members to allow the review.
The reduction in budget to reflect the change in electoral cycle may put the service at risk if there are any unanticipated by-elections.	A proportion of the savings from non-election years should be retained in a reserve to fund any unanticipated elections.

Key Development and Delivery Milestones

Milestone	Timeline
Application to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England	Early 2019/20
Implementation	2020/21

Section D

Consultation required?	No
-------------------------------	-----------

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	N/A	N/A
Trade Union	N/A	N/A
Public	N/A	N/A
Service Users	N/A	N/A
Other	N/A	N/A

Equality Impact Screening

Is there potential for the proposed budget reduction to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following?

Disabled people	No
Particular Ethnic Groups	No
Men or Women (including impacts due to pregnancy / maternity)	No
People who are married or in a civil partnership	No
People of particular sexual orientation	No
People who are proposing to undergo, undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People on low incomes	No
People in particular age groups	No
Groups with particular faiths and beliefs	No

EIA required? (choose YES if any of the above impacts are YES)	No
---	-----------

Section E

Finance comments
The implementation of this proposal would generate an on-going saving of £0.190m per annum from 2020/21 from the budget for Members' Allowances which is set at £1.018m in 2019/20. There would be a corresponding reduction in individual Members budgets of £0.100m from 2020/21, bringing the total reduction to £0.290m.

Signed RO	14/12/2018
------------------	------------

Signed Finance	14/12/2018
-----------------------	------------

BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	People Services
Budget Reduction Title:	Reduction in the General Training Budget agreed in 2018/19 to be made permanent

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

The General Training budget for 2019/2020 is £0.555m.

For 2018/2019 a 'one off' reduction of £0.150m was proposed and implemented by the Administration.

The Opposition has proposed to make this this reduction permanent from 2019/20 onwards. The net effect would be to reduce the General Training budget to £0.405m annually.

The reduction would require all future training requirements to be reviewed to ensure that best value is being secured. Priority would be provided to statutory and mandatory training. Any additional training and development would be assessed on the basis of value provided to the organisation, managing any identified risks to the Council in terms of building capability across all service areas.

2018/19 Service Budget and Establishment

	£000
Employees	0
Other Operational Expenses	555
Income	0
Total	555

Current Forecast (under) / overspend

	0
--	---

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)

	0
--	---

	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	(150)	0	0
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	0	0	0

Is your proposal a 'one-off' in 2019/20 or is it ongoing?

	Ongoing
--	---------

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following?

Property
None
Service Delivery
There is a potential for stagnation or reduction of service delivery should individuals become less effective.
Future expected outcomes
The proposal will contribute to the achievement of the budget proposal and drive the requirement to achieve best value from training and development activity. However, there will be less development of employees which may impact organisational and individual capability and effectiveness.
Organisation
Priority would be provided to statutory and mandatory training. Any additional training and development would be assessed on the basis of value provided to the organisation.
Workforce
There will be less development of employees which may impact organisational and individual capability and effectiveness.
Communities / Service Users
None
Oldham Cares
None
Partner Organisations
There will be no direct impact on partner organisations from this proposal, however the Council will seek to achieve savings in training procurement as and/or reduce demand.

Who are the key stakeholders?

Staff	Yes
Elected Members	No
Residents	Yes
Local business community	Yes
Schools	No
Trade Unions	No
External partners (if yes please specify below)	Yes
Any training providers that the Council currently use	
Other Council departments (if yes please specify below)	No
N/A	
Other (if yes please specify below)	No
N/A	

Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements

A £0.150m contribution to the achievement of the 2019/20 budget reduction target and the achievement of improved value by driving down supplier costs and/or demand. A greater focus on internal training delivery and self-directed learning will also be adopted.

Section C**Key Risks and Mitigations**

Risk	Mitigation
General training provision will reduce, limiting the development of employees.	Better management in procuring training and development activity, investment in resource to enable Internal training delivery / capacity, expansion and promotion of self-directed learning methods.
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

Key Development and Delivery Milestones

Milestone	Timeline
Proposal presented to Overview and Scrutiny Performance and Value for Money Select Committee	5 February 2019
Implementation	April 2019.
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

Section D

Consultation required?	No
-------------------------------	-----------

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	N/A	N/A
Trade Union	N/A	N/A
Public	N/A	N/A
Service Users	N/A	N/A
Other	N/A	N/A

Equality Impact Screening

Is there potential for the proposed budget reduction to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following?

Disabled people	No
Particular Ethnic Groups	No
Men or Women (including impacts due to pregnancy / maternity)	No
People who are married or in a civil partnership	No
People of particular sexual orientation	No
People who are proposing to undergo, undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People on low incomes	No
People in particular age groups	No
Groups with particular faiths and beliefs	No

EIA required? (choose YES if any of the above impacts are YES)	No
---	-----------

Section E

Finance comments
This proposal would create an ongoing saving of £0.150m from the central training budget from 2019/20. However, the prioritisation of statutory and mandatory training through the Development Academy may encourage services to source additional training requirements from service budgets with the potential of creating pressures in these areas.

Signed RO	14/12/2018
------------------	------------

Signed Finance	17/12/2018
-----------------------	------------

BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	People Services
Budget Reduction Title:	Reduced Sickness Absence through more robust absence management procedures

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

To consider potential financial savings through reducing sickness absence across the workforce.

The Alternative budget for the 2019/20 financial year includes a budget reduction of £0.013m based on achieving an aspirational target of 8 days absence per FTE on average. The actual sickness position for 2017/18 was 8.38 days per FTE.

Increased intervention at earlier stages including signs and symptoms of future potential absence, in addition to further challenges, timely meetings, adjustments and phased returns to reduce sickness absence and support provided to reduce the duration of absenteeism will be further enforced with DMT's and managers.

For long term absences, all cases will have an appropriate action plan attached to them to ensure that adequate and appropriate support is automatically pursued.

2018/19 Service Budget and Establishment	£000
Employees	-
Other Operational Expenses	-
Income	-
Total	-

Current Forecast (under) / overspend	-
--------------------------------------	---

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)	-
--	---

	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	(13)	0	0
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	0.00	0.00	0.00

Is your proposal a 'one-off' in 2019/20 or is it ongoing?	Ongoing
---	---------

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following?

Property
None.
Service Delivery
None.
Future expected outcomes
None.
Organisation
None.
Workforce
More robust application of the absence management procedures and support provided to staff in work and absent should have a positive impact on staff attendance through the reduction of sickness absence levels
Communities / Service Users
None.
Oldham Cares
None.
Partner Organisations
None.

Who are the key stakeholders?

Staff	Yes
Elected Members	No
Residents	No
Local business community	No
Schools	No
Trade Unions	Yes
External partners (if yes please specify below)	No
N/A	
Other Council departments (if yes please specify below)	No
N/A	
Other (if yes please specify below)	No
N/A	

Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements

Reduction in absence results in greater productivity from the workforce in addition to increased engagement, reduced costs of cover via agency and overtime and increased performance improvements across Council services.

Section C

Key Risks and Mitigations

Risk	Mitigation
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

Key Development and Delivery Milestones

Milestone	Timeline
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

Section D

Consultation required?	No
-------------------------------	----

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	N/A	N/A
Trade Union	N/A	N/A
Public	N/A	N/A
Service Users	N/A	N/A
Other	N/A	N/A

Equality Impact Screening

Is there potential for the proposed budget reduction to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following?

Disabled people	No
Particular Ethnic Groups	No
Men or Women (including impacts due to pregnancy / maternity)	No
People who are married or in a civil partnership	No
People of particular sexual orientation	No
People who are proposing to undergo, undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People on low incomes	No
People in particular age groups	No
Groups with particular faiths and beliefs	No

EIA required? (choose YES if any of the above impacts are YES)	No
---	-----------

Section E

Finance comments
There is no specific budget for sickness and as such any budget reduction would be cross cutting across Council employee budgets.

Signed RO	14/12/2018
------------------	------------

Signed Finance	17/12/2018
-----------------------	------------

BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	People Services
Budget Reduction Title:	Review of car allowances as previously promised to reduce the amount paid as a lump sum to staff doing zero or minimal mileage

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

A lump sum car allowance of £500 is paid annually to essential car users.

The amount paid in the year 2017/18 totalled £0.199m to approx. 432 members of staff (including leavers and thus a pro rata allowance for part of the year). For the period April 2018 to November 2018 a further £0.155m has been paid to 520 members of staff (again including pro rata for leavers).

Analysis of the data shows that in 2017/18 40% of those individuals in receipt of Essential Car Allowance had recorded less than 100 miles in their roles. 35% had claimed no mileage. These figures are believed to be understated as officers may not always make claims, especially for short journeys.

For the period April 2018 to November 2018 48% of recipients had recorded less than 100 miles in their roles. 42% of recipients (216 individuals) had claimed no mileage. It is believed officers have not always claimed mileage refunds in all instances.

The Liberal Democrats have proposed generating circa £0.050m by reducing the number of posts that attract an essential car user payment. A saving of £0.050m would equate to removal of allowance from circa 100 employees. Due to consultation requirements, only a part year reduction of £0.037m would be generated in 2019/20 with an additional saving of £0.013m in 2020/21.

There is a local agreement with Trades Unions regarding the assessment of entitlement and application of the Car Allowance Scheme. The scheme comprises a series of factors, including mileage, and allocates points per factor.

Consultation with Trades Unions and Individuals would need to take place before staff terms and conditions could be amended.

2018/19 Service Budget and Establishment	£000
Employees	0
Other Operational Expenses	232
Income	0
Total	232

Current Forecast (under) / overspend	0
---	---

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)	0
---	---

	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	(37)	(13)	0
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	0	0	0

Is your proposal a 'one-off' in 2019/20 or is it ongoing?	Ongoing
--	---------

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following?

Property
As Essential user status bestows free parking on Council property, budget is provided to the Property Team (Parking Shop). Removal of Essential user status would lead to a reduction in Parking Shop budget.
Service Delivery
Employees may refuse to use their own vehicles to complete their duties which may result in service delay, especially in the areas of social care.
Future expected outcomes
Potential to increase travel costs associated with other methods e.g. taxi, public transport.
Organisation
None.
Workforce
Certain individuals will have Car Allowance removed. Car parking costs would also increase for those individuals who are reclassified from Essential Users.
Communities / Service Users
Potential for delays in receiving support in certain areas, e.g. social care.
Oldham Cares
None.
Partner Organisations
None.

Who are the key stakeholders?

Staff	Yes
Elected Members	No
Residents	No
Local business community	No
Schools	No
Trade Unions	Yes
External partners (if yes please specify below)	No
N/A	
Other Council departments (if yes please specify below)	Yes
People and Place - Property	
Other (if yes please specify below)	No
N/A	

Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements

Achievement of budget reduction resulting in less pressure to make saving elsewhere.

Section C**Key Risks and Mitigations**

Risk	Mitigation
The allowance may be taken from users who travel a significant number of miles but have not claimed them in the past.	Communicate to claimants the requirement to claim mileage on a regular basis.
Where allowance is removed there may be an increase in costs associated with other modes of transport, e.g. taxis, public transport.	None
N/A	N/A

Key Development and Delivery Milestones

Milestone	Timeline
Communicate to all staff the requirement to claim mileage in a timely manner.	January - February 2019
Communicate the intention to remove Car allowance from all zero mileage claimants.	March 2019
Consult with affected employees.	April – May 2019
Remove Car Allowance from all recipients who have claimed zero mileage in the preceding year.	June 2019

Section D

Consultation required?	Yes
-------------------------------	------------

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	April 2019	May 2019
Trade Union	April 2019	May 2019
Public	N/A	N/A
Service Users	N/A	N/A
Other	N/A	N/A

Equality Impact Screening

Is there potential for the proposed budget reduction to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following?

Disabled people	N/A
Particular Ethnic Groups	N/A
Men or Women (including impacts due to pregnancy / maternity)	N/A
People who are married or in a civil partnership	N/A
People of particular sexual orientation	N/A
People who are proposing to undergo, undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	N/A
People on low incomes	N/A
People in particular age groups	N/A
Groups with particular faiths and beliefs	N/A

EIA required? (choose YES if any of the above impacts are YES)	N/A
---	-----

Section E

Finance comments
The reduction in the number of essential users for car allowances by 100 employees could generate a saving of £0.050m (phased over 2019/20 and 2020/21).

Signed RO	14/12/2018
------------------	------------

Signed Finance	14/12/2018
-----------------------	------------

BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	People Services
Budget Reduction Title:	Reduce the subsidisation of Trade Union support provided by the Council following a reduction in membership

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

The Council, in accordance with the National Agreement on Pay and Conditions of Service, recognises 3 unions for Local Government Services employees; Unison, Unite and GMB.

- Unison 2.89 FTE
- GMB 0.8 FTE
- Unite 0.4 FTE

Oldham Council supports the system of collective bargaining and the principle of solving employee relations problems by discussion and agreement before they escalate and to facilitate the conduct of joint business. The role of the unions is to work with the employer to represent and protect the interests of their members by:

- Negotiating agreements with the Council on changes to conditions of service or other contractual provisions;
- Representing the workforce in consultation on changes which impact on their members or that represent major changes to the workplace such as large-scale restructure or working practices;
- Supporting members to discuss their concerns with the Council;
- Accompanying their members in disciplinary and grievance meetings; and
- Providing access to legal and financial advice and other support functions.

The Council seeks to provide for time off and facilities within the statutory framework provided by of the Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992, and the ACAS Code of Practice 'Time off for Trade Union Duties and Activities'. The Liberal Democrats are proposing the Council reduces it subsidisation of trade union support following a reduction in membership. This would result in a reduction of approximately 50% to the base budget resulting in a total saving £0.075m which, due to the consultation required, would be achieved over 2 financial years.

In addition the Liberal Democrats propose a review is undertaken to ensure the Council subsidy of trade union time and facilities is in line with that of neighbouring boroughs.

2018/19 Service Budget and Establishment

	£000
Employees	182
Other Operational Expenses	20
Income	(46)
Total	156

Current Forecast (under) / overspend

	0
--	---

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)

	4.09
--	------

	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	(38)	(37)	-
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	(2.00)	-	-

Is your proposal a 'one-off' in 2019/20 or is it ongoing?

	Ongoing
--	---------

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following?

Property
Potential impact on provision of office facilities within Manchester Chambers for UNISON and rent collection for this property.
Service Delivery
Potential effective use of management time and ability to conduct meetings and hearings due to non-availability of union representation.
Future expected outcomes
Loss of goodwill and excellent industrial relations history. Movement of trade union activity from local to regional. Loss of trust and confidence among the workforce where unions are not fully involved.
Organisation
Delays in work/ projects requiring (or where best practice dictates) working with, consulting or negotiating with the trades unions
Workforce
Potential reduction in employee capacity arising from the requirement for increased workforce direct engagement in change or budget cuts.
Communities / Service Users
Delay in change or other cost saving activities
Oldham Cares
Where unions represent employees working within or in partnership with Oldham Cares – similar implications to those identified for Oldham Council.
Partner Organisations
As above within Unity Partnership Limited and Mio Care and Oldham Schools. Could impact on change proposals which increasingly involve other agencies.

Who are the key stakeholders?

Staff	Yes
Elected Members	Yes
Residents	No
Local business community	No
Schools	Yes
Trade Unions	Yes
External partners (if yes please specify below)	No
N/A	
Other Council departments (if yes please specify below)	Yes
All Council departments	
Other (if yes please specify below)	Yes
Oldham Cares, MioCare and the Unity Partnership Ltd	

Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements

Reduction in cost.

Section C

Key Risks and Mitigations

Risk	Mitigation
TU incapacity to be able to support and properly represent their members especially given the ongoing GM devolution and Health integration programme and degree of change anticipated within the Council over the next 12 months.	Seek greater involvement from Regional / National Officers Increase recruitment of directorate stewards to undertake role within working time* (* we have tried to encourage this in the past with limited success)
Delay in the ability of management to arrange and undertake meetings requiring statutory or policy trade union presence in a timely manner or having no continuity of attendees.	Seek greater involvement from Regional / National Officers Increase recruitment of directorate stewards to undertake role within working time* (* we have tried to encourage this in the past with limited success) Lengthen consultation periods / development of new initiatives deadlines to allow for limited availability of local representatives.
Inability of the organisation to comply with statutory, national or local policy requirements regarding negotiation, consultation and representation which will increase the risk of successful challenge, litigation and significant cost.	Seek greater involvement from Regional / National Officers for corporate initiatives. Increase recruitment of directorate stewards to undertake role within working time* (* we have tried to encourage this in the past with limited success). Increase in employee direct engagement.
Confusion with the Councils own Fair Employment Charter which honours the right of every employee to be an active member of a recognised trade union without fear of discrimination or reprisal.	Be clear with employees where they are able to access alternative representation outside of the council.
Movement away from local representation and engagement with reliance on Union own professional Regional Officers. Significant time delays due to lack of availability together with loss of knowledgeable local representation who understand the context, history and operational positions within Oldham.	Retain the recognition agreement and sufficient reasonable and benchmarked facility time.
Reduction in capacity efficiencies gained from collective bargaining. Decline in current constructive industrial relations working partnership and increase in disputes and escalation of industrial action	Retain the recognition agreement and sufficient and benchmarked facility time.

Key Development and Delivery Milestones

Milestone	Timeline
Review Membership amongst current workforce and update TU figures	April 2019
Benchmark with other GM / regional authorities	May 2019
Monitor statute to identify potential change or direction	Jan -May 2019
Open consultation with the trades unions	June 2019
Internal sign off process	September 2019
Submission to Local NJC Committee (LJNCC)	November 2019 or in accordance with future budget timescales.

Section D

Consultation required?	Yes
------------------------	-----

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	N/A	N/A
Trade Union	June 19	September 19
Public	N/A	N/A
Service Users	N/A	N/A
Other (SMT/ Members)	August 19	October 19

Equality Impact Screening

Is there potential for the proposed budget reduction to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following?

Disabled people	No
Particular Ethnic Groups	No
Men or Women (including impacts due to pregnancy / maternity)	No
People who are married or in a civil partnership	No
People of particular sexual orientation	No
People who are proposing to undergo, undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People on low incomes	No
People in particular age groups	No
Groups with particular faiths and beliefs	No

EIA required? (choose YES if any of the above impacts are YES)	No
--	----

Section E

Finance comments

The proposal would generate an ongoing saving of the amount detailed in section A.
--

Signed RO	14/12/2018
------------------	------------

Signed Finance	17/12/2018
-----------------------	------------

BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	Marketing and Communications
Budget Reduction Title:	Redesign of Communications & Marketing

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

The Communication team's role is to ensure that information and key messaging about Council services, decisions and campaigns are equally accessible to all of the borough's residents, our staff and our partners. Oldham Council has a centralised Communications and Marketing team with staff delivering digital, design internal communications, media relations, marketing and social media content creation with business partner support to each directorate.

As more information moves online and residents become increasingly technologically advanced the need to produce hard copy publications reduces. As such the Liberal Democrat's propose to reduce the service budget for the Communications and Marketing team by £0.150m in 2019/20, and an additional £0.100m in 2020/21 and £0.100m in 2021/22.

This reduction in 2019/20 would be met by generating £0.145m through ceasing the publication of the Borough Life Magazine and the Staff Matters newsletter, halting all staff conferences, removing the reputation tracker, deleting 1 vacant Communications officer post and 1 Graphic Designer post.

Alongside the above reductions, it is proposed to generate income of circa £0.005m by selling advertising on the Council's website similar to that which is done in a neighbouring authority.

A further review of the core offer of the Communications and Marketing team for 2020/21 onwards would be then be completed to deliver additional savings in future years.

2018/19 Service Budget and Establishment	£000
Employees	802
Other Operational Expenses	90
Income	(134)
Total	758

Current Forecast (under) / overspend	21
---	----

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)	18
---	----

	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	(150)	(100)	(100)
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	(2)	TBC	TBC

Is your proposal a 'one-off' in 2019/20 or is it ongoing?	Ongoing
--	---------

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following?

Property
None.
Service Delivery
A reduction in the capacity to deliver for core services would necessitate internal clients simply going elsewhere to get the work they needed done. That is likely to impact negatively on the quality and consistency of what is delivered and would also mean departments potentially paying more for the work than they do already – increasing their own spend. A reduction in the information available is also likely to lead to increased demand on other areas, like the Contact Centre, and increased pressures and costs for those areas.
Future expected outcomes
Reducing the capacity of the Communications team would affect the entire organisation's ability to deliver information and behaviour change with residents, partners, staff and other key stakeholders.
Organisation
The organisation's key policy and behaviour change initiatives – schemes which must be communicated effectively in order to deliver future savings – would be impacted by a reduction in our capacity to deliver internal communications, especially to remote staff. Less communication with staff would lead to them being less informed and less able to be effective ambassadors who understand our values and behaviours, plus our aims and objectives for the borough. This would also make leadership more difficult.
Workforce
Reduced communications to staff means a less informed workforce able to understand its role and purpose within the organisation, and the corporate narrative.
Communities / Service Users
Having less informed residents in a 'post-truth' era runs the risk of less satisfaction with services and falling trust – plus more demands elsewhere across the organisation for information. A lack of understanding of our services and strategic vision is also likely to impact negatively on residents' and communities' resilience and understanding – or willingness – to do #yourbit.
Oldham Cares
The Communications team currently works alongside and supports the new Oldham Cares organisation on internal and external messaging, plus events and promotion, like The Big Conversation. A reduction would impact on Oldham Cares' ability to: ensure robust mechanisms are in place to inform and involve key stakeholders; identify opportunities and channels for genuine engagement and involvement; provide information for the key audiences in the format best suited to their needs; identify key messages, milestones and outcomes and how they will be communicated; support patient, carer and staff engagement.
Partner Organisations
Partner organisations need to be able to understand Oldham Council's corporate narrative and strategic vision for the borough. Diluting our ability to deliver this could lead to them feeling less informed and connected. It also might lead to them seeking information direct from services, which again shifts the response burden but does not necessarily save money.

Who are the key stakeholders?

Staff	Yes
Elected Members	Yes
Residents	Yes
Local business community	Yes
Schools	Yes
Trade Unions	Yes
External partners (if yes please specify below)	Yes
All i.e. Oldham Cares	

Other Council departments (if yes please specify below)	Yes
All	
Other (if yes please specify below)	No
N/A	
Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements	
A budget reduction of £0.150m in 2019/20	

Section C

Key Risks and Mitigations

Risk	Mitigation
The Communications Team will be unable to meet demand.	Priorities would have to be reviewed and activity reduced simply to support only statutory services.
Proactive communications would be vastly reduced.	A tightly-defined and agreed set of core priorities would have to be agreed across the organisation with an acceptance that many existing communications activities would cease.
A reduction in communication opportunities could lead to some areas delivering their own messaging.	Utilise Business Partner relationships and other avenues for communication within the organisation or partners.

Key Development and Delivery Milestones

Milestone	Timeline
Proposal presented to Overview and Scrutiny Performance and Value for Money Select Committee	5 February 2019
Staff and Trades Union consultations	February 2019 – March 2019
Implementation of proposal	April 2019

Section D

Consultation required?	Yes
-------------------------------	------------

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	February 2019	March 2019
Trade Union	February 2019	March 2019
Public	February 2019	March 2019
Service Users	February 2019	March 2019
Other	February 2019	March 2019

Equality Impact Screening

Is there potential for the proposed budget reduction to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following?

Disabled people	No
Particular Ethnic Groups	No
Men or Women (including impacts due to pregnancy / maternity)	No
People who are married or in a civil partnership	No
People of particular sexual orientation	No
People who are proposing to undergo, undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People on low incomes	No
People in particular age groups	No
Groups with particular faiths and beliefs	No

EIA required? (choose YES if any of the above impacts are YES)	No
---	-----------

Section E

Finance comments
The approval of this proposal would generate on going budget reductions within Marketing and Communications as stated, however, should the organisational demand remain for marketing and communications at the current level then this may lead to external agencies being employed. Budgets would have to be managed to ensure that there was no adverse impact.

Signed RO	18/01/2019
------------------	------------

Signed Finance	15/01/2019
-----------------------	------------

BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	Soft Facilities Management
Budget Reduction Title:	Additional Bus Lane Enforcement to ensure consistency of provision within the Council controlled area

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

As part of the Administration's budget reduction proposal an additional 5 bus lane enforcement routes have been consulted upon.

It is proposed to introduce a further lane at Rochdale Road Oldham and therefore ensure consistency of enforcement across the borough.

To enable the implementation, the relevant infrastructure will need to be purchased or put in place i.e. purchase of camera (capital), maintenance, signage, highways works, advertising and reviewing of CCTV (revenue). Any revenue costs, including the revenue implications of the capital expenditures, will be offset by income generated by Penalty Charge Notices (PCN's) issued.

The purchase of a new camera would be £0.020m. Civil works for lines and signs will cost approximately £0.003m resulting in an initial capital outlay of circa £0.023m.

If this alternative budget reduction proposal is approved, it is anticipated it would take circa six months to implement the works and the new CCTV system based on the implementation of previous bus lanes. The legal work associated with the updating of the traffic regulation order has already been completed.

Ongoing revenue costs are estimated to be in the region of £0.008m per annum.

Based on income received to date from existing bus lane enforcement, it is estimated that the additional income generated from the above route would have a value of circa £0.037m.

2018/19 Service Budget and Establishment	£000
Employees	113
Other Operational Expenses	1,898
Income	(2,088)
Total	(77)

Current Forecast (under) / overspend	0
---	---

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)	3.5
---	-----

	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	(16)	(13)	0
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	0	0	0

Is your proposal a 'one-off' in 2019/20 or is it ongoing?	Ongoing
--	---------

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following?

Property
None.
Service Delivery
Parking Services will negotiate the additional monitoring requirements with NSL, the Council's Parking Enforcement Agency
Future expected outcomes
None.
Organisation
Parking Services will performance manage the additional bus lanes through the NSL contact
Workforce
None.
Communities / Service Users
Minimal, as there are very few residential properties within the vicinity of the proposed bus lane enforcement site
Oldham Cares
None.
Partner Organisations
This will increase the enforcement work NSL currently undertake for the Council

Who are the key stakeholders?

Staff	No
Elected Members	No
Residents	No
Local business community	No
Schools	No
Trade Unions	No
External partners (if yes please specify below)	Yes
NSL	
Other Council departments (if yes please specify below)	No
N/A	
Other (if yes please specify below)	No
N/A	

Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements

The Council is seen by Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) to be enforcing bus lanes that were previously constructed but not enforced.

Section C

Key Risks and Mitigations

Risk	Mitigation
Level of PCNs issued does not meet the expected income levels	Regular updates on PCNs issued and an action plan developed for any adverse reduction in income generated Camera can be relocated if required
Negative publicity	Clear communication plan developed
N/A	N/A

Key Development and Delivery Milestones

Milestone	Timeline
Programme of infrastructure and camera installation works are implemented	August 2019
Implementation of bus lane enforcement	September 2019
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

Section D

Consultation required?	No (previously completed)
------------------------	------------------------------

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	N/A	N/A
Trade Union	N/A	N/A
Public	N/A	N/A
Service Users	N/A	N/A
Other	N/A	N/A

Equality Impact Screening

Is there potential for the proposed budget reduction to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following?

Disabled people	No
Particular Ethnic Groups	No
Men or Women (including impacts due to pregnancy / maternity)	No
People who are married or in a civil partnership	No
People of particular sexual orientation	No
People who are proposing to undergo, undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People on low incomes	No
People in particular age groups	No
Groups with particular faiths and beliefs	No

EIA required? (choose YES if any of the above impacts are YES)	No
--	----

Section E

Finance comments
Finance comments are included within the additional information section.

Signed RO	14/12/2018
-----------	------------

Signed Finance	12/12/2018
----------------	------------

Additional information (if required)

The proposal is to install 1 new enforcement camera at the bus lane on Rochdale Road, Oldham.

The proposal requires an initial capital outlay of circa £0.023m to cover the purchase and installation of the cameras and the required groundwork / site preparation. (The 1st years licencing and software costs are included in this figure).

It is anticipated that the new camera will generate circa £0.037m per annum in additional income based on estimated contravention figures of 1,092 PCN's paid at the current average payment rate of £33.62. The estimated contravention figures are based on the current bus lane enforcement cameras in operation.

Ongoing management and maintenance costs have been calculated at circa £8k per annum resulting in a net income generation of £0.029m.

	£'000
Income	(37)
Expenditure	8
Net Surplus	(29)

Due to a six month lead-in time, the first year option has been calculated at £0.016m increasing to £0.029m in the second full year of operation.

It is anticipated that the initial capital outlay will be funded through unallocated capital resources. However if funding is met through additional prudential borrowing the service will incur annual repayment costs. This will reduce the full year impact of the budget option.

BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	Street Lighting
Budget Reduction Title:	Review of Existing Dimming Regime

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

The Liberal Democrats are proposing to further reduce energy consumption by reviewing the current dimming regime specifically to reduce the lighting levels from 100% to 75% from – Dusk to 22:00 and 05:00 to Dawn for both Traffic Routes and Residential Areas.

By implementing a variable lighting strategy the financial impact can be reduced whilst still maintaining a street lighting provision. However it should be noted that a reduction in light output is not directly proportional to a reduction in energy consumption. This is as a result of the additional energy used by the street light’s control equipment.

A scheme of variable street lighting went live across Oldham from January 2016 following trialling across 1,000 lanterns in the borough.

The new street lights have the ability to vary the light output anywhere between 100% and 50%, however it is common practice to reduce the levels in steps of 25% as this equates to one lighting class (in accordance with British Standards lighting design). This provides three stepped options as follows – 100% (full brightness), 75% (a 25% reduction in light) and 50% (half brightness).

Under a scheme of delegated authority, the Portfolio Holder determined a scheme for dimming lights in the borough, details of the current regime can be found in Additional Information. The exception within the scheme is in respect of locations advised by Community Safety, the Police and areas covered by fixed CCTV sites. These areas will remain at 100% during the hours of darkness. These locations will be reviewed periodically in conjunction with Community Safety and the Police.

A review has been made of Street Lighting energy consumption/cost for the calendar years 2015 and 2016 and this shows that the number of Kilowatt hours (KWH) consumed has fallen by 1,260,946 resulting in a year on year saving of £0.183m. Further details can be found in Section 1 within additional information.

One proposal could be to reduce lighting between 22.00 hrs and 05.00 hrs by a further 25%. This would mean that at these times, lanterns would have been dimmed by 75%. Technical guidance suggests that lighting at such low levels would impact adversely on lantern performance and shorten their lifespan thus leading to increased costs elsewhere.

An alternative proposal is to reduce the Dusk to 22.00 hrs and 05.00hrs to Dawn lighting periods from 100% to 75% (i.e. 25% across the board). It is estimated that this could produce a further saving of £0.055m p.a. on top of the £0.183m already achieved in 2016/17. The proposal is set out in the following tables:

For traffic routes (Proposed)

Hours	Dusk –22:00	22:00 – 24:00	24:00 –05:00	05:00 – Dawn
Option approved	75%	75%	50%	75%

For residential areas (Proposed)

Hours	Dusk –22:00	22:00 – 24:00	24:00 –05:00	05:00 – Dawn
Option approved	75%	50%	50%	75%

Comparison of Energy Usage / Cost

The proposed review of the dimming regime has assumed the street lighting operating hours per annum of 4,015 and base hour levels have assumed to be at 7pm average switch on and 6am average switch off for a 365 day period.

It should be noted that the current lighting reductions were achieved after consultation and advice from parties such as the Police, Highways, Health and Safety etc. A similar process would need to be considered to ensure that lighting continues to be set at a standard that minimises crime and third party claims.

The original detail from the proposal to dim lights in 2015 & 2016 will need to be revisited to ensure there are no further impact changes and the proposal is still feasible.

2018/19 Service Budget and Establishment

	£000
Employees	133
Other Operational Expenses	6,459
Income	(2,530)
Total	4,062

Current Forecast (under) / overspend

(60)

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)

3 Oldham, 1 Rochdale

	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	(55)	0	0
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	0	0	0

Is your proposal a 'one-off' in 2019/20 or is it ongoing?

Ongoing

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following?

Property
The savings associated with dimming street lighting will result in savings in energy costs for the Council.
Service Delivery
Members of the public may notice a reduction in the level of street lighting and feel this is a reduction in level of service provided by the Council. The expectation of stakeholders for the service will need to be managed through engagement and consultation, to explain the rationale for the change and the benefits.
Future expected outcomes
None.
Organisation
The organisation will see a reduction in its energy costs.
Workforce
None.
Communities / Service Users
The wider community may feel that the reduction in street lighting will put them at risk. Engagement with stakeholders will take place prior to the implementation to ensure this risk is minimised.
Oldham Cares
None.
Partner Organisations
Council officers will engage and work with other community groups to ensure that any concerns are dealt with and risks are minimised.

Who are the key stakeholders?

Staff	No
Elected Members	Yes
Residents	Yes
Local business community	Yes
Schools	Yes
Trade Unions	No
External partners (if yes please specify below)	Yes
Police	
Other Council departments (if yes please specify below)	Yes
Community Safety Services	
Other (if yes please specify below)	N/A

Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements

The benefits are a reduction in energy costs and there are no staff implications, however there is a reduction in lighting performance that could potentially impact on public safety, crime, and third party claims.

Section C

Key Risks and Mitigations

Risk	Mitigation
Risk of accidents and increase the risks associated with wider community safety due to reduction in street lighting levels.	Council officers would work closely with Members and other stakeholders prior to any proposal being implemented to minimise any risk to safety.
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

Key Development and Delivery Milestones

Milestone	Timeline
Proposal presented to Overview and Scrutiny Performance and Value for Money Select Committee	5 February 2019
Consultation with the public and partner organisations	February 2019 – March 2019
Start the implementation of the dimming scheme throughout the Borough	April 2019

Section D

Consultation required?	Yes
-------------------------------	------------

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	No	N/A
Trade Union	No	N/A
Public	February 2019	March 2019
Service Users	February 2019	March 2019
Other - Stakeholders	February 2019	March 2019

Equality Impact Screening

Is there potential for the proposed budget reduction to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following?

Disabled people	No
Particular Ethnic Groups	No
Men or Women (including impacts due to pregnancy / maternity)	No
People who are married or in a civil partnership	No
People of particular sexual orientation	No
People who are proposing to undergo, undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People on low incomes	No
People in particular age groups	No
Groups with particular faiths and beliefs	No

EIA required? (choose YES if any of the above impacts are YES)	No
---	-----------

Section E

Finance comments
<p>The Street Lighting PFI commenced in 2012. It is managed on a joint basis by Oldham Council and Rochdale Council via a joint authority board. Day to day management is provided by a small core team of 4 officers based at Kingsway, Rochdale. The PFI receives partial funding from the Department for Transport totalling approximately £2.5M p.a. Oldham Council has authority to determine its own lighting standards provided they meet national minimum standards and subject to the technical limitations imposed by its own lighting stock. The current scheme of dimming for Oldham was put in place in 2016. If this proposal is agreed then this would represent a second phase of dimming across the borough. As energy costs are incurred by Corporate Landlord (cost centre 12266) and then recharged to other services, the saving would be made under that budget heading.</p>

Signed RO	08/01/2019
------------------	------------

Signed Finance	08/01/2019
-----------------------	------------

Additional information (if required)**1. The current dimming regime**For traffic routes: (Existing)

Hours	Dusk to 22:00	22:00 to 24:00	24:00 –05:00	05:00 – Dawn
Option approved	100%	75%	50%	100%

For residential areas (Existing)

Hours	Dusk –22:00	22:00 – 24:00	24:00 –05:00	05:00 – Dawn
Option approved	100%	50%	50%	100%

2. Year on Year Comparison of Energy Usage/Cost

Month	2015		2016	
	Energy Usage	Cost	Energy Usage	Cost
	KWH	£	KWH	£
January	835,223	117,207	1,130,848	176,984
February	986,772	197,784	942,839	147,565
March	1,003,608	140,815	801,122	125,397
April	738,244	103,539	629,057	88,863
May	628,491	88,157	518,775	73,294
June	534,377	74,968	375,988	53,134
July	557,929	78,267	418,708	59,167
August	683,625	95,888	530,833	74,997
September	773,365	55,558	644,609	91,058
October	954,417	149,413	797,407	112,632
November	1,057,788	165,610	889,176	125,587
December	1,171,137	183,287	984,668	139,070
Total	9,924,975	1,450,492	8,664,029	1,267,748
Year on Year Reduction in Usage/Cost			(1,260,946)	(182,744)

BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	Corporate
Budget Reduction Title:	Reduce in travel budgets to ensure the most efficient method of transport is used for essential Council business

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

In April 2018, the Council received a Freedom of Information (FOI) request asking for details of all flights paid for by the Council within the period 1 January 2015 and 31 March 2018. Within this period Oldham Council reported a number of flights to differing destinations domestically and beyond. A significant number of these flights were funded by external sources however some costs were incurred by the general fund and so there is scope to reduce the impact on Council mainstream funding.

By ensuring that the most efficient and cost effective method for travel is used, it is proposed to reduce travel expenditure budgets by £0.005m in 2019/20. Travel budgets are held across the organisation and therefore this reduction would be cross cutting.

2018/19 Service Budget and Establishment	£000
Employees	0
Other Operational Expenses	71
Income	0
Total	71

Current Forecast (under) / overspend	0
---	---

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)	0
---	---

	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	(5)	0	0
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	0	0	0

Is your proposal a 'one-off' in 2019/20 or is it ongoing?	Ongoing
--	---------

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following?

Property
None.
Service Delivery
None.
Future expected outcomes
Most efficient use of transport is used for Council business.
Organisation
None.
Workforce
None.
Communities / Service Users
None.
Oldham Cares
None.
Partner Organisations
None.

Who are the key stakeholders?

Staff	Yes
Elected Members	No
Residents	No
Local business community	No
Schools	No
Trade Unions	No
External partners (if yes please specify below)	No
N/A	
Other Council departments (if yes please specify below)	No
N/A	
Other (if yes please specify below)	No
N/A	

Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements

Most efficient use of transport is used for Council business which will generate financial efficiencies for the Council.

Section C

Key Risks and Mitigations

Risk	Mitigation
Employees continue to book flights for Council business.	Staff communication through Departmental Management Teams to ensure most cost effective and efficient transport solution is used. Exception reporting to be developed to identify any areas of non-compliance. Details of any such instances will be reported back to the Senior Management Team.
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

Key Development and Delivery Milestones

Milestone	Timeline
Proposal presented to Overview and Scrutiny Performance and Value for Money Select Committee	5 February 2019
Implementation of proposal	April 2019
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

Section D

Consultation required?	No
-------------------------------	-----------

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	N/A	N/A
Trade Union	N/A	N/A
Public	N/A	N/A
Service Users	N/A	N/A
Other	N/A	N/A

Equality Impact Screening

Is there potential for the proposed budget reduction to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following?

Disabled people	No
Particular Ethnic Groups	No
Men or Women (including impacts due to pregnancy / maternity)	No
People who are married or in a civil partnership	No
People of particular sexual orientation	No
People who are proposing to undergo, undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People on low incomes	No
People in particular age groups	No
Groups with particular faiths and beliefs	No

EIA required? (choose YES if any of the above impacts are YES)	No
---	-----------

Section E

Finance comments
The approval of this budget reduction proposal would reduce travel budgets by £0.005m. Budgets for travel are held across the Council and therefore this would be a cross cutting saving.

Signed RO	17/01/2019
------------------	------------

Signed Finance	17/01/2019
-----------------------	------------

BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	Heritage, Libraries and Arts
Budget Reduction Title:	Generating additional income through increased renting out of artworks to other institutions and interested parties subject to security

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

The Council owns a diverse range of fine and decorative art which consists of 450 oil paintings, 500 watercolours and 1,400 prints. This includes a Charles Lees collection of paintings, drawings and engravings and 55 watercolours and drawings from the S.C. Turner collection.

Currently the Council loans items from the collections to accredited museums and galleries both nationally and internationally for public exhibitions. Whilst there is often a financial transaction involved this is to cover the cost of insurance, conservation and transport and does not generate a surplus. Also loans of this nature are a reciprocal arrangement whereby the Council is able to borrow items from collections around the country at minimal cost. It is an established principle that all museums support the appropriate loan of collections for public access.

The Opposition are proposing to expand the current arrangements to include an income generation element and provide private and corporate artwork lending. This proposal could inhibit the current reciprocal arrangements between museums and a private and corporate lending scheme could be costly to establish. As there is a need to fully test the market and quantify all relevant costs, including staff time, insurance valuations, conservation, framing, packing and marketing, it is currently difficult to assess if the notional income target of £0.002m proposed for 2019/20 is feasible.

2018/19 Service Budget and Establishment	£000
Employees	854
Other Operational Expenses	347
Income	(51)
Total	1,150

Current Forecast (under) / overspend	0
---	---

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)	24.52
---	-------

	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	(2)	0	0
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	0	0	0

Is your proposal a 'one-off' in 2019/20 or is it ongoing?	Ongoing
--	---------

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following?

Property
None.
Service Delivery
The service are currently at capacity due to urgent conservation and restoration works required following a flood in March 2018, which resulted in damage to over 1,000 items within the Council's collection. Any additional tasks would therefore require additional recruitment and staffing costs.
Future expected outcomes
None.
Organisation
None.
Workforce
Additional staff time needed to check conditions, prepare works, pack items, document and market.
Communities / Service Users
None.
Oldham Cares
None.
Partner Organisations
Some museum and gallery partners will incur additional charges which might make loans unfeasible.

Who are the key stakeholders?

Staff	Yes
Elected Members	No
Residents	No
Local business community	No
Schools	No
Trade Unions	No
External partners (if yes please specify below)	No
N/A	
Other Council departments (if yes please specify below)	No
N/A	
Other (if yes please specify below)	No
N/A	

Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements

Increased income generation from existing resources, although this would need to be off-set by the cost of implementation.

Section C

Key Risks and Mitigations

Risk	Mitigation
The lending scheme proves uneconomical to run due to increased staffing, materials, marketing and insurance costs and a lack of commercial demand.	Funding will need to be found for extensive market testing to be undertaken to ensure an adequate level of demand exists at a price which will cover additional costs.
Additional charges for public institutions borrowing artworks from Oldham inhibit opportunities for Oldham to receive loans from other museums.	Consideration given as to how costs are included in loan agreements.
Loss or damage to items within the Councils art collection.	Strict insurance controls would need to be in place before any artwork is transferred outside the Council's control. Particularly around transport, storage and display.

Key Development and Delivery Milestones

Milestone	Timeline
Proposal presented to Overview and Scrutiny Performance and Value for Money Select Committee	5 February 2019
Market testing and feasibility assessments completed.	February 2019 – March 2019
Potential loan items identified and programme of reframing and conservation underway.	March – June 2019
Scheme templates and processes developed to minimise additional workload and materials purchased	March 2019 – May 2019
Marketing and launch of scheme	From June 2019

Section D

Consultation required?	No
-------------------------------	-----------

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	N/A	N/A
Trade Union	N/A	N/A
Public	N/A	N/A
Service Users	N/A	N/A
Other	N/A	N/A

Equality Impact Screening

Is there potential for the proposed budget reduction to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following?

Disabled people	No
Particular Ethnic Groups	No
Men or Women (including impacts due to pregnancy / maternity)	No
People who are married or in a civil partnership	No
People of particular sexual orientation	No
People who are proposing to undergo, undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People on low incomes	No
People in particular age groups	No
Groups with particular faiths and beliefs	No

EIA required? (choose YES if any of the above impacts are YES)	No
---	-----------

Section E

Finance comments
The increase in income target for loaning out of fine art work by £0.002m will mean that the existing reciprocal arrangements are shifted to that of a profit making commercial basis. Increased activity in loaning out fine art work will incur addition costs in packaging, transportation, marketing and display. No market testing has been carried out to identify if there is sufficient demand to meet the increased income target. Any shortfalls against the income target must be met from existing budget within the Gallery Service. C. Holdaway

Signed RO	08/01/2019
------------------	------------

Signed Finance	09/01/2019
-----------------------	------------

Additional information (if required)

The Arts & Heritage Service budgets are currently ring-fenced whilst the new business model for the Oldham Heritage & Arts Centre (OMA) is developed. The current revenue budget is under significant pressure as OMA will deliver and expanded cultural offer with existing resources and there is an expectation that a year-on-year saving will be achieved after opening.

It should be noted that museums operate a mutually beneficial reciprocal lending arrangement between themselves, which works effectively for the public benefit.

Private and Corporate art lending schemes have been run by different institutions in the past, however we are not aware of any that are still operational. The main reasons for this appear to be running costs and lack of demand.

BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	Community / Adult Learning
Budget Reduction Title:	Charging for leisure courses within Lifelong Learning to reduce the Council subsidy

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

The aim of the Lifelong Learning Service is to deliver high quality, accessible local learning opportunities which enable adults to realise their potential and gain employment by developing their confidence, creativity, knowledge and skills.

The Lifelong Learning service is mainly grant funded through the Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) however the Council provides some mainstream funding to support the running of the service for example central support charges.

All lifelong learning courses are for people aged 19 years and over and are delivered across the borough at various sites. The Service complies with ESFA requirements to provide free courses for designated categories of learners. For other learner courses fees are charged and these must be used to co-fund the delivery of learning. Some learners are entitled to a concessionary rate and therefore pay a reduced fee towards a number of leisure courses.

The Liberal Democrat's propose to remove the concessionary rate for non-essential leisure courses such as arts and crafts and sewing which will reduce the amount of Council funding required for this service by £0.003m for 2019/20.

Please note that if this proposal is approved, a full Equality Impact Assessment will be required.

2018/19 Service Budget and Establishment	£000
Employees	2,317
Other Operational Expenses	616
Income	(3,275)
Total	(342)

Current Forecast (under) / overspend	0
--------------------------------------	---

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)	62.31
--	-------

	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	(3)	0	0
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	0	0	0

Is your proposal a 'one-off' in 2019/20 or is it ongoing?	Ongoing
---	---------

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following?

Property
Some sites will become less viable including Shaw and Failsworth.
Service Delivery
If concessions are removed this could impact on the volume of learners who can afford the full fees and this would impact on the achievement of service targets.
Future expected outcomes
A reduced uptake in this provision and reduced learner numbers which will impact on the value of the service in terms of devolution. There are unknown risks to funding in respect of the devolution to Greater Manchester of the Adult Skills budget including the Community Learning element for non-essential 'leisure' type courses.
Organisation
Organisation will become smaller. Reputational damage/fall out as provision is priced out of the market for non-essential leisure courses.
Workforce
Reduced workforce numbers. Redundancy costs. Loss of highly skilled tutors in specialist subjects.
Communities / Service Users
Social Isolation - see Equality Impact screening section for breakdown of learners on this type of provision.
Oldham Cares
Negative impact on health and wellbeing as some learners will not be able to attend if costs increase.
Partner Organisations
Impact on fees we are able to pay to providers so that we can be located in places where learners are able to access our provision.

Who are the key stakeholders?

Staff	Yes
Elected Members	Yes
Residents	Yes
Local business community	No
Schools	Yes
Trade Unions	No
External partners (if yes please specify below)	No
Other Council departments (if yes please specify below)	No
Other (if yes please specify below)	No

Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements

Generate £3,000 for the Organisation.

Section C

Key Risks and Mitigations

Risk	Mitigation
Lose learners due to increased cost.	Recruit more learners who are able to pay full cost via marketing and advertising of provision.
Increased social isolation of learners.	Need to refer to other agencies who can support with these issues.
Reduction in viability of training space.	Hire additional space as and when required for provision.

Key Development and Delivery Milestones

Milestone	Timeline
Consultation with learners	April – May 2019
Communication of change of policy for concessions	June 2019
Fees policy reviewed/changed	June 2019
N/A	N/A

Section D

Consultation required?	Yes
------------------------	-----

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	N/A	N/A
Trade Union	N/A	N/A
Public	N/A	N/A
Service Users	April 2019	May 2019
Other	N/A	N/A

Equality Impact Screening

Is there potential for the proposed budget reduction to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following?

Disabled people	YES 21% on CL courses declared a disability
Particular Ethnic Groups	YES 51.8% BME
Men or Women (including impacts due to pregnancy / maternity)	YES 77.3% Female 22.7% Male
People who are married or in a civil partnership	Unknown
People of particular sexual orientation	Unknown
People who are proposing to undergo, undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	Unknown
People on low incomes	YES 63.1%
People in particular age groups	YES 16-18 – 0.2% 19-24 – 6.6% 25-34 24.4% 35-44 27.1% 45-54 – 17.3% 55-64 – 12.5% 65+ - 12%
Groups with particular faiths and beliefs	Unknown

EIA required? (choose YES if any of the above impacts are YES)	YES
--	-----

Section E

Finance comments

The additional income generated could have an adverse effect on overall learner numbers as the additional pricing could lead to reduced overall numbers.

In 2017/18, out of the 1,173 enrolments there were 480 concessions who booked on the non-essential leisure courses. The average hourly rate for one of these courses is £3.70 of which the concessionary rate equates to £1.20. Each course on average is 3 hours in duration.

Although learner numbers could decline, it is anticipated that an additional income of £0.003m could be generated to support the Council's overall annual budget position.

(Catherine Dunkerley)

Signed RO	11/01/2019
------------------	------------

Signed Finance	11/01/2019
-----------------------	------------