

Responsible Officer :	Maggie Kufeldt
-----------------------	----------------

Cabinet Member :	Cllr J Harrison
------------------	-----------------

Support Officer :	Gioia Morrison
-------------------	----------------

BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	Director Adult Social Care
----------------	----------------------------

Budget Reduction Title :	Local Care Organisation (LCO) Efficiencies
--------------------------	--

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

Oldham Council and Oldham Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) are currently undertaking a major transformation to integrate Health and Social Care and design new procedures that will move more care from Acute settings such as the hospital, to community settings, such as the resident's home. This is expected to have a very large impact on the way we work as a health economy, although the details of this have not yet been finalised.

This saving proposal is looking at how the integration of services will lead to a reduction in delivery costs across the whole economy. These savings will then be used to address the savings gap of all the partners. The amounts included are an estimate of our share of the overall benefit that is expected to be achieved.

The main programmes of work, which are still to be designed in detail, are:

- Community Enablement
- Thriving Communities
- Core and Extended Primary Care
- Mental Health is Central to good health
- Health Improvement
- Start Well
- Urgent and Emergency Care

2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment

£000

Employees	8,240
Other Operational Expenses	87,756
Income	(30,799)
Total	65,197

Current Forecast (under) / overspend	(245)
--------------------------------------	-------

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)	0.00
--	------

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	0	(300)	(1,400)	0
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Is your proposal a "one-off" in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?	Ongoing
---	---------

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following? :

Property
A separate but linked piece of work is underway to see what efficiencies can be achieved by better use of the property portfolio across the region.
Service Delivery
This should significantly improve services for residents, enabling care to be delivered at an earlier stage and closer to home.
Future expected outcomes
This is expected to improve health outcomes for residents, allowing them more choice and control over their lives, as well as longer life expectancy.
Organisation
Likely to be significant but as yet unclear.
Workforce
Likely to be significant but as yet unclear.
Communities
Communities should be better served as care is delivered at cluster level. The Thriving Communities workstream especially should provide more opportunities and cohesion for communities.
Service Users
Likely to be significant but as yet unclear.
Partner Organisations
Likely to be significant but as yet unclear.

Who are the key stakeholders?

Staff	Yes
Elected Members	Yes
Residents	Yes
Local business community	Yes
Schools	No
Trade Unions	Yes
External Partners (if yes please specify below)	Yes
Minimum of CCG, PAHT, Pennine Care, Action Together	
Other Council Departments (if yes please specify below)	Yes
Corporate and Commercial as enabling services will be heavily involved	
Other (if yes please specify below)	Yes
GMHSC Partnership, MioCare	

Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements

This should reduce duplication across the health economy and enable services to be delivered closer to residents' homes.

Section C

Key Risks and Mitigations:

Risk	Mitigation
The biggest risk is that rather than move services to less expensive parts of the system capacity is increased and demand increases to fill it.	Careful monitoring of outcomes by GM and the economy and changes in approach if targets are not being achieved.
Benefits are not achieved in line with GM expectations so Transformation Funding, essential to delivery of the scheme, is not released.	Careful programme and project management of the programme and individual workstreams.
Governance and structural problems lead to delays in implementation which will delay the realisation of benefits.	Clear legal and professional advice to be sought to ensure the structural framework is in place.

Key Development and Delivery Milestones:

Milestone	Timeline
Operating Model of LCO established.	October 2017 to March 2018.
Shadow working arrangements commence.	April 2018.
Full implementation of LCO.	April 2019.
N/A	N/A

Section D

Consultation Required?	No
------------------------	----

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	not applicable	not applicable
Trade Union	not applicable	not applicable
Public	not applicable	not applicable
Service User	not applicable	not applicable
Other	not applicable	not applicable

Equality Impact Screening

Is there the 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? (automatically updates to Yes, if any of the above impacts are Yes)	No
---	----

Section E

Finance Comments
<p>These savings are estimates of what Oldham Council would receive as a share of the overall economy impact of integration and closer working. They will need to be revisited for the 2019/20 budget process to see how much progress is being made.</p> <p>Staff and public consultations, as well as any necessary Equality Impact Assessments, will be undertaken at a workstream level as the detail of what is to change is better understood.</p>

Signed RO	08-Jan-2018
-----------	-------------

Signed Finance	08-Jan-2018
----------------	-------------

Cabinet Member Signature		
Name and Date	Cllr J Harrison	10-Jan-2018

BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	Director Adult Social Care
Budget Reduction Title :	Alignment of ASC Care Packages with Statutory & Policy Expectations

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

Adult Social Care provides care and support services to people with eligible social care needs. The support may be in the form of residential or non-residential services, which enables people to live independent lives with choice and control.

In recent months, it has been identified by our internal audit function, that a number of direct payment cases have not been fully utilising their allocated funding, with high levels of monies being reclaimed via the audit function. To ascertain the reasons for this, an interim review was commissioned which highlighted that the causes may be due to a shift in policy or legislative approach to the allocation of resources since the last review or reassessment had taken place, or that circumstances relating to a person's care and support needs may have changed and the service not informed.

In light of this, it has been proposed that all high cost care packages within the service are reviewed, with a focus on ensuring the resources allocated are in line with policy and legislative duties, reflect current care and support needs and offer value for money in the services being commissioned.

The additional information section provides statistics and data relating to the proposal.

2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment

£000

Employees	8,240
Other Operational Expenses	77,114
Income	(30,686)
Total	54,668

Current Forecast (under) / overspend

(245)

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)

189.00

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	(150)	150	0	0
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Is your proposal a "one-off" in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?

One-off

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following? :

Property
None.
Service Delivery
A detailed implementation plan of reassessments for the cohort of cases identified, which will require social work resourcing to achieve the saving. It is proposed that this will be met from within existing resource budgets.
Future expected outcomes
Ensure consistency in service delivery and alignment with policy / statutory duties.
Organisation
Potential reputational impact due to perceptions of those people in receipt of services. A full EIA completed which ensures reviews / reassessments are in line with statutory responsibilities.
Workforce
No direct reduction or impact.
Communities
None.
Service Users
Direct impact on the cohort of 226 high cost packages as this may result in a reduction in care package, commissioning of an alternative service provider or a different way in their eligible care and support needs being met.
Partner Organisations
A review of high cost packages may lead to an increase in continuing health care applications, where the needs are identified as health care related.

Who are the key stakeholders?

Staff	No
Elected Members	No
Residents	Yes
Local business community	No
Schools	No
Trade Unions	No
External Partners (if yes please specify below)	Yes
Health partners i.e. Clinical Commissioning Group	
Other Council Departments (if yes please specify below)	No
N/A	
Other (if yes please specify below)	Yes
Social Care providers	

Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements

Ensures all packages of care are aligned with policy and statutory expectations.

Section C

Key Risks and Mitigations:

Risk	Mitigation
Service user perceptions of reassessments that lead to a reduction in packages of care.	A full EIA completed and changes in packages of care aligned with statutory responsibilities, local policy approaches and national eligibility criteria.
Level of reviews to be completed to achieve the level of financial savings.	A detailed implementation plan with review/reassessment targets set. This will be monitored on a monthly basis, via the service's high cost and complex panel.
Timescales for completing reviews/reassessments to achieve the savings by April 2018.	Monitoring and escalation arrangements will be overseen via the high cost panel on a monthly basis. With resources redirected, as appropriate, to ensure that the timetable for reassessments can be achieved.

Key Development and Delivery Milestones:

Milestone	Timeline
Completion of a full equality impact assessment. Consultation is not required as we are aligning with our statutory responsibilities in line with The Care Act 2014.	October 2017.
Develop detailed implementation plans, including reassessment schedules.	October 2017.
Commence reassessment process of identified high cost packages of care.	November 2017.
Achievement of anticipated level of savings.	1 April 2018.

Section D

Consultation Required?	No
------------------------	----

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	not applicable	not applicable
Trade Union	not applicable	not applicable
Public	not applicable	not applicable
Service User	not applicable	not applicable
Other	not applicable	not applicable

Equality Impact Screening

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

Disabled people	Yes
Particular Ethnic Groups	No
Men or women (including impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	Yes
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	Yes
People in particular age groups	Yes
Groups with particular faiths and beliefs	No


EIA required? (automatically updates to Yes, if any of the above impacts are Yes)	Yes
---	-----

Section E

Finance Comments
By reviewing high cost packages quickly the appropriate, sustainable package of care should be identified. There has been a history of high cost packages being allocated in crisis and then not being reviewed when the crisis has abated. Although this may reduce the ability to achieve income from audits which if done correctly from the outset should lead to a net saving overall. This is currently shown as a one off saving but could potentially be on-going, although this would need to be monitored in future years. The review process will be managed within the service within the current resources available.

Signed RO	08-Jan-2018
-----------	-------------

Signed Finance	08-Jan-2018
----------------	-------------

Cabinet Member Signature		
Name and Date	Cllr J Harrison	10-Jan-2018

Additional Information (if required)

High cost cases across direct payments, residential care and home care have been identified as part of this process. High cost packages are determined by the weekly cost being in excess of £500 per week. Across these areas, there are 226 packages of care above £500, which can be broken down as:

Direct Payments - 105 cases, ranging from £503 - £5,302 per week

Residential Care - 79 cases, ranging from £500 - £3,671 per week

Home Care - 42 cases, ranging from £503 to £1,458 per week

The annual cost of these packages of care are approximately £10.5m per year and it is proposed to achieve efficiencies within existing funding arrangements of £0.150m through a variety of mechanisms including consideration of alternative service provision such as preventative services, micro or macro commissioning, identification of alternative funding arrangements and reductions in care packages where they are no longer aligned with policy or statutory duties.

N.B - Supported Living are excluded from this review due to the recent retender and active engagement with clients in receipt of these services.

HWB – PSV – 116 Alignment of ASC Care Packages with Statutory & Policy Expectations

Stage 1: Initial screening

Lead Officer:	Kirsty Littlewood Head of Client Support
People involved in completing EIA:	Karen Maders Team Manager Client Support
Is this the first time that this project, policy or proposal has had an EIA carried out on it? If no, please state date of original and append to this document for information.	Yes X No Date of original EIA:

General Information

1a	Which service does this project, policy, or proposal relate to?	<p>Adult Social Care- Care package alignment with statutory and policy expectations</p> <p>The Care Act 2014 Section 9 sets out the duty for Local Authorities to assess a person’s needs and provide care and support services to meet eligible needs.</p> <p>This proposal relates a budget saving proposal to review high cost packages of Adult Social Care to ensure that they are in line with policy and legislative duties and reflect current care needs.</p>
1b	What is the project, policy or proposal?	<p>What are eligible needs?</p> <p>When a person contacts Adult Social Care a needs assessment is completed and if they meet the national eligibility criteria they are determined to have eligible needs. The needs assessment focuses on the following 3 key areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does a person have care and support needs as a result of a physical or mental condition? • Due to care and support needs is a person unable to achieve or meet 2 or more desired outcomes? • Is there, or is there likely to be a significant impact on a person’s wellbeing?

How can eligible needs be met?

If following the completion of a needs assessment it is determined that a person has eligible needs a care and support plan will be completed which will identify the most appropriate way of meeting these needs. Needs may be met by the provision of residential care services where a person moves into a residential or nursing care home or by the provision of non-residential care services where a person receives services whilst continuing to live within the community.

Non-residential care services can be provided in a number of ways including

- Home care services
- Day care
- Extra Care Housing
- Direct Payment

What is a direct payment?

If a person is assessed as having eligible needs and their needs are to be met within the community then these can be met in a number of ways including receiving a direct payment.

If they choose to receive a direct payment rather than receiving traditional service they will receive a monetary payment in order for them to purchase services and support to meet the needs and outcomes identified in their care and support plan. The receipt of a direct payment is intended to give greater independence and choice in care.

Where a direct payment is made the Care and Support (Direct Payment) Regulations 2014 requires an audit to be completed initially within 6 months and then every 12 months to ensure that making a direct payment is still an appropriate way of meeting a service users' needs and that the funds are being used according to their support plan.

In order to comply with this, audits are completed on a regular basis and funds that haven't been used or have been used incorrectly are reclaimed. This is done by sending an invoice for the amount due to be repaid. This process has been in place since direct payments were introduced as an option.

		<p>Over recent months audits completed have highlighted that in a number of direct payment packages, particularly high value ones, the allocated funding is not being fully utilised and high levels of funds have been reclaimed as part of the audit function.</p> <p>Work undertaken has identified possible reasons for this including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in policy or legislative approach following the last review • Changes in needs that have not been notified to the service <p>As a result of this it is proposed that all high cost care packages, those over £500 a week, are reviewed to ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resources allocated are in line with policy and legislative duties • Reflect care and support needs • Offer value for money
1c	<p>What are the main aims of the project, policy or proposal?</p>	<p>Every effort is made to ensure that assessments are correct at the time of completion and that people have the correct care and support in place, however needs change over time and it is important that regular reviews are completed to ensure that the care package in place is still appropriate.</p> <p>The main aims of this proposal are to review all care packages with a weekly cost of over £500 to ensure that :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resources allocated are in line with policy and legislative duties • Reflect care and support needs • Offer value for money • Reviews are completed as needed to meet requirements <p>Through the completion of these reviews the Council can be certain that funds are utilised in the most appropriate way. The proposal does not extend to those residing in Supported Living.</p>
1d	<p>Who, potentially, could this project, policy or proposal have a detrimental effect on, or benefit, and how?</p>	<p>This proposal could have a detrimental effect on those service users whose care packages costs over £500 a week, however it should be noted that it is only proposed that these packages be reviewed and as part of this process the current level of needs will be determined and the appropriateness of the services in</p>

		place will be fully considered. Through the completion of an up to date needs assessment the Council and the service user can be confident that all eligible needs have been identified and the required level of care and support is in place.
--	--	---

1e. Does the project, policy or proposal have the potential to <u>disproportionately</u> impact on any of the following groups? If so, is the impact positive or negative?				
	None	Positive	Negative	Not sure
Disabled people	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
Particular ethnic groups	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Men or women (include impacts due to pregnancy / maternity)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
People of particular sexual orientation/s	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People in a Marriage or Civil Partnership	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People on low incomes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
People in particular age groups	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
Groups with particular faiths and beliefs	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are there any other groups that you think may be affected negatively or positively by this project, policy or proposal?				
Carers		<input type="checkbox"/>	X	

If the answer is “negative” or “not sure” consider doing a full EIA

1f. What do you think that the overall NEGATIVE impact on groups and communities will be? <u>Please note that an example of none / minimal impact would be where there is no negative impact identified, or there will be no change to the service for any groups.</u> Wherever a negative impact has been identified you should consider completing the rest of the form.	None / Minimal	Significant
		<input type="checkbox"/>

1g	Using the screening and information in questions 1e and 1f, should a full assessment be carried out on the project, policy or proposal?	Yes X No <input type="checkbox"/>
----	---	--

1h	How have you come to this decision?	The proposal is likely to have a negative impact on the level of care that some service users receive due to a change in their circumstances or level of need.
----	-------------------------------------	--

If you need to complete a full EIA, please go on to Stage 2.

Stage 2: What do you know?

What do you know already?

We know the current number of packages where the care and support provided costs over £500 a week. In total there are 226 packages broken down as follows

- Direct Payments – 105 packages ranging from £503- £5,302 a week
- Residential Care – 79 packages ranging from £500-£3,671 a week
- Home Care – 42 packages ranging from £503- £1,458 a week

Each package is for an individual service user and the total annual cost for these packages is approximately £10.5m.

The age split of those in receipt of high cost packages of care is as follows

- 17 are under 25
- 137 are between 25 and 65
- 72 are over 65

From this it is evident that this proposal will have more of an impact on those under the age of 65.

As a result of audits that have been completed invoices have been raised for £85,995 during October 2017 to reclaim funds from direct payment accounts. Whilst these funds are sat in direct payment accounts they are not available to meet the needs of other service users, this is particularly a key concern during the current economic climate. Through the completion of this exercise funds that are not being utilised will be identified and these can then be reallocated more appropriately across the service.

What don't you know?

We don't currently know the impact on individual service users of the reviews to be undertaken, the completion of the review may identify that needs have increased, decreased or remained the same. In instances where there has been a change in a service user's needs then the support that they receive may increase or decrease accordingly.

Further data collection

Summary (to be completed following analysis of the evidence above)				
Does the project, policy or proposal have the potential to have a <u>disproportionate</u> impact on any of the following groups? If so, is the impact positive or negative?	None	Positive	Negative	Not sure
Disabled people	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
Particular ethnic groups	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Men or women (include impacts due to pregnancy / maternity)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
People of particular sexual orientation/s	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People in a Marriage or Civil Partnership	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People on low incomes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
People in particular age groups	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Groups with particular faiths and beliefs	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are there any other groups that you think that this proposal may affect negatively or positively?				
Carers		<input type="checkbox"/>	X	

Once you have identified who might be impacted, continue to Stage 3 to consider what the impact might be.

Stage 3: What do we think the potential impact might be?

Consultation information

3a. Who have you consulted with?	Those in receipt of a high cost care package will be consulted individually as part of the review process, they will be fully involved in the assessment process to identify their needs and how these are to be met and where appropriate will be supported by family members or other relevant parties.
3b. How did you consult? (inc meeting dates, activity undertaken & groups consulted)	Consultation will take the form of individual meetings with service users and their families.

3c. What do you know?

We know there are currently 226 high cost packages of care, costing over £500 a week. Each package relates to an individual service user and the breakdown of the packages is as follows

- Direct Payments – 105 packages ranging from £503- £5,302 a week
- Residential Care – 79 packages ranging from £500-£3,671 a week
- Home Care – 42 packages ranging from £503- £1,458 a week

We know that of the service users receiving these packages

- 17 are under 25
- 137 are between 25 and 65
- 72 are over 65

From this we know that this proposal will have more of an impact on those under the age of 65 and those in receipt of a Direct Payment to meet their needs.

3d. What don't you know?

We do not currently know what the impact will be on the individual packages of care and whether they will reduce or increase as a result of the reviews to be undertaken.

3e. What might the potential impact on individuals or groups be?

Generic (impact across all groups)	There are 226 packages of care for individual service users that will be reviewed as part of this proposal. There may be an impact on people with a low income as if the review determines that the level of care required has reduced and they want to continue with the current level of support then they would need to pay the difference privately, this would be more difficult for those on a low income as opposed to those with financial assets.
Disabled people	Service users in receipt of a high value care package will have significant eligible needs and as such this proposal will directly impact this protected group.
Particular ethnic groups	No Impact.
Men or women (include impacts due to pregnancy / maternity)	Whilst our approach does not positively or negatively impact either of these groups disproportionately it should be noted that in general, across health and social care, there are significantly higher levels of women receiving care and support than men. This is linked to demographics reflecting that generally women live longer than men and in turn need a high level of social care support. In turn this may mean that a greater number of women are affected.
People of particular sexual orientation/s	No impact.

People in a Marriage or Civil Partnership	No impact.
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender	No impact.
People on low incomes	People on a low income will be adversely affected as they will have less disposable income to pay for additional private care should they wish if their funding for support is reduced.
People in particular age groups	The analysis of the 226 packages to be reviewed highlights that this will have a greater impact on those under 65.
Groups with particular faiths and beliefs	No impact.
Other excluded individuals and groups - Carers	Carers may be negatively impacted if they are required to provide additional support as a result of the review being completed.

Once you have identified who potentially might be impacted, continue to Stage 4 to consider what actions we could take to reduce / mitigate the impact.

Stage 4: Reducing / mitigating the impact?	
4a. Where you have identified an impact, what can be done to reduce or mitigate the impact?	
Impact 1: Reduction in funding to provide care and support	<p>Although the funds available to meet eligible needs may reduce, the completion of an up to date needs assessment will ensure that support provided is appropriate to the current level of eligible needs. As the assessment is person centred its completion will be collaborative and be person centered focusing on the needs and wishes of the individual.</p> <p>When an audit is completed and funds are to be reclaimed the full amount is not reclaimed and an amount for contingencies is left in the account.</p> <p>Following any changes being made regular reviews will continue to be undertaken to ensure that the support provided is appropriate, if changes occur in between planned reviews one can be requested.</p>
Impact 2: The review may result in a change of residential placement	If the results of the review are that a service users needs could be better met in alternative residential accommodation then they may need to move. A best interest decision would need to be made prior to any move being made.

4b. Have you done, or will you do, anything differently as a result of the EIA?

Those affected by this proposal will be fully communicated with and a review of the needs assessment and care and support in place will be completed with the involvement of the service user/ their representative before any changes are made.

4c. How will the impact of the project, policy or proposal and any changes made to reduce the impact be monitored?

The outcomes of the reviews will be recorded and monitored and ongoing reviews will be scheduled to ensure that eligible needs continue to be met in line with policy and legislation on an ongoing basis.

Conclusion

Whilst there could potentially be both positive and negative impacts on a range of protected characteristic groups – disability and people on a low income– appropriate mitigating actions have been identified to reduce the potential impact.

Stage 5: Signature

Lead Officer: Kirsty-Louise Littlewood Date: 21/12/2017

Approver signature: Mark Warren Date: 03/01/2018

EIA review date: October 2018

➤ **APPENDIX 1: Action Plan and Risk Table**

Action Plan

Once you have decided on the course of action to be taken in order to reduce or mitigate the impact, please complete the action plan below (An example is provided in order to help you)

Number	Action	Required outcomes	By who?	By when?	Review date
1. Reviews which lead to a reduction in support	This process will be managed sensitively by the social worker working closely with the individual to ensure all of their eligible care and support needs are met through provision of appropriate services.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service User and representative to be fully involved in the review process • Care and support needs are met through a fair and equitable system 	ASC teams	31/03/2018	April 2018
2. Negative impact on carers	Any change in a service user's package will be managed sensitively by the social care professionals to ensure that there is not a significant impact on the carer's wellbeing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carers continue to feel valued • Carers wellbeing is maintained by the provision of appropriate services and information 	ASC teams/ Carers Support Officers	31/03/2018	April 2018

Risk table

Record any risks to the implementation of the project, policy or proposal and record any actions that you have put in place to reduce the likelihood of this happening.

Ref.	Risk	Impact	Actions in Place to mitigate the risk	Current Risk Score	Further Actions to be developed
R1.1	Care packages are reduced.	Changes to care and support plan.	Full review of needs to be undertaken.	B III	
	Increase in complaints received.	Reputational damage to the council.	Reviews will fully involve the service user and appropriate representatives which should reduce the risk of complaints.	C II	Monitoring report to record complaints received and actions identified.
	Indirect impact on carers may result in them reducing the amount of support they provide.	Work with the service user and their carer to ensure any indirect impact is managed sensitively.	Carers can have an assessment in their own rights if they wish and we will work with them to maximise support.	C II	Provision of preventative service offer including information, advice and signposting to be provided as appropriate.



Responsible Officer :	Mark Warren
Cabinet Member :	Cllr J Harrison
Support Officer :	Susannah Meakin

BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	Director Adult Social Care
Budget Reduction Title :	LD employment - reduction in Direct Payments for day care support

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

The employment of people with a learning disability links to the wider GM agenda – not only is this a strong value driven focus for GM (and nationally) it should also provide some savings to direct payments currently used for day care support. However these savings can only be anticipated with appropriate investment in a skilled provider who can support people with learning disabilities in achieving and sustaining paid employment.

There are approx. 390 people in receipt of a Direct Payment in Oldham Council with a Primary Support Reason of Learning Disability. 290 of these receive only Direct Payments (i.e. no other services) ranging from £24 to £1,200 per week. For the purpose of this proposal it is anticipated that people receiving £200-500 per week as a Direct Payment use part of these funds to support occupational day time activity (those below £200 may be using funds to support personal care / wellbeing at low level and those above £500 need additional support beyond day time activity). 107 people receive a direct payment on average of £294 per week (£15,288 p.a.)– independent day care costs are on average £55 per day. If we are able to sustain people in paid employment a reduction of 2 days per week day support would equate to a potential saving of £110 per week. GM have suggested that each Local Authority should aim to support 60 people with a learning disability into paid employment. If this is achieved and 2 days of day provision reduced from personal budgets this could be a potential saving of £343,200. However such savings will only be achieved with investment and over a period of time given the market and support available. Therefore this figure is optimistic in the current economic climate and without the infrastructure in Oldham that may be available in other (more affluent) GM localities. The proposal for a total £0.150m saving over a 3 year period, will commence in 2019/20 with a 'lead in' as a partner organisation is engaged and undertakes preparatory work.

2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment

	£000
Employees	8,240
Other Operational Expenses	77,114
Income	(30,686)
Total	54,668

Current Forecast (under) / overspend

(245)

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)

189.00

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	0	(50)	0	0
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Is your proposal a "one-off" in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?

Ongoing

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following? :

Property
None.
Service Delivery
None.
Future expected outcomes
Improved quality of life, links to the GM priorities, supports social inclusion and Equality Act.
Organisation
Links to “Get Oldham Working” – reputational asset.
Workforce
The LD & Autism team will require direction, training and support with a provider to identify people who would benefit from support in to paid employment.
Communities
Links to “Get Oldham Working” and community strengths based asset approach.
Service Users
Often cited at service user and carer forums of the wish to be employed and occupied in meaningful activities – this approach will support this without the sense of service reduction as employment would take its place.
Partner Organisations
PCFT, CCG and Primary Care need to be engaged and supportive of this agenda – again seeing this as an opportunity rather than service reduction.

Who are the key stakeholders?

Staff	Yes
Elected Members	Yes
Residents	Yes
Local business community	Yes
Schools	Yes
Trade Unions	No
External Partners (if yes please specify below)	Yes
CCG, PCFT, Voluntary Sector, Independent Providers.	
Other Council Departments (if yes please specify below)	Yes
Economy, Neighbourhoods and Skills (Education)	
Other (if yes please specify below)	Yes
Department for Work and Pensions	

Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements

Supporting people into paid employment will provide alternatives to commissioned support / direct payments and aligns with the GM priorities.

Section C

Key Risks and Mitigations:

Risk	Mitigation
That the chosen provider (GM level) is unable to achieve employment options that are sustainable for people with learning disabilities.	To be continually reviewed – evidence from other GM authorities is of successful sustainable employment.
That savings will not be achieved.	This is a conservative proposal with reduced figures which, with the right engagement of provider, should be able to achieve employment and subsequent reductions in care.
N/A	N/A

Key Development and Delivery Milestones:

Milestone	Timeline
Appoint partner organisation.	Quarter one 2018/19.
Engage with partner organisation and undertake preparatory work.	Quarter two 2018/19.
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

Section D

Consultation Required?	No
------------------------	----

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	not applicable	not applicable
Trade Union	not applicable	not applicable
Public	not applicable	not applicable
Service User	not applicable	not applicable
Other	not applicable	not applicable

Equality Impact Screening

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

Disabled people	Yes
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? (automatically updates to Yes, if any of the above impacts are Yes)	Yes
---	-----

Section E

Finance Comments
The proposal is for a net £50k saving p.a. commencing in 2019/20. The reduction in personal budgets payments will be generated as a result of people with learning disabilities (LD) entering employment. This will inevitably be phased over the term of the proposal (with a target of 60). Up-front and recurring investment will be required to drive this shift with expenditure also being required in 2018/19. In the first instance this will be funded from the resources available within LD, or more widely Adult Social Care if so required, with potential to create an in year pressure before the reduction in personal budget payments commences in the following year.

Signed RO	08-Jan-2018
-----------	-------------

Signed Finance	08-Jan-2018
----------------	-------------

Cabinet Member Signature		
Name and Date	Cllr J Harrison	10-Jan-2018

Equality Impact Assessment Tool

HWB-PSV-133 LD employment - reduction in Direct Payments for day care support

Stage 1: Initial screening

Lead Officer:	Susannah Meakin
People involved in completing EIA:	Susannah Meakin, Claire Hooley, Policy Team
Is this the first time that this project, policy or proposal has had an EIA carried out on it? If no, please state date of original and append to this document for information.	<p>Yes</p> <p>Date of original EIA:</p>

General Information

1a	Which service does this project, policy, or proposal relate to?	Budget proposal HWB-PSV-133 LD employment - reduction in Direct Payments for day care support
1b	What is the project, policy or proposal?	<p>Learning disability services – to support employment of people with a learning disability which in turn will reduce their use of direct payments for day time occupational care.</p> <p>The reduction would only come into place on robust review of the person being in stable employment and not requiring day time support.</p> <p>This proposal will only be successful via appropriate investment in support structures to enable people with learning disabilities to achieve and sustain employment.</p>
1c	What are the main aims of the project, policy or proposal?	<p>This proposal is to reduce direct payments for day care to people with a learning disability. To enable this we (as part of GM health and social care partnership) are investing in support providers to allow people with a learning disability to obtain permanent paid employment. This is a values based proposal and will not produce savings without investment but by enabling someone into employment will enhance their financial and social independence and allow them to be a valued and socially included member of society.</p> <p>The support providers are currently in tender process but they will need to work with local employers as well</p>

		as large scale employers – for example in other authorities there have been successful employment of people with a learning disability in the NHS. Any reduction in direct payment will be following robust review process of stable permanent paid employment or other occupied time in order not to disadvantage – the person will be otherwise occupied rather than attending funded day provision. So although a reduction in funding will not be a reduction in activity of daily living.
1d	Who, potentially, could this project, policy or proposal have a detrimental effect on, or benefit, and how?	This is intended to have a benefit for people with a learning disability and their informal carers / support networks. In this is an ambition to reduce direct payments for day time support as it is hoped that people will be in employment rather than funded care.

1e. Does the project, policy or proposal have the potential to <u>disproportionately</u> impact on any of the following groups? If so, is the impact positive or negative?				
	None	Positive	Negative	Not sure
Disabled people	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Particular ethnic groups	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Men or women (include impacts due to pregnancy / maternity)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People of particular sexual orientation/s	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People in a Marriage or Civil Partnership	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People on low incomes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People in particular age groups	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Groups with particular faiths and beliefs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are there any other groups that you think may be affected negatively or positively by this project, policy or proposal?				
<i>Carers - should not be negatively affected as the cared for person will be enabled to take up alternative day time occupation.</i>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

<p>1f. What do you think that the overall NEGATIVE impact on groups and communities will be? <u>Please note that an example of none / minimal impact would be where there is no negative impact identified, or there will be no change to the service for any groups.</u> Wherever a negative impact has been identified you should consider completing the rest of the form.</p>	None / Minimal	Significant
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		There will be an impact on individuals who obtain paid employment as their need for funded care will reduce – so this will be a service change but for the positive.

1g	Using the screening and information in questions 1e and 1f, should a full assessment be carried out on the project, policy or proposal?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
1h	How have you come to this decision?	I consider the impacts to be positive.

Stage 2: What do you know?

What do you know already?

It is estimated that 1.8% of the Oldham population will have some level of learning disability. Overall, the number of people with a learning disability is expected to increase by 3.5% from 4,003 to 4,143 by 2020.

There are approx. 390 people in receipt of a Direct Payment in Oldham Council with a Primary Support Reason of Learning Disability (this number can change week to week as population and needs change). 290 of these receive only Direct Payments (i.e. no other services) ranging from £24 to £1,200 per week and are of working age. For the purpose of this proposal it is anticipated that people receiving £200-500 per week as a Direct Payment use part of these funds to support occupational day time activity (those below £200 may be using funds to support personal care / wellbeing at low level and those above £500 need additional support beyond day time activity). 107 people receive a direct payment on average of £294 per week (£1,635,816 per annum) – independent day care costs are on average £55 per day.

What don't you know?

We are confident we can improve the number of people with a learning disability obtaining and sustaining paid employment but this requires investment and we are unclear how many we can achieve this with. Greater Manchester have suggested that each Local Authority should aim to support 60 people with a learning disability into paid employment. The integrated community learning disability team will identify people who would benefit from support into paid employment currently in receipt of direct payments which they are using for day time support. This

identification will be via assessment and review with people who have been assessed as having capacity to undertake employment given the right support provided. We will initially identify 10 people to pilot this approach, review progress and then scale up to 60 and hopefully more in 3 years.

Further data collection

Further information will be available as GM Health and Social Care Partnership identify the providers we will be working with.

Summary (to be completed following analysis of the evidence above)

Does the project, policy or proposal have the potential to have a <u>disproportionate</u> impact on any of the following groups? If so, is the impact positive or negative?	None	Positive	Negative	Not sure
Disabled people	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Particular ethnic groups	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Men or women (include impacts due to pregnancy / maternity)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People of particular sexual orientation/s	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People in a Marriage or Civil Partnership	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People on low incomes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People in particular age groups	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Groups with particular faiths and beliefs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are there any other groups that you think that this proposal may affect negatively or positively?				
<i>E.g. vulnerable residents, individuals at risk of loneliness, carers or serving and ex-serving members of the armed forces</i>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Stage 3: What do we think the potential impact might be?

Consultation information

3a. Who have you consulted with?

This proposal has been consulted with the ASC Director, commissioning manager and lead member for social care. This is a 3 year plan to support people into paid employment.

3b. How did you consult?
(inc meeting dates, activity undertaken & groups consulted)

The proposal was developed and considered with ASC and Commissioning Manager and requires investment to progress. However employment has been a regular topic at the Learning Disability Partnership Board (a regular meeting of users, carers, providers, health and social care representation) as it is a key work stream in GM for learning disability and has been indicated as a key need for this service user group. Get Oldham Working have been engaged regarding providers to support and possible employers to target but the investment is key to this.

3c. What do you know?

That supported people with a learning disability is a key direction for GM and for Oldham where employment of people with a learning disability is lower than other localities. This direction is based on values and social inclusion principles.

3d. What don't you know?

That we will be able to sustain employment for people with a learning disability and achieve the reduction in direct payments – what time frame this will be and ensuring people are supported effectively before their direct payment is reduced.

3e. What might the potential impact on individuals or groups be?

Generic (impact across all groups)	<p>This should be a positive impact as will support people to gain and sustain meaningful employment.</p> <p>A direct payment is not an income. It is funds provided to pay for services – if the service is not required as the person will be working this will not be a reduction of income. As part of supporting people into paid employment they may need skills training and budget management re transport to and from work. Some people will have disability living allowance mobility component which can fund their transport needs. But the majority will not be entitled to this and have not received transport costs for day care and will continue not to have transport costs for employment – the same as all other employees.</p> <p>Therefore the support to manage budgets effectively including transport to and from work will be essential.</p>
Disabled people	As above.
Particular ethnic groups	As above.
Men or women (include impacts due to pregnancy / maternity)	As above.
People of particular sexual orientation/s	As above.

People in a Marriage or Civil Partnership	As above.
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	As above.
People on low incomes	As above.
People in particular age groups	As above.
Groups with particular faiths and beliefs	As above.
Other excluded individuals and groups (e.g. <i>vulnerable residents, individuals at risk of loneliness, carers or serving and ex-serving members of the armed forces</i>)	As above.

Stage 4: Reducing / mitigating the impact

4a. Where you have identified an impact, what can be done to reduce or mitigate the impact?

Impact 1: Supporting people into employment	We need to enable the right support and provision to enable people to undertake paid employment and sustain this. To mitigate any impact of this reduction will be via regular review to ensure their eligible needs are being met and their employment is sustained.
Impact 2: Reduction in direct payment for day time support	The reduction in direct payment for day time support will be as a result of the person obtaining and sustaining paid employment so this provision can be reduced. The reduction will be linked to a positive outcome of obtaining employment but we will ensure that the care planning process includes clear requirements with regards to reasonable implementation timescales and that there is a stepped approach to decision making on any changes to a person's direct payment – to ensure any changes are implemented in a way that is comfortable for the individual concerned, and that they make use of approaches such as trial

	periods.
Impact 3: There may be an impact on day time provision organisations as use will be reduced	Engage day time provision providers to support service development – refocus on people with high complex needs who may not be able to undertake paid employment and enable meaningful day time activity for this service user group and support the move on of more able people into employment. Both the person with a learning disability and their employer will need support from the specialist provider in sustaining employment.

4b. Have you done, or will you do, anything differently as a result of the EIA?

We need to ensure that any reduction in direct payment is linked to the sustainability of employment in order that people with a learning disability continue to have their eligible needs met on an individual basis – we need to ensure a safe transition to any reduction whilst also positively encouraging the ambition for people with a learning disability to be in paid employment as a valued member of society.

4c. How will the impact of the project, policy or proposal and any changes made to reduce the impact be monitored?

This will be subject to regular review to ensure individual needs are not negatively impacted by the proposal.

Conclusion

This section should record the overall impact, who will be impacted upon and the steps being taken to reduce / mitigate the impact

The aim of this proposal is to support people with a learning disability into paid employment, thereby reducing the reliance on paid support. This reduction in direct payment will be aligned with the approach in a staged way to ensure eligible needs are met whilst the person achieves and is supported in their ambition to be in employment. This proposal is values driven and will rely on engagement of staff and an experienced provider to enable the sustainability of employment.

Stage 5: Signature

Lead Officer: Susannah Meakin Date: 29/12/2017

Approver signature: Mark Warren Date: 03/01/2018

EIA review date: October 2018

APPENDIX 1: Action Plan and Risk Table

Action Plan

Once you have decided on the course of action to be taken in order to reduce or mitigate the impact, please complete the action plan below (An example is provided in order to help you)

Number	Action	Required outcomes	By who?	By when?	Review date
1	Ensure consultation, discussion and agreement regarding employment and staged reduction in direct payment with the person in question and where applicable their families and carers, is documented and managed through the care planning process. This will be incremental as the service develops / provider is sourced. Proposed 10 individuals in 2018. Consultation following provider tender process will take place with individuals identified.	Ensure people retain choice and control over their lives.	Susannah Meakin (lead) LD team management, allocated workers.	Incremental as people identified over the 3 year period.	April 2019.
2	Ensure that the care planning process includes clear requirements with regards to reasonable implementation timescales and that there is a stepped approach to decision making on any changes to a person's direct payment.	People feel comfortable with any changes.	LD team allocated workers.	As above.	As above.
3	Ensure learning disability partnership board and self advocate groups (Opel) are provided with regular information regarding service developments.	Experts by experience and carers are able to engage in this proposal and support the development of the service.	Susannah Meakin (lead).	LDPB April 18.	Updates through the year.

Risk table

Record any risks to the implementation of the project, policy or proposal and record any actions that you have put in place to reduce the likelihood of this happening.

Ref.	Risk	Impact	Actions in Place to mitigate the risk	Current Risk Score	Further Actions to be developed
R1.1	Sustaining people in paid employment.	Individual impact and impact on resources as direct payments may need to be sustained / increased. Impact on reputation in Greater Manchester.	Oversight of the programme – clear agreements with supported employment provider. Resource intensive to sustain employment.	C2 High/ Critical	Oversight and review of project to support its remaining on track.
	Not achieving the reductions in direct payments.	Impact on resources.	Oversight of the programme – engagement with finance re effective forecasts.	C3 High/ Critical	Ongoing review.
	Risk to day time provision re reduction in use.	Day time provision becomes under used / unsustainable.	Engagement with day time provision re plans of employment and their role to support this.	C3 Significant / Marginal	



BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	Public Health (Client and Delivery)
Budget Reduction Title :	Wellness / Weight Management

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

The proposed saving is for £0.100m. This was due to be allocated to a wellness service or to weight management in 2018/19. It is proposed that this now does not happen and the funds are used to make the saving. The funds were used previously to cover Integrated Youth savings shortfall in 2017/18 and used for weight management support in 2016/17.

2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment

£000

Employees	861
Other Operational Expenses	26,599
Income	(9,118)
Total	18,342

Current Forecast (under) / overspend

0

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)

16.00

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	(100)	0	0	0
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Is your proposal a "one-off" in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?

Ongoing

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following? :

Property
N/A.
Service Delivery
None.
Future expected outcomes
Smoking rates may not decrease at the pace needed to radically upgrade population health. Targets for certain groups e.g. smoking in pregnancy or smoking in routine and manual workers may be affected.
Organisation
Oldham Council not aligning to GM model with defined set of consistent standards for all Wellness services across GM. Risk of not being a part of the GM wellness hub attracting devolution investment for a digital platform as a tier 3 service is required as part of the operating model.
Workforce
None.
Communities
Affects transformation agenda if focus isn't given to models that encompass self-help and self-care.
Service Users
None.
Partner Organisations
Not aligning fully with the LCO primary care agenda as current model doesn't effectively feed in or out of primary care.

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)	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
Savings achieved.

Section C

Key Risks and Mitigations:

Risk	Mitigation
Risk of not aligning to GM population plan activity of consistent standards for all Wellness services across GM.	Targeting and prioritisation within current service.
Risk of not being a part of the GM wellness hub attracting devolution investment for a digital platform.	Continue to develop alternative plans for a wellness service.
N/A	N/A

Key Development and Delivery Milestones:

Milestone	Timeline
Discussions with current provider to target and prioritise within current service.	Ongoing.
Procurement timeline for wellness service to be scoped.	September 2017-April 2018.
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

Section D

Consultation Required?	No
------------------------	----

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	not applicable	not applicable
Trade Union	not applicable	not applicable
Public	not applicable	not applicable
Service User	not applicable	not applicable
Other	not applicable	not applicable

Equality Impact Screening

Is there the 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? (automatically updates to Yes, if any of the above impacts are Yes)	No
---	----

Section E

Finance Comments
This service has not yet been commissioned so negotiating a reduction will be achievable. The funds are being used to offset a pressure within Targeted Youth in 2017/18, the ability to manage the removal of the budget from this service in 2018/19 has been confirmed.

Signed RO	08-Jan-2018
-----------	-------------

Signed Finance	08-Jan-2018
----------------	-------------

Cabinet Member Signature		
Name and Date	Cllr E Moores	10-Jan-2018

Responsible Officer :	Katrina Stephens
-----------------------	------------------

Cabinet Member :	Cllr E Moores
------------------	---------------

Support Officer :	Neil Consterdine
-------------------	------------------

BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	Public Health (Client and Delivery)
----------------	-------------------------------------

Budget Reduction Title :	Reduction in Public Health contribution to Business Intelligence
--------------------------	--

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

Public health currently contributes £0.138m per year to the Council's Business Intelligence Service, in addition to contributions made through Central Support Service (CSS) recharges. Through this funding Business intelligence Service is expected to provide the Council's public health intelligence function which is an essential service to enable the Council to carry out its statutory public health responsibilities.

This proposal is to reduce the public health contribution to the business intelligence service by £0.050m. This would bring the public health contribution broadly into line with the level needed to deliver the core public health intelligence function (approx. 1.5 WTE Grade 8 posts), and with the level of input currently received from business intelligence, following the BI team restructure which has made all posts generic rather than specialist.

2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment

£000

Employees	861
Other Operational Expenses	26,599
Income	(9,118)
Total	18,342

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

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)	16.00
--	-------

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	(50)	0	0	0
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	(1.50)	0.00	0.00	0.00

Is your proposal a "one-off" in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?	Ongoing
---	---------

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following? :

Property
N/A
Service Delivery
It is expected that there will be an impact on the service that Business Intelligence is able to deliver to other Council departments.
Future expected outcomes
Reduction in capacity in the Business Intelligence team may impact on the Council's ability to monitor progress against outcomes, and understanding of priority areas for development.
Organisation
It is expected that there will be an impact on the service that Business Intelligence is able to deliver to other Council departments.
Workforce
This is likely to have an impact on staffing capacity in the Business Intelligence service.
Communities
N/A
Service Users
N/A
Partner Organisations
Reduced capacity in Business Intelligence may impact on joint intelligence work with other partner organisations e.g. Oldham CCG.

Who are the key stakeholders?

Staff	Yes
Elected Members	Yes
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
Business Intelligence	
Other (if yes please specify below)	No
N/A	

Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements

Savings achieved. Investment in public health intelligence reduced to the level needed to achieve that function.

Section C

Key Risks and Mitigations:

Risk	Mitigation
Reduction cannot be achieved due to negative impact on Business Intelligence functions across the Council.	Early discussions with Business Intelligence to understand impact.
Reduction means Council cannot deliver its public health intelligence function.	Service Level Agreement (SLA) to be agreed with Business Intelligence to set out expectations of public health investment in the service and ensure these functions are delivered.
N/A	N/A

Key Development and Delivery Milestones:

Milestone	Timeline
Discussions with Business Intelligence to understand and quantify impact of reduction.	September – October 2017.
SLA agreed.	March 2018.
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

Section D

Consultation Required?	Yes
------------------------	-----

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	13-Nov-2017	15-Feb-2018
Trade Union	13-Nov-2017	15-Feb-2018
Public	not applicable	not applicable
Service User	not applicable	not applicable
Other	not applicable	not applicable

Equality Impact Screening

Is there the 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? (automatically updates to Yes, if any of the above impacts are Yes)	No
---	----

Section E

Finance Comments
This reduction will affect the Business Intelligence Unit (BIU). The proposal has been discussed, the exact means of delivery has still to confirmed but there is a possible reduction in FTE's within the service as a result.

Signed RO	08-Jan-2018
-----------	-------------

Signed Finance	08-Jan-2018
----------------	-------------

Cabinet Member Signature		
Name and Date	Cllr E Moores	10-Jan-2018

BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	Public Health (Client and Delivery)
Budget Reduction Title :	Reduction in Commissioning - Young People

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

Public health currently contributes £0.202m per year to the Council's Commissioning function. In addition to this there was an allocation of £0.155m to support the commissioning and set-up of the Right Start model in 2016/17. All staffing costs within young people's commissioning are accounted for and the £0.155m has not been called upon in 2017/18 from a commissioning perspective. However the funding for 2017/18 is being used to support the wider Public Health pressures.

2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment

£000

Employees	861
Other Operational Expenses	26,599
Income	(9,118)
Total	18,342

Current Forecast (under) / overspend

0

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)

16.00

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	(155)	0	0	0
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Is your proposal a "one-off" in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?

Ongoing

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following? :

Property
N/A
Service Delivery
The funds are not currently utilised against commissioning in 2017/18 so minimal.
Future expected outcomes
N/A
Organisation
Potential future reduction in capacity in children's commissioning.
Workforce
Nil at this point.
Communities
N/A
Service Users
N/A
Partner Organisations
N/A

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
N/A	
Other Council Departments (if yes please specify below)	Yes
Commissioning	
Other (if yes please specify below)	No
N/A	

Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements

Savings achieved without an effect on current staffing capacity.

Section C

Key Risks and Mitigations:

Risk	Mitigation
Restrict the ability to increase capacity within the commissioning function.	Currently the funding is not being utilised against commissioning as it was initially set aside to support the commissioning and set-up of the Right Start model in 2016/17. It is being used against the PH pressures.
Public Health Pressures.	Further managed against current budget and overall reduced spend on Public Health.
N/A	N/A

Key Development and Delivery Milestones:

Milestone	Timeline
Consultation with DMT, EMT and Members through the budget reduction proposal process.	September through to April 2018.
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

Section D

Consultation Required?	No
------------------------	----

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	not applicable	not applicable
Trade Union	not applicable	not applicable
Public	not applicable	not applicable
Service User	not applicable	not applicable
Other	not applicable	not applicable

Equality Impact Screening

Is there the 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? (automatically updates to Yes, if any of the above impacts are Yes)	No
---	----

Section E

Finance Comments
The saving is offered on the basis that within the current financial year the budget has not been required for its earmarked purpose (to support commissioning), it is therefore being applied to support the wider Public Health agenda. In 2018/19 it will be released as an on-going saving.

Signed RO	08-Jan-2018
-----------	-------------

Signed Finance	08-Jan-2018
----------------	-------------

Cabinet Member Signature		
Name and Date	Cllr E Moores	10-Jan-2018

BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	Public Health (Client and Delivery)
Budget Reduction Title :	Reduction in funding to GM Public Health Network

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

The proposal is to reduce the Oldham Council contribution to the Greater Manchester Public Health Network to £0.020m, achieving a saving of £0.038m.

2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment

£000

Employees	861
Other Operational Expenses	26,599
Income	(9,118)
Total	18,342

Current Forecast (under) / overspend

0

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)

16.00

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	(38)	0	0	0
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Is your proposal a "one-off" in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?

Ongoing

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following? :

Property
Nil
Service Delivery
This will impact on the delivery of the Greater Manchester Population Health Plan in that the GM Public Health Network supports the delivery of this plan. The funding reduction will leave less capacity (staffing and project resource) to support delivery of the plan.
Future expected outcomes
Potential for negative impact on outcomes across all population health plan areas. Oldham is likely to receive less benefit from any Greater Manchester work as a result of disinvestment.
Organisation
Negative reputational impact from disinvesting in Greater Manchester work at a time when others are continuing to invest. Oldham's investment was already lower than some other areas in GM.
Workforce
Direct impact would be on GM employed workforce, but there would be a knock on impact for the Oldham public health workforce in that work would need to be undertaken locally where there is no longer capacity/investment at GM level.
Communities
Potential for negative impact on communities across all population health plan areas, if outcomes worsen/do not improve. Oldham is likely to receive less benefit from any Greater Manchester work as a result of disinvestment.
Service Users
Potential for negative impact on service users across all population health plan areas (e.g. users of stop smoking, substance misuse, sexual health and early years services), if outcomes worsen/do not improve. Oldham is likely to receive less benefit from any GM work as a result of disinvestment.
Partner Organisations
Negative reputational impact from disinvesting in GM work when other Local Authorities are continuing to invest. Oldham's investment was already lower than some other areas in GM. Reduced investment will also impact on Oldham CCG, as a result of Oldham not being able to benefit from GM work.

Who are the key stakeholders?

Staff	No
Elected Members	Yes
Residents	Yes
Local business community	No
Schools	No
Trade Unions	No
External Partners (if yes please specify below)	Yes
Oldham CCG	
Other Council Departments (if yes please specify below)	No
N/A	
Other (if yes please specify below)	Yes
Other GM authorities	

Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements

Local saving achieved.

Opportunity to work with other GM areas to restructure public health network support, if other GM areas are willing to engage in this process.

Section C

Key Risks and Mitigations:

Risk	Mitigation
Reduction in funding contribution affects viability of GM public health network.	Early discussions with other GM authorities through GM Directors of Public Health Group to understand others' investment intentions and impact of reduction in funding.
Reduction in funding means Oldham is not able to benefit from GM population health plan work.	Early discussions with other GM authorities and GM Health and Social Care partnership to understand impact of reduction in funding, and prioritise GM programmes that we want to remain involved in.
N/A	N/A

Key Development and Delivery Milestones:

Milestone	Timeline
Discuss proposed reduction and impact with other GM authorities and GM Health and Social Care Partnership.	October – November 2017.
Prioritise areas of GM work where remaining investment should be focussed.	January 2018.
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

Section D

Consultation Required?	No
------------------------	----

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	not applicable	not applicable
Trade Union	not applicable	not applicable
Public	not applicable	not applicable
Service User	not applicable	not applicable
Other	not applicable	not applicable

Equality Impact Screening

Is there the 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? (automatically updates to Yes, if any of the above impacts are Yes)	No
---	----

Section E

Finance Comments
The proposal is a reduction of £0.038m to a payment made to GM, currently totalling £0.058m. The financial reduction, particularly if it is replicated by other GM Councils, may lead to a reduction/cessation in the services we receive through the payment.

Signed RO	08-Jan-2018
-----------	-------------

Signed Finance	08-Jan-2018
----------------	-------------

Cabinet Member Signature		
Name and Date	Cllr E Moores	10-Jan-2018

BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	Public Health (Client and Delivery)
Budget Reduction Title :	Public Health staffing reductions

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

Specifically this proposed saving comes from the early release of the drugs and alcohol commissioner (£0.067m) and an executive support (£0.029m) post both of which are currently vacant. As a mitigation Public Health will invest £0.025m into a new jointly funded post with Community Safety to support the delivery of the new drugs and alcohol commission/work area.

2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment

£000

Employees	861
Other Operational Expenses	26,599
Income	(9,118)
Total	18,342

Current Forecast (under) / overspend

0

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)

16.00

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	(71)	0	0	0
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	(1.60)	0.00	0.00	0.00

Is your proposal a "one-off" in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?

Ongoing

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following? :

Property
Nil.
Service Delivery
These are vacant posts and in addition the drugs and alcohol work will continue to be supported by a new jointly funded post.
Future expected outcomes
Initial support to the new drugs and alcohol commission may be impacted upon.
Organisation
Mitigations are in place to prevent any loss of capacity/ expertise.
Workforce
Workforce reduction by 1.6 FTE although posts are vacant.
Communities
Potential reduced level of support and expert knowledge.
Service Users
This should have no impact as the new drugs and alcohol commission will deliver against an agreed specification and outcomes.
Partner Organisations
Nil.

Who are the key stakeholders?

Staff	Yes
Elected Members	Yes
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
Cashable savings.

Section C

Key Risks and Mitigations:

Risk	Mitigation
Loss of post and expertise.	As a mitigation Public Health will invest £0.025m (50%) into a new joint funded post with Community Safety to support the delivery of the new drugs and alcohol commission/work area. The Business support element is already being covered.
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

Key Development and Delivery Milestones:

Milestone	Timeline
Approvals.	September to March 2018.
Implementation.	April 2018.
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

Section D

Consultation Required?	Yes
------------------------	-----

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	13-Nov-2017	15-Feb-2018
Trade Union	13-Nov-2017	15-Feb-2018
Public	not applicable	not applicable
Service User	not applicable	not applicable
Other	not applicable	not applicable

Equality Impact Screening

Is there the 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? (automatically updates to Yes, if any of the above impacts are Yes)	No
---	----

Section E

Finance Comments
The actual net saving is £0.071m; being combined salary budgets for the posts that will not be filled (£0.096m), netted down by a contribution of £0.025m towards a post within Community Safety relating to drugs and alcohol support that will offset the impact of the proposal.

Signed RO	08-Jan-2018
-----------	-------------

Signed Finance	08-Jan-2018
----------------	-------------

Cabinet Member Signature		
Name and Date	Cllr E Moores	10-Jan-2018

BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	Public Health (Client and Delivery)
Budget Reduction Title :	Cancer support centre contribution

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

This proposal is to cease public health's contribution of £0.007m to the Oldham Cancer Support Centre (within Ena Hughes). Public Health agreed to this contribution as a short term arrangement. It is assumed that alternative funding or delivery space has been identified and this is therefore being put forward as a saving. The funding was used to pay for rooms at the centre - counselling room, small kitchen, therapy room and reception.

2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment

£000

Employees	861
Other Operational Expenses	26,599
Income	(9,118)
Total	18,342

Current Forecast (under) / overspend

0

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)

16.00

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	(7)	0	0	0
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Is your proposal a "one-off" in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?

Ongoing

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following? :

Property
The £0.007m contributes to the rent of the Ena Hughes centre for room hire for the Cancer Support Centre.
Service Delivery
Service delivery will be affected if the use of this centre ceases.
Future expected outcomes
N/A
Organisation
There could be reputational damage to the organisation if this led to closure of the centre or services discontinued.
Workforce
Unknown.
Communities
Services from the centre could be discontinued.
Service Users
Possible discontinuation of the service from this building.
Partner Organisations
Cancer support centre would have reduced funding.

Who are the key stakeholders?

Staff	No
Elected Members	Yes
Residents	Yes
Local business community	No
Schools	No
Trade Unions	No
External Partners (if yes please specify below)	Yes
Cancer support centre	
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 proposal will contribute to the 2018/19 budget reduction target.

Section C**Key Risks and Mitigations:**

Risk	Mitigation
Alternative funding cannot be sourced.	Public health maintains the payment from within available resources or alternatively the centre space is offered free of charge.
Reputation risk for Council of disinvesting in the cancer support centre running costs.	Alternative funding is identified.
Cancer support centre has nowhere to deliver from.	Public Health identifies alternative accommodation.

Key Development and Delivery Milestones:

Milestone	Timeline
Discuss the option with the cancer support centre and the chair who is Cllr Briggs.	September 2017.
Implementation.	April 2018.
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

Section D

Consultation Required?	Yes
------------------------	-----

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	not applicable	not applicable
Trade Union	not applicable	not applicable
Public	not applicable	not applicable
Service User	not applicable	not applicable
Other	01-Nov-2017	24-Jan-2018

Equality Impact Screening

Is there the 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? (automatically updates to Yes, if any of the above impacts are Yes)	No
---	----

Section E

Finance Comments
The proposal is offered on the grounds that no charge has been made in either of 2016/17 and 2017/18 (to date), if it were to be reinstated the cost would have to be met from within existing resources or alternative rent free accommodation found.

Signed RO	08-Jan-2018
-----------	-------------

Signed Finance	08-Jan-2018
----------------	-------------

Cabinet Member Signature		
Name and Date	Cllr E Moores	10-Jan-2018

BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	Public Health (Client and Delivery)
Budget Reduction Title :	Get Oldham Growing

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

This proposal is to reduce the Council's investment in the Get Oldham Growing (GOG) programme by £0.030m from the current investment of £0.142m. To mitigate the reduction the Get Oldham Growing programme is now clearly aligned to Well North funding, with funding being received in the current and future years enabling sustainability of the programme and the wider objectives.

2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment

£000

Employees	861
Other Operational Expenses	26,599
Income	(9,118)
Total	18,342

Current Forecast (under) / overspend

0

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)

16.00

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	(30)	0	0	0
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Is your proposal a "one-off" in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?

Ongoing

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following? :

Property
GOG is currently supporting the development and physical construction of 7 growing hubs across Oldham. A reduction in funding may impact on this.
Service Delivery
The reduction in funding could potentially affect GOG's ability to work with community groups.
Future expected outcomes
A reduction in funding could affect the development of the growing hubs, would limit or end the growing entrepreneur scheme with schools and would limit the training offered to local residents. There would be impacts on skills development and on various health and wellbeing indicators.
Organisation
A reduction in funding could have a negative impact on the Council's reputation as partners and residents who have been led to believe certain projects would take place and are disappointed by the withdrawal of resources/support.
Workforce
Reduction in funding could affect the health ambassador posts and the project co-ordinators post at Alexandra Park leading to a reduced service and possible redundancies. Funding would need to be aligned accordingly.
Communities
Working for and with communities is a key focus of Get Oldham Growing. A reduction in funding would affect GOG's ability to work with community groups, particularly people on low incomes, people from BME communities, older & isolated people, people with mental health issues.
Service Users
Reduction in funding could affect GOG's ability to work with individuals and groups.
Partner Organisations
Reduction in funding would affect work with partner organisations such as IF Oldham (a local social enterprise), the community and voluntary groups running the Growing Hubs, schools, Oldham College, Royal Oldham Hospital.

Who are the key stakeholders?

Staff	No
Elected Members	Yes
Residents	Yes
Local business community	No
Schools	Yes
Trade Unions	No
External Partners (if yes please specify below)	Yes
Food Network, Action Together.	
Other Council Departments (if yes please specify below)	Yes
Environmental services	
Other (if yes please specify below)	No
N/A	

Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements

The proposal will contribute to the 2018/19 budget reduction target.

Section C

Key Risks and Mitigations:

Risk	Mitigation
A reduction in funding would impact on service delivery.	Funding is to be received from the Well North programme which could support some aspects of community activity in Oldham which could help to mitigate some of the impacts from funding reduction.
If the funding reduction is used to reduce staff there could be further implications i.e. redundancies.	The funding could be allocated appropriately to reduce the negative impact on staffing. In addition Well North could support the overall programme and funding aligned as appropriate.
N/A	N/A

Key Development and Delivery Milestones:

Milestone	Timeline
Instigate proposals.	November 2017 to December 2017.
Implementation.	April 2018.
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

Section D

Consultation Required?	Yes
------------------------	-----

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	not applicable	not applicable
Trade Union	not applicable	not applicable
Public	not applicable	not applicable
Service User	not applicable	not applicable
Other	01-Nov-2017	24-Jan-2018

Equality Impact Screening

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

Disabled people	No
Particular Ethnic Groups	Yes
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	Yes
People in particular age groups	Yes
Groups with particular faiths and beliefs	No


EIA required? (automatically updates to Yes, if any of the above impacts are Yes)	Yes
---	-----

Section E

Finance Comments
The proposal represents a reduction of £0.030m in money available for the GOG scheme. In mitigation funding has been received from Public Health England for the Well North project, £0.200m in 2017/18 with the same expected in 2018/19 and 2019/20, which should enable the continuation of similar services with lower contributions in 2018/19 and beyond.

Signed RO	08-Jan-2018
-----------	-------------

Signed Finance	08-Jan-2018
----------------	-------------

Cabinet Member Signature		
Name and Date	Cllr E Moores	10-Jan-2018

HWB-PSV-128 Get Oldham Growing

Stage 1: Initial screening

Lead Officer:	Anne Fleming
People involved in completing EIA:	Anne Fleming, Julie Holt
Is this the first time that this project, policy or proposal has had an EIA carried out on it? If no, please state date of original and append to this document for information.	Yes X No Date of original EIA:

General Information

1a	Which service does this project, policy, or proposal relate to?	Get Oldham Growing - a public health funded community engagement programme using food as a vehicle to inspire and engage residents, build skills and encourage enterprise. The programme values and relies on volunteers with much of its benefits delivered by them, facilitated and supported by Council staff.
1b	What is the project, policy or proposal?	Reduction in funding by £0.030m from a total budget of £0.142m (just over a 20% reduction). This will entail reducing the funding to the growing entrepreneur scheme by £0.010m; reducing focused work on BME community by £0.001m; reducing the training budget by £0.005m; reducing the communication budget by £0.005m, reducing funding for growing hubs by £0.009m.
1c	What are the main aims of the project, policy or proposal?	The reduction in funding to this programme supports the achievement of the Council's savings plans for 2018/19.
1d	Who, potentially, could this project, policy or proposal have a detrimental effect on, or benefit, and how?	The reduction in funding will not have a disproportionate detrimental effect on any group. Although a small amount of £0.001m will be taken from the budget for focused work with BME communities there are now other programmes and funding streams (including Green Dividend and Well North) which may provide access to funding for community growing or enterprise projects which would minimise the effect of the reduction in Get Oldham Growing funding. In addition groups have the support of the Food Network (a community / voluntary led network which supports members to become more enterprising and sustainable) and Action Together which supports groups in accessing funding, networking and building skills.

		As most of the projects are run by volunteers we do not have the level of information on users of the Hubs etc which is being asked for. Asking for such information would be to put an additional burden on often small voluntary groups and hasn't been considered to be proportional to the level of resource allocated.
--	--	---

1e. Does the project, policy or proposal have the potential to <u>disproportionately</u> impact on any of the following groups? If so, is the impact positive or negative?				
	None	Positive	Negative	Not sure
Disabled people	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Particular ethnic groups	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Men or women (include impacts due to pregnancy / maternity)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People of particular sexual orientation/s	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People in a Marriage or Civil Partnership	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People on low incomes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People in particular age groups	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Groups with particular faiths and beliefs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are there any other groups that you think may be affected negatively or positively by this project, policy or proposal?				
<i>E.g. vulnerable residents, homeless people, individuals at risk of loneliness, carers or serving and ex-serving members of the armed forces</i>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

If the answer is “negative” or “not sure” consider doing a full EIA

1f. What do you think that the overall NEGATIVE impact on groups and communities will be? <u>Please note that an example of none / minimal impact would be where there is no negative impact identified, or there will be no change to the service for any groups.</u> Wherever a negative impact has been identified you should consider completing the rest of the form.	None / Minimal	Significant
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Although there will be a reduction in funding it will still be possible to deliver the Get Oldham Growing programme though at a reduced level. See 1 d.	

1g	Using the screening and information in questions 1e and 1f, should a full assessment be carried out on the project, policy or proposal?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1h	How have you come to this decision?	Through agreeing potential areas of funding reductions with colleagues in Environmental Services & Public Health, and considering the ways in which new funding streams (e.g. Well North) may be able to be used.

Stage 5: Signature		
Lead Officer:	Julie Holt	Date: 13 December 2017
Approver signature:	Katrina Stephens	Date: 3 January 2018
EIA review date:	28 September 2018	

Responsible Officer :	Katrina Stephens
-----------------------	------------------

Cabinet Member :	Cllr B Brownridge
------------------	-------------------

Support Officer :	Neil Consterdine
-------------------	------------------

BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	Leisure and Youth Services Client
----------------	-----------------------------------

Budget Reduction Title :	Youth delivery staff reductions
--------------------------	---------------------------------

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

This saving proposal is aligned to commissioning HWB-PSV-105 - review of Targeted Youth Services. The total of both is £0.100m. This element of the proposal is £0.076m.

Currently Mahdlo receive £0.400m as the main part of their contract with Oldham Council. In addition the Council fund 2 Youth Development Officers which are seconded to Mahdlo. The proposal would be to take back the two seconded Youth Workers and make a saving of £0.076m against these posts. These staff are still paid direct from the Council but are managed by Mahdlo. Potentially a discussion with Mahdlo for them to continue funding the posts could take place. A further £0.024m would need to be found by reducing the Positive Steps Oldham contract or from the wider targeted youth offer as outlined above - this will be achieved through budget proposal Review of Targeted Youth Services (HWB-PSV-105).

2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment

£000

Employees	76
Other Operational Expenses	400
Income	(0)
Total	476

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

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)	2.00
--	------

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	(76)	0	0	0
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	(2.00)	0.00	0.00	0.00

Is your proposal a "one-off" in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?	Ongoing
---	---------

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following? :

Property
N/A
Service Delivery
Mahdlo have maintained the secondment of 2 Youth workers to support them with the quality of the offer and training. Stopping the secondment of the staff may impact on the service delivery of youth sessions.
Future expected outcomes
Potential impact on the quality of the youth offer. Reduction in youth sessions.
Organisation
The posts are seconded to Mahdlo therefore from an OMBC perspective the impact of the proposal is on the relationship with Mahdlo.
Workforce
Workforce reduction by 2 FTE.
Communities
Reduced quality Youth Offer.
Service Users
Reduced quality Youth Offer.
Partner Organisations
Mahdlo would lose 2 quality qualified youth staff diminishing their offer to the end service user but also this would be a loss of qualified youth staff who deliver on a wider programme including staff development.

Who are the key stakeholders?

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

Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements
Budget reduction.

Section C

Key Risks and Mitigations:

Risk	Mitigation
Reputational damage with external funding partners.	Maintain the £0.400m contribution the Council gives to Mahdlo.
Loss of 2 quality Youth Work staff.	A partial mitigation may be to reduce the saving to just one member of the seconded staff and bring back the other staff member back into the Council, within current resources in order that it can support the wider voluntary youth sector.
Reduced offer to young people.	The Mahdlo grant does not set specific targets they need to achieve to receive the funding. This could be changed to add in targets and thus driving through quality, improved attendance and improved outcomes for young people.

Key Development and Delivery Milestones:

Milestone	Timeline
Discussion with Mahdlo about the proposal including young people.	October 2017.
Discussion with Staff and Unions. Including formal staff consultation.	November 2017 – February 2018.
Implementation, approvals and notice periods.	December 2017 to March 2018.
N/A	N/A

Section D

Consultation Required?	Yes
------------------------	-----

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	13-Nov-2017	15-Feb-2018
Trade Union	13-Nov-2017	15-Feb-2018
Public	not applicable	not applicable
Service User	not applicable	not applicable
Other	13-Nov-2017	15-Feb-2018

Equality Impact Screening

Is there the 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	Yes
Groups with particular faiths and beliefs	No

EIA required? (automatically updates to Yes, if any of the above impacts are Yes)	Yes
---	-----

Section E

Finance Comments
This saving will be achieved through no longer paying for two members of Oldham Council staff currently seconded to Mahdlo, either by transferring them to Mahdlo (the preferred option) or making them redundant. There may be additional costs in the form of either a TUPE liability or redundancy depending on the final solution for delivering the proposal, which could potentially impact on the final quantum delivered.

Signed RO	08-Jan-2018
-----------	-------------

Signed Finance	08-Jan-2018
----------------	-------------

Cabinet Member Signature		
Name and Date	Cllr B Brownridge	10-Jan-2018

Equality Impact Assessment Tool

HWB – PPL – 126 Youth Delivery staff reductions

Stage 1: Initial screening

Lead Officer:	Neil Consterdine
People involved in completing EIA:	
Is this the first time that this project, policy or proposal has had an EIA carried out on it? If no, please state date of original and append to this document for information.	Yes Date of original EIA: N/A

General Information

1a	Which service does this project, policy, or proposal relate to?	The project relates to proposed budget saving Leisure and Youth Services - HWB-PPL-126 – Youth Delivery staff reductions.
1b	What is the project, policy or proposal?	Currently Mahdlo receive £0.400m as the main part of their contract with Oldham Council. In addition the Council fund 2 Youth Development Officers which are seconded to Mahdlo. Specifically these officers were placed with Mahdlo to support the development of Mahdlo's wider workforce and develop them to support the skills they require to improve quality. This programme is now well established and the proposal would be to take back the two seconded Youth Workers and make a saving against these posts. These staff are still paid direct from the Council but are managed by Mahdlo. As outlined, the posts since going to Mahdlo do not deliver front line youth work and provide a wider development role to ensure the quality of the offer and training is developed through Mahdlo delivery. The posts also support District delivery development. This will continue to be delivered by Mahdlo. In addition, Mahdlo have decided they will create some similar development posts that will allow ongoing support to the staff and the Districts and so the impact to front line delivery will not be impacted upon.
1c	What are the main aims of the project, policy or proposal?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Deliver a saving - To reduce the dependency of Youth Development Officers working to support Mahdlo - Create a more sustainable model which is funded in an alternative way by Mahdlo and the ongoing grant they receive from the Council

		Council gives to Mahdlo is utilised effectively.
1d	Who, potentially, could this project, policy or proposal have a detrimental effect on, or benefit, and how?	It is not likely that the proposal will have a direct impact on young people as the posts are development officer posts. These posts have created sustainability and it is likely Mahdlo will create new roles to support the ongoing delivery as part of the wider work they do and the grant they get from the Council. This would result in minimal change (other than loss of experienced staff) to the end user.

1e. Does the project, policy or proposal have the potential to <u>disproportionately</u> impact on any of the following groups? If so, is the impact positive or negative?				
	None	Positive	Negative	Not sure
Disabled people	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Particular ethnic groups	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Men or women (include impacts due to pregnancy / maternity)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People of particular sexual orientation/s	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People in a Marriage or Civil Partnership	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People on low incomes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People in particular age groups	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Groups with particular faiths and beliefs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are there any other groups that you think may be affected negatively or positively by this project, policy or proposal?				
<i>E.g. vulnerable residents, homeless people, individuals at risk of loneliness, carers or serving and ex-serving members of the armed forces</i>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

If the answer is “negative” or “not sure” consider doing a full EIA

1f. What do you think that the overall NEGATIVE impact on groups and communities will be? <u>Please note that an example of none / minimal impact would be where there is no negative impact identified, or there will be no change to the service for any groups.</u> Wherever a negative impact has been identified you should consider completing the rest of the form.	None / Minimal	Significant
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The continuation of service delivery will happen through Mahdlo	<input type="checkbox"/>

1g	Using the screening and information in questions 1e and 1f, should a full assessment be carried out on the project, policy or proposal?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1h	How have you come to this decision?	The impact on young people's service delivery with regards to the number of sessions would be minimal.

Stage 5: Signature

Lead Officer: Neil Consterdine **Date:** 22/12/2017

Approver signature: Katrina Stephens **Date:** 03/01/2018

EIA review date: 30/04/2018

BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	Targeted Youth
Budget Reduction Title :	Review of Targeted Youth Services

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

This saving proposal is aligned with Youth Delivery Staff reductions HWB-PPL-126. The total of both proposals is £0.100m.

The proposal is for £0.024m and would need to be found by reducing the Positive Steps Oldham contract through the review of Integrated Youth Services. Proposal HWB-PPL-126 would be to take back the two seconded Youth workers and make a saving against these posts of £0.076m.

It is proposed to review the 'basket' of youth services provided by Positive Steps as follows:

- Youth Justice/Youth Crime Prevention
- Careers Advice and Guidance with Vulnerable Groups
- Support to Young Carers
- Young Peoples Sexual Health and Substance Misuse Services
- Young People Missing from Home Return Interview Service

The contract is currently due to end in March 2018 and there is an option to extend for a further period of up to two years.

2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment

£000

Employees	0
Other Operational Expenses	2,207
Income	(1,612)
Total	595

Current Forecast (under) / overspend

2

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)

0.00

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	(24)	0	0	0
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Is your proposal a "one-off" in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?

Ongoing

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following? :

Property
The services are delivered from the organisations main building in central Oldham which is not Council owned or operated.
Service Delivery
The provider have had their funding reduced over the lifetime of the current contract and have indicated that any future financial efficiencies are likely to have a direct impact on frontline service delivery.
Future expected outcomes
Initial discussions with the provider have indicated that future funding efficiencies would have a direct impact on the targets applied, impacting on the overall outcomes for Oldham's vulnerable young people. All relevant services will have to remain statutorily compliant.
Organisation
Further funding reductions are likely to have an impact in the number of staff the organisation employs, but it is not expected that these will impact the sustainability of the organisation as a whole.
Workforce
The organisation have provided indicative estimates of the direct impact the proposal will have in terms of a reduction in the provider's staff. The proposal is still being developed and is considering all wider elements of the Oldham Youth Offer with a view to achieving the savings required.
Communities
N/A
Service Users
Any reduction to the provider will have a direct impact on frontline service delivery and will likely result in some service disruption to service users.
Partner Organisations
The services are currently commissioned by a key partner organisation in Oldham. The sexual health element of the current contact is sub contacted to a clinical provider, Brook.

Who are the key stakeholders?

Staff	Yes
Elected Members	Yes
Residents	Yes
Local business community	Yes
Schools	Yes
Trade Unions	No
External Partners (if yes please specify below)	Yes
Positive Steps (and its sub contractors) and Mahdlo.	
Other Council Departments (if yes please specify below)	Yes
Public Health and Leisure.	
Other (if yes please specify below)	No
N/A.	

Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements

Cash saving to the organisation.

Section C

Key Risks and Mitigations:

Risk	Mitigation
That there is not adequate resource allocated to support the proposal.	Financial envelope confirmed.
That there is no suitable service provision available for the funding available.	As above.
Link to the outcome of the Early Help Offer review.	Outcome of the review considered and included within the project board work programme.

Key Development and Delivery Milestones:

Milestone	Timeline
Review of current services within the youth offer.	September/October 2017.
Consultation with young people and service users.	October 2017 to January 2018.
Decision paper.	November 2017.
Implementation.	December 2017 to April 2018.

Section D

Consultation Required?	Yes
------------------------	-----

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	13-Nov-2017	15-Feb-2018
Trade Union	13-Nov-2017	15-Feb-2018
Public	01-Nov-2017	25-Jan-2018
Service User	01-Nov-2017	25-Jan-2018
Other	not applicable	not applicable

Equality Impact Screening

Is there the 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	Yes
People in particular age groups	Yes
Groups with particular faiths and beliefs	No

EIA required? (automatically updates to Yes, if any of the above impacts are Yes)	Yes
---	-----

Section E

Finance Comments
The saving will need to be found by working with Positive Steps to agree a contract reduction. Discussions with the provider are on-going as part of agreeing a contract extension.

Signed RO	08-Jan-2018
-----------	-------------

Signed Finance	08-Jan-2018
----------------	-------------

Cabinet Member Signature		
Name and Date	Cllr B Brownridge	10-Jan-2018

HWB – PSV – 105 Review of Targeted Youth Services

Stage 1: Initial screening

Lead Officer:	Clare Bamforth
People involved in completing EIA:	Ed Francis Clare Bamforth
Is this the first time that this project, policy or proposal has had an EIA carried out on it? If no, please state date of original and append to this document for information.	Yes No X Date of original EIA: 1 December 2016 HWB-TRN-005: Review Sexual Health Service for Young People (Relates to 2017/18 Savings Proposal)

General Information

1a	Which service does this project, policy, or proposal relate to?	This proposal relates to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget template HWB-PSV-105. A saving of £0.024m is proposed set against service delivery within the Targeted Youth services contract.
1b	What is the project, policy or proposal?	The Council currently commissions Positive Steps to deliver a range of services to support Oldham's vulnerable young people under the overarching banner of Targeted Youth Services. These include support to young people around sexual health and substance misuse; services for young carers; delivery of missing from home return interviews; careers information advice and guidance as well as the Council's Youth Justice Service. The proposal is to reduce the Positive Steps budget for Integrated Support Services for Young People by £0.024m in 2018/19. Negotiations are currently happening with the provider to identify from what service area this saving will be made.
1c	What are the main aims of the project, policy or proposal?	To achieve a cost saving for the Council whilst minimising the impact on frontline service delivery.
1d	Who, potentially, could this project, policy or proposal have a detrimental effect on, or benefit, and how?	This proposal will affect Positive Steps, the current provider of targeted youth provision and their service users.

	<p>Positive Steps were required to achieve a saving of £0.150m in 2017/18 although £0.100m of this was deferred by 12 months. This was addressed in the EIA for the 2017/18 budget savings process. There is an ongoing consultation with the provider to determine what the impact will be in 2018/19 but at this stage it is unknown where this will directly impact, We are also working to identify any mitigations via other sources of funding.</p> <p>Once the detail of the affected service area or areas is known, an equality screening will be carried out against each one and where there is the potential for disproportionate impacts on any of the protected groups, a full EIA will be carried out.</p> <p>Following this the Cabinet Member will be fully appraised of the potential impacts once the EIA has been completed.</p>
--	--

1e. Does the project, policy or proposal have the potential to <u>disproportionately</u> impact on any of the following groups? If so, is the impact positive or negative?				
	None	Positive	Negative	Not sure
Disabled people	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Particular ethnic groups	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Men or women (include impacts due to pregnancy / maternity)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
People of particular sexual orientation/s	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
People in a Marriage or Civil Partnership	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People on low incomes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
People in particular age groups	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Groups with particular faiths and beliefs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are there any other groups that you think may be affected negatively or positively by this project, policy or proposal?				

<i>E.g. vulnerable residents, homeless people, individuals at risk of loneliness, carers or serving and ex-serving members of the armed forces</i>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
--	--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--

<p>1f. What do you think that the overall NEGATIVE impact on groups and communities will be? <u>Please note that an example of none / minimal impact would be where there is no negative impact identified, or there will be no change to the service for any groups.</u> Wherever a negative impact has been identified you should consider completing the rest of the form.</p>	None / Minimal	Significant
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

1g	Using the screening and information in questions 1e and 1f, should a full assessment be carried out on the project, policy or proposal?	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><i>Not at this time</i></p>
1h	How have you come to this decision?	<p>Until an agreement with the provider has been reached on how the savings will be managed we do not know whether a full EIA will be needed. At this stage, we do not know which service areas within the contract will be affected or by how much and are therefore unable to provide further details on this. However, we believe that the reduction will be absorbed across the whole contract and therefore impact on service users directly will be low.</p>

Stage 5: Signature	
Lead Officer: Clare Bamforth	Date: 20 February 2018
Approver signature: Jill Beaumont	Date: 20 February 2018
EIA review date: March and September 2018	

Responsible Officer :	Carol Brown
Cabinet Member :	Cllr B Brownridge
Support Officer :	Glenn Dale

BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	Environmental Management
Budget Reduction Title :	Commissioning Arboricultural Services

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

This proposal is to commission the remainder of the work currently undertaken by the in-house team.
The work of the arboricultural team is currently a mix of commissioned & in house service delivery.

2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment

£000

Employees	213
Other Operational Expenses	411
Income	(128)
Total	496

Current Forecast (under) / overspend

60

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)

13.00

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	(50)	0	0	0
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	(1.00)	0.00	0.00	0.00

Is your proposal a "one-off" in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?

Ongoing

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following? :

Property
N/A
Service Delivery
Commissioned work will be managed to reduce impact.
Future expected outcomes
Commissioned work will be managed to reduce impact.
Organisation
Commissioned work will be managed to reduce impact.
Workforce
Full consultation would be undertaken to evaluate the full impact on the workforce.
Communities
Commissioned work will be managed to reduce impact.
Service Users
Commissioned work will be managed to reduce impact.
Partner Organisations
Commissioned work will be managed to reduce impact.

Who are the key stakeholders?

Staff	Yes
Elected Members	Yes
Residents	Yes
Local business community	Yes
Schools	No
Trade Unions	Yes
External Partners (if yes please specify below)	Yes
FCHO	
Other Council Departments (if yes please specify below)	Yes
Corporate Property & Corporate Landlord	
Other (if yes please specify below)	No
N/a	

Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements

Potential for efficiencies and improved resilience.

Section C

Key Risks and Mitigations:

Risk	Mitigation
The external contractors increase the costs of the service they provide once there is no internal opposition.	A new procurement exercise will have to take place to bring the future costs back in line.
N/a	N/a
N/a	N/a

Key Development and Delivery Milestones:

Milestone	Timeline
Understand the implications of externalisation on the workforce. Potential TUPE implications to be understood.	October 2017.
Discussions to take place with Trades Unions and staff to inform the process.	13 November 2017 - 15 February 2018.
Agree framework start date.	Summer 2018.
N/a	N/a

Section D

Consultation Required?	Yes
------------------------	-----

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	13-Nov-2017	15-Feb-2018
Trade Union	13-Nov-2017	15-Feb-2018
Public	not applicable	not applicable
Service User	not applicable	not applicable
Other	not applicable	not applicable

Equality Impact Screening

Is there the 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? (automatically updates to Yes, if any of the above impacts are Yes)	No
---	----

Section E

Finance Comments
<p>The saving would come from the employee line in the main with a small amount against supplies and services within the countryside and arbor cost centre 21020.</p> <p>The cost implications for any redundancy, legal and TUPE (relating to pensions) will have to be factored in as part of the project timeline.</p> <p>It is assumed that a summer implementation will also realise a full year savings benefit. (Sadrul Alam).</p>

Signed RO	08-Jan-2018
-----------	-------------

Signed Finance	08-Jan-2018
----------------	-------------

Cabinet Member Signature		
Name and Date	Cllr B Brownridge	10-Jan-2018

Responsible Officer :	Carol Brown
-----------------------	-------------

Cabinet Member :	Cllr B Brownridge
------------------	-------------------

Support Officer :	Glenn Dale
-------------------	------------

BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	Environmental Management
----------------	--------------------------

Budget Reduction Title :	Service Rationalisation
--------------------------	-------------------------

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

This proposal is to save £0.107m from the Environmental Services budget based on the success of managing the replacement of hired equipment with purchased and maintained in house machinery. The service has taken a prudent approach to managing equipment and has put in place a 5 year replacement plan. The potential to save against the existing budget is estimated at £0.107m. This supports the move to undertake planned maintenance in parks through the increased use of a mobile team operating across a series of parks and open spaces, delivering greater efficiency.

2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment

£000

Employees	5,594
Other Operational Expenses	5,665
Income	(3,095)
Total	8,164

Current Forecast (under) / overspend	(38)
--------------------------------------	------

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)	188.00
--	--------

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	(107)	0	0	0
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Is your proposal a "one-off" in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?	Ongoing
---	---------

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following? :

Property
N/A
Service Delivery
Managed efficiencies.
Future expected outcomes
Essential that programme for replacement is maintained.
Organisation
As above.
Workforce
N/A
Communities
N/A
Service Users
N/A
Partner Organisations
N/A

Who are the key stakeholders?

Staff	Yes
Elected Members	Yes
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

Achievement of budget reduction for 2018/19 onwards.

Section C

Key Risks and Mitigations:

Risk	Mitigation
Failure to commit resources to support the 5 year programme will result in machinery breakdown and service failure.	Maintenance/provision of adequate capital resources to support future replacement cost of machinery.
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

Key Development and Delivery Milestones:

Milestone	Timeline
Effective budget reduction from April 2018.	April 2018.
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

Section D

Consultation Required?	No
------------------------	----

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	not applicable	not applicable
Trade Union	not applicable	not applicable
Public	not applicable	not applicable
Service User	not applicable	not applicable
Other	not applicable	not applicable

Equality Impact Screening

Is there the 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? (automatically updates to Yes, if any of the above impacts are Yes)	No
---	----

Section E

Finance Comments
Purchase of machinery using reserves in 2017/18 will lead to savings on hire and operational machinery costs within the Environmental services cost centres from 2018/19 onwards. However, sufficient funds have been set aside within the capital strategy to help support the replacement cost of machinery as the expected useful life of the machinery comes to an end.

Signed RO	08-Jan-2018
-----------	-------------

Signed Finance	08-Jan-2018
----------------	-------------

Cabinet Member Signature		
Name and Date	Cllr B Brownridge	10-Jan-2018

Responsible Officer :	Carol Brown
-----------------------	-------------

Cabinet Member :	Cllr B Brownridge
------------------	-------------------

Support Officer :	Neil Crabtree
-------------------	---------------

BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	Public Protection
----------------	-------------------

Budget Reduction Title :	Commissioning of Dog Warden Service
--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

The proposal is to commission a dog warden service from the private sector in response to the dramatic reduction in the number of stray dogs being dealt with.

Over the last four years the numbers have reduced from 625 to 400 per year and this has a direct affect on the income that can be generated by the service.

Even though the Council has a statutory duty to provide a service this can be commissioned from the private sector with a number of providers already delivering a service for other Greater Manchester (GM) authorities.

2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment

£000

Employees	35
Other Operational Expenses	57
Income	(35)
Total	57

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

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)	1.00
--	------

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	(15)	0	0	0
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	(1.00)	0.00	0.00	0.00

Is your proposal a "one-off" in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?	Ongoing
---	---------

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following? :

Property
Not applicable.
Service Delivery
A more flexible service delivered with better value for money in line with other GM authorities. The detail around whether or not to provide an out of hours dog warden service will form part of the procurement process.
Future expected outcomes
If the service is not rationalised it will have an ever increasing deficit budget as the projected number of stray dogs dealt with reduces year on year.
Organisation
Minimal. The contractor delivering the service will be monitored and held to account to their contractual obligations. The main impact on the organisation will be a reduction in costs going forward as the service delivery model is changed.
Workforce
1 FTE reduction.
Communities
Not applicable - same service provision just different delivery vehicle.
Service Users
Minimal.
Partner Organisations
Currently the Council provides the service to Tameside Council and they will have to consider other service providers.

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)	Yes
Tameside Council	
Other Council Departments (if yes please specify below)	No
N/a	
Other (if yes please specify below)	Yes
External Service Provider	

Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements

Delivery of statutory function using private organisation that will ensure value for money going forward with no impact on service delivery.

Section C

Key Risks and Mitigations:

Risk	Mitigation
Selected private contractor is unable to deliver to the advertised contract.	Review of contractual obligations including the out of hours provision will be considered.
N/a	N/a
N/a	N/a

Key Development and Delivery Milestones:

Milestone	Timeline
Staff and trade union consultation.	13 November 2017 - 15 February 2018.
Procurement of provider.	Agreed GMCA framework.
N/a	N/a
N/a	N/a

Section D

Consultation Required?	Yes
------------------------	-----

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	13-Nov-2017	15-Feb-2018
Trade Union	13-Nov-2017	15-Feb-2018
Public	not applicable	not applicable
Service User	not applicable	not applicable
Other	13-Nov-2017	15-Feb-2018

Equality Impact Screening

Is there the 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? (automatically updates to Yes, if any of the above impacts are Yes)	No
---	----

Section E

Finance Comments
This proposal can be delivered and budget can go towards the reduction proposed on cost centre 24930. Impact of possible redundancy costs and legal costs will have to be factored in as part of the implementation timeline. (Sadrul Alam)

Signed RO	08-Jan-2018
-----------	-------------

Signed Finance	08-Jan-2018
----------------	-------------

Cabinet Member Signature		
Name and Date	Cllr B Brownridge	10-Jan-2018

Responsible Officer :	Tom Stannard
Cabinet Member :	Cllr J Stretton
Support Officer :	Gail McDonough

BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	Asset Management (Client)
Budget Reduction Title :	Driving Value from Assets

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

The Council has a large and diverse property portfolio and significant progress has been made to rationalise the office estate of the Council and make budget savings. This proposal is to address the remainder of the estate and will deliver cost savings, new income and capital receipts. Addressing the opportunities that exist in the remainder of the portfolio requires a fundamental review of the Council's approach to both its property assets and the management of those assets. This review and approach will be captured in an updated Corporate Property Strategy.

Firstly, there is an operational estate with annual running costs of circa £14m and a maintenance backlog of £40m. Further rationalisation of this estate is required in light of changing service delivery arrangements across the Council and with partners, although it will also will require a more radical property strategy.

Secondly there is a non-operational estate that comprises circa 3,250 individual assets producing a net income of £1m. These headline figures hide the detail behind the portfolio which includes:

- a large number of low value, low yielding assets that require rationalisation and in which there are opportunities to generate increased income,
- a small number of 'pure' investments where the focus should be on maximising income growth and income security and therefore require maintenance and investment to maintain the income stream,
- community assets treated as investments, but in reality serve a purpose greater than simply income/capital optimisation, although their cost is not explicitly identified.

* Continued in additional information

2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment

	£000
Employees	284
Other Operational Expenses	13,681
Income	(13,253)
Total	712

Current Forecast (under) / overspend

(170)

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)

5.00

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	0	(1,000)	(1,500)	(2,000)
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Is your proposal a "one-off" in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?

Ongoing

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following? :

Property
All Council property (land and building) is affected by this proposal.
Service Delivery
The management of the Council properties, largely undertaken by Unity Partnership will need to change as the portfolio changes.
Future expected outcomes
A smaller more efficient property portfolio with a greater number of categories rather than simply operational and non-operational, reflecting the differing objectives and priorities of the Council.
Organisation
As property is used to deliver Council services it is an enabler to transformational change within the organisation.
Workforce
As property is used to deliver Council and partner services, any portfolio change will affect staff.
Communities
Better identification of assets important to communities in support of the co-operative agenda, including Community Asset Transfer.
Service Users
As property is used to deliver Council services, any portfolio change has the opportunity to improve the experience of service users.
Partner Organisations
In recent years there has been an increase in the co-location of services, this is expected to continue.

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
Schools, health, blue light services, etc.	
Other Council Departments (if yes please specify below)	Yes
All services.	
Other (if yes please specify below)	Yes
Unity Partnership Limited.	

Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements

Long term revenue savings from a smaller more focused property portfolio.
Improvements to staff and customers when property is used to facilitate organisational change.

Section C

Key Risks and Mitigations:

Risk	Mitigation
Decision making too slow to enable the Council to take the benefit from time sensitive investment opportunities.	Review Council decision making arrangements.
Operational estate rationalisation does not take place.	Business case approach to decision making to drive a programme of change.
N/A	N/A

Key Development and Delivery Milestones:

Milestone	Timeline
Programme for the production of a Corporate Asset Management Plan and Property Investment Strategy.	November 2017.
Approval of Commercial Property Investment Strategy.	December 2017.
Prepare Corporate Property Strategy.	March 2018.
N/A	N/A

Section D

Consultation Required?	No
------------------------	----

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	not applicable	not applicable
Trade Union	not applicable	not applicable
Public	not applicable	not applicable
Service User	not applicable	not applicable
Other	not applicable	not applicable

Equality Impact Screening

Is there the 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? (automatically updates to Yes, if any of the above impacts are Yes)	No
---	----

Section E

Finance Comments
The proposal will be achieved from a reduction in property costs and measures to generate increased income from the Council's investment estate along with capital receipts from any properties disposed. There is a significant workstream to develop the Council's Corporate Property Strategy to detail the proposals to ensure that they can be met from the 2019/20 financial year onwards.

Signed RO	08-Jan-2018
-----------	-------------

Signed Finance	08-Jan-2018
----------------	-------------

Cabinet Member Signature		
Name and Date	Cllr J Stretton	10-Jan-2018

Additional Information (if required)

Accordingly, the proposition is to prepare a new Corporate Property Strategy that will help transform the remainder of the estate. It will need to address why each asset is held, its contribution to the Council's objectives and future management requirements, and, if surplus/potentially surplus, its disposal. This will be captured in sub-portfolio / individual asset management plans.

Responsible Officer :	Tom Stannard
-----------------------	--------------

Cabinet Member :	Cllr J Stretton
------------------	-----------------

Support Officer :	Gail McDonough
-------------------	----------------

BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	Economy Skills and Neighbourhoods Management
----------------	--

Budget Reduction Title :	Economy, Skills and Neighbourhoods Staffing Review
--------------------------	--

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

This budget proposal is an achievable contribution to corporate savings from existing vacant posts on the structure following a recent staffing review in the division.

This review has been designed to remove duplication and improve efficiency in management and to bring greater coherence to the relationship between key divisions within the regeneration and environment divisions.

An extensive staff and trade union consultation has been undertaken and this has made clear that whilst this reorganisation is not driven by efficiency savings to be made, with the continuing financial pressures, there is a need to meet budgetary reductions and requirements.

2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment

£000

Employees	13,084
Other Operational Expenses	25,600
Income	(33,971)
Total	4,713

Current Forecast (under) / overspend	432
--------------------------------------	-----

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)	437.09
--	--------

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	(100)	0	0	0
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	(2.00)	0.00	0.00	0.00

Is your proposal a "one-off" in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?	Ongoing
---	---------

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following? :

Property
N/A
Service Delivery
Improvement in management efficiency within ESN.
Future expected outcomes
Improvement in business plan delivery within ESN.
Organisation
Improvement in management efficiency within ESN.
Workforce
Improvement in management efficiency within ESN.
Communities
N/A
Service Users
N/A
Partner Organisations
Improvement in management efficiency within ESN.

Who are the key stakeholders?

Staff	Yes
Elected Members	Yes
Residents	No
Local business community	Yes
Schools	No
Trade Unions	No
External Partners (if yes please specify below)	Yes
Private sector, RSLs, developers etc	
Other Council Departments (if yes please specify below)	Yes
Most other directorates at senior level	
Other (if yes please specify below)	No
N/A	

Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements

Improvement in management efficiency within ESN.

Section C**Key Risks and Mitigations:**

Risk	Mitigation
Failure to realise management savings.	Saving to be provided by vacant posts minimising implementation risks.
Failure to achieve improvement in management efficiency within ESN.	Saving to be provided by vacant posts minimising implementation risks.
Inadequate staff consultation.	Extensive staff and Trade Unions consultation programme.

Key Development and Delivery Milestones:

Milestone	Timeline
Conclusion of staff consultation.	September 2017.
Final management proposals.	October 2017.
Implementation.	From October/November 2017.
Realisation of £100k savings.	From April 2018/19 recurring.

Section D

Consultation Required?	Yes
------------------------	-----

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	13-Nov-2017	15-Feb-2018
Trade Union	13-Nov-2017	15-Feb-2018
Public	not applicable	not applicable
Service User	not applicable	not applicable
Other	not applicable	not applicable

Equality Impact Screening

Is there the 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? (automatically updates to Yes, if any of the above impacts are Yes)	No
---	----

Section E

Finance Comments
<p>The saving that has been proposed will be met principally from a reduction in management costs within the Economy, Skills and Neighbourhoods directorate.</p> <p>Posts are vacant and therefore no redundancy costs will be incurred.</p>

Signed RO	08-Jan-2018
-----------	-------------

Signed Finance	08-Jan-2018
----------------	-------------

Cabinet Member Signature		
Name and Date	Cllr J Stretton	10-Jan-2018

Responsible Officer :	Joe Davies
Cabinet Member :	Cllr A Jabbar
Support Officer :	Jayne Harrington

BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	Economy Skills and Neighbourhoods Management
Budget Reduction Title :	Traded Services Review

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

To undertake a full review of the Council's traded services following work already completed via an initial desktop exercise and a pilot in-depth review that has identified scope for savings and service improvements. The review will consider specific drivers for traded services to:

- Operate commercially at a competitive rate to ensure Council services provide value for money
- Reduce the cost of delivery of such services by collaborating with other Local Authorities to exploit synergies and share best practice and resources
- Generate income by trading commercially with other public sector bodies
- Generate income by operating commercially externally, where appropriate, and trading on the open market.

The proposal will look to review all traded services on a phased basis over the next 2 years and implement actions from each review in line with the drivers highlighted above.

The review will require some initial investment funded from the transformation reserve in order to resource the review.

The information on budget and establishment for each of the services will be collated and provided as each review commences through the phases of the review. Some services are fully traded and therefore do not have net budgets, some are part traded where the budgets for the traded elements are not fully known at this time.

*The proposal will cover a range of cross cutting budgets that are yet to be identified

2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment

£000

Employees	0
Other Operational Expenses	0
Income	(0)
Total	0

Current Forecast (under) / overspend

0

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)

0.00

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	0	(940)	0	0
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Is your proposal a "one-off" in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?

Ongoing

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following? :

Property
None anticipated from the first phase to review all services. There may be some potential implications resulting from agreed actions to take each service forward but this will be subject to a separate report.
Service Delivery
It is planned that service delivery will stay the same or improve as a result of the changes and that there will be increase in profitable delivery to customers.
Future expected outcomes
Improvement in performance of traded services.
Organisation
There will likely be some changes in how certain trades services are managed and delivered organisationally. There may be some externalisation required of certain traded elements in order to deliver benefits.
Workforce
There will likely be some changes in workforce, dependent on the outcomes of the detailed reviews and proposed changes in order to deliver benefits.
Communities
No changes/impact expected or planned.
Service Users
No degradation in service for end users expected or planned. Changes to categories of customers targeted and traded with may change depending on the market analysis for each traded service.
Partner Organisations
No impact expected or planned.

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
Unity Partnership Limited	
Other Council Departments (if yes please specify below)	Yes
All relevant departments dependent on the outcome of each review.	
Other (if yes please specify below)	No
N/A	

Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements

The benefits will primarily be financial resulting from a reduction in deficit and/or subsidy and an increase in profits.

Streamlined traded services performing with appropriate support and at reputable performance levels.

Section C

Key Risks and Mitigations:

Risk	Mitigation
Skills and capacity within the Council to carry out the transformation required to realise the savings and performance rectification.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Assess skills and capacity and plan for this with respect to the change.• Draw in expertise as necessary.• Fund dedicated resources to ensure delivery of benefits.
Reluctance to externalise certain services.	Early engagement with TU's, workforce and Elected Members to help understanding of methods for improvement of traded services and where externalisation is likely to be in the benefit of both the workforce, Council and customers.
Unforeseen liabilities within traded services (losses increasing).	Establish position of key traded services early, prioritising based on risk.

Key Development and Delivery Milestones:

Milestone	Timeline
90 day sprint review of each service.	April 2018 for completion of first 'sprint'.
Report back to EMT to consider recommendations from each sprint. The outcome of the recommendations will then determine further milestones.	May 2018 for the first report back to EMT.
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

Section D

Consultation Required?	Yes
------------------------	-----

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	not applicable	not applicable
Trade Union	not applicable	not applicable
Public	not applicable	not applicable
Service User	not applicable	not applicable
Other	not applicable	not applicable

Equality Impact Screening

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

Disabled people	Yes
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	Yes
People in particular age groups	Yes
Groups with particular faiths and beliefs	No

EIA required? (automatically updates to Yes, if any of the above impacts are Yes)	Yes
---	-----

Section E

Finance Comments
Please see additional information.

Signed RO	08-Jan-2018
-----------	-------------

Signed Finance	08-Jan-2018
----------------	-------------

Cabinet Member Signature	
Name and Date	Clr A Jabbar 10-Jan-2018

Additional Information (if required)

The Council provides a range of services that includes some form of trading. In total 52 services generate external income on either a fully or partly traded basis. Some of these services generate significant amounts of income that is solely used to fund the expenditure on a break-even basis whereas others generate small amounts of income that contribute to the ongoing operational expenditure of the service.

Where services are partly trading, it is not possible to determine which elements of the service expenditure relates to traded activities and which elements relates to core business, as more often than not, the costs are included together in one cost centre. The review will explore this with a view to separating the traded and non-traded elements to ascertain whether the traded part of the service is making a loss, breaking even or generating a surplus to support the non-traded parts of the service.

Of the 52 services that have trading activity, 12 of these are fully traded services and these elements will form the first phase of the review. Within these 12 services, the desktop review has found that budgets i.e. subsidies provided to support these services, amount to around £0.900m and on top of that, these services overspent by a further £1.1m in 2016/17.

The first phase of the project will look to review each of these services and to recommend the most appropriate course of action to alleviate the overspend and to remove the budget subsidy so that all fully traded services can break-even. Depending on the recommendations, the outcome of each review may need to go onto Cabinet for approval. This is the reason for no savings being achievable within the first 12 months.

The second phase of the review will look at part-traded services and will firstly ascertain the actual trading position before recommending actions to alleviate overspend and budget subsidies. The recommended action for both phases will fall into one or more of the areas of cost drivers as highlighted in the first section.

Equality Impact Assessment Tool

ESN-PSV-131 Review of Traded Services

Stage 1: Initial screening

Lead Officer:	Jayne Harrington
People involved in completing EIA:	
Is this the first time that this project, policy or proposal has had an EIA carried out on it? If no, please state date of original and append to this document for information.	Yes X No Date of original EIA:

General Information

1a	Which service does this project, policy, or proposal relate to?	<p>Various services throughout the organisation that are deemed as traded.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cleaning Service Home Help Access Service School Crossing Patrols Gallery Oldham and Museum Service Theatre Workshop Pest Control Waste Management Environment Chadderton Environment Failsworth Oldham District Environment Royton and Shaw Environment Saddleworth and Lees Cleaning Service Catering – Primary Educational Psychology Service Music Service Outdoor Education Governor Support and Training Sports Development Schools Swimming Service Grounds General Arbor and Countryside Services Environment East Oldham Catering – Special Quality Effectiveness support Team SFA Lifelong Learning – Central IT Client – Schools Study Support Service
----	---	---

		<p>Car Parking Fleet Management People Services Cemeteries and Crematorium Health and Safety at Work (Env) Response Services SFA ESOL Talk English SFA Learner Support Fund</p>
1b	What is the project, policy or proposal?	Traded Services Review
1c	What are the main aims of the project, policy or proposal?	<p>The Traded Services Group identified the following drivers to support understanding of traded services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operate commercially at a competitive rate to ensure Council services provide value for money • Reduce the cost of delivery of such services by forming co-operative or shared services with other Councils or providers. This means the resource expense can be shared across a number of Councils, synergies exploited and best practice can be developed to deliver the best outcomes for citizens and communities • Generate income by trading commercially with other public sector bodies • Generate income by operating commercially externally and trading that service outside of the Council arena in the open market. <p>The above ought to improve sustainability by enabling us to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce subsidies provided to services that are currently trading • Generate additional income which can be reinvested in other Council services • Reduce the cost of service delivery through commercialism • Protect our non-statutory but valued services to Oldham • Improve our reputation and responsiveness for good quality services with citizens and communities
1d	Who, potentially, could this project, policy or proposal have a detrimental effect on, or benefit, and how?	The initial phase of this project is to carry out a review of services within the organisation that are traded both internally and externally. It is envisaged that there will be no impact at this stage.

1e. Does the project, policy or proposal have the potential to <u>disproportionately</u> impact on any of the following groups? If so, is the impact positive or negative?				
	None	Positive	Negative	Not sure
Disabled people	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
Particular ethnic groups	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Men or women (include impacts due to pregnancy / maternity)	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People of particular sexual orientation/s	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People in a Marriage or Civil Partnership	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People on low incomes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
People in particular age groups	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
Groups with particular faiths and beliefs	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are there any other groups that you think may be affected negatively or positively by this project, policy or proposal?				
<i>E.g. vulnerable residents, homeless people, individuals at risk of loneliness, carers or serving and ex-serving members of the armed forces</i>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

If the answer is “negative” or “not sure” consider doing a full EIA

1f. What do you think that the overall NEGATIVE impact on groups and communities will be? <u>Please note that an example of none / minimal impact would be where there is no negative impact identified, or there will be no change to the service for any groups.</u> Wherever a negative impact has been identified you should consider completing the rest of the form.	None / Minimal	Significant
		<input type="checkbox"/>

1g	Using the screening and information in questions 1e and 1f, should a full assessment be carried out on the project, policy or proposal?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No X
1h	How have you come to this decision?	The initial stage of the project is to carry out a review of Traded Services. This part of the project would not present either positive or negative impact on particular groups as listed above. The finding of each review carried out would give a clearer picture of any potential

		<p>impact, both positive or negative and at that stage it would be advisable to carry out an EIA assessment for each individual traded service project. However, we will consider the broader picture of dependencies when carrying out the reviews within specific areas, i.e. Schools.</p>
--	--	--

Stage 5: Signature	
Lead Officer: Jayne Harrington	Date: 04/01/2018
Approver signature: Joe Davies	Date: 04/01/2018
EIA review date: Six month review to be carried out June 2018	

Responsible Officer :	Dami Awobajo
-----------------------	--------------

Cabinet Member :	Cllr A Jabbar
------------------	---------------

Support Officer :	Dami Awobajo
-------------------	--------------

BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	Business Intelligence
----------------	-----------------------

Budget Reduction Title :	Review of BIS Functions
--------------------------	-------------------------

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

Review of Business Intelligence Service (BIS) functions with a view to reduce costs. This would be an additional reduction to BIS following on from proposal HWB-PSV-122.

The Business Intelligence Service provides and develops insight that informs strategic decisions which demonstrates impact. For example, it is responsible for:

- Service Improvement (e.g. Getting to Good)
- Research (e.g. Warehouse to Wheels, Legal Highs, Early Help Evaluation, Fly-Tipping)
- Business Analysis (Hospital Social Care Review, LINK Centre Review, Trade Waste)
- Statutory Data Submissions (Children in Need, SALT, Looked After Children, Safeguarding, DOLS)
- Strategic Responsibility for Geographic Information
- Maintenance and Administration of Business Critical IT systems
- Support to organisation to meet External Inspection regimes (OFSTED, CQC)
- School Census
- Thematic Reports (Welfare Reform, Local Economic Assessment, Ward Profiles)
- Corporate Performance Framework
- Support to Overview and Scrutiny
- Service Improvement (e.g. Getting to Good)
- Mosaic Implementation and Management

2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment

£000

Employees	1,077
Other Operational Expenses	65
Income	(1,391)
Total	(249)

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

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)	26.82
--	-------

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	(35)	0	0	0
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	(1.00)	0.00	0.00	0.00

Is your proposal a "one-off" in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?	Ongoing
---	---------

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following? :

Property
None.
Service Delivery
There will be an impact on the service that Business Intelligence is able to deliver to other Council departments and a revision to the prioritisation of activities will be required to minimise this impact.
Future expected outcomes
Reduction in capacity in the Business Intelligence team will require a revision to the prioritisation of activities so as to minimise the impact on the Council's ability to monitor progress against outcomes, and understanding of priority areas for development.
Organisation
The organisation will have a reduced capacity to meet statutory obligations and improve services to residents, and this will require careful planning of team activities.
Workforce
A reduction in workforce.
Communities
The work of the Business Intelligence team will require prioritisation and it will focus on key tasks so that the impact on communities and the Council's ability to understand them is minimised.
Service Users
The work of the Business Intelligence team will require prioritisation and it will focus on key tasks so that the impact on service users and the Council is minimised.
Partner Organisations
Reduced capacity in Business Intelligence may impact on joint intelligence work with other partner organisations e.g. Oldham CCG. Efforts will be made to take advantages of opportunities to pool team efforts with partners.

Who are the key stakeholders?

Staff	Yes
Elected Members	Yes
Residents	Yes
Local business community	No
Schools	Yes
Trade Unions	Yes
External Partners (if yes please specify below)	Yes
Schools and Oldham Clinical Commissioning Group	
Other Council Departments (if yes please specify below)	Yes
All directorates	
Other (if yes please specify below)	No
N/A	

Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements

The saving will contribute to the Council's budget reduction target.

Section C

Key Risks and Mitigations:

Risk	Mitigation
Reduction will mean the Council will need to prioritise requests for non-statutory requirements.	Opportunities to work with Business Intelligence teams in partner agencies will be explored. However other partner agencies may reduce their intelligence capacity and if so the effectiveness of this mitigation would be limited.
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

Key Development and Delivery Milestones:

Milestone	Timeline
Staff Consultation	November 2017 to February 2018.
Implementation begins.	March 2018.
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

Section D

Consultation Required?	Yes
------------------------	-----

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	13-Nov-2017	15-Feb-2018
Trade Union	13-Nov-2017	15-Feb-2018
Public	not applicable	not applicable
Service User	not applicable	not applicable
Other	not applicable	not applicable

Equality Impact Screening

Is there the 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? (automatically updates to Yes, if any of the above impacts are Yes)	No
---	----

Section E

Finance Comments
This proposal will result in a permanent deletion of one post triggering an on-going saving of £35k.

Signed RO	08-Jan-2018
-----------	-------------

Signed Finance	08-Jan-2018
----------------	-------------

Cabinet Member Signature		
Name and Date	Clr A Jabbar	10-Jan-2018

Responsible Officer :	Joe Davies
-----------------------	------------

Cabinet Member :	Cllr A Jabbar
------------------	---------------

Support Officer :	Karen Ollerenshaw
-------------------	-------------------

BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	Commissioning and Procurement
----------------	-------------------------------

Budget Reduction Title :	Savings from Procurement Activities
--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

The Councils Procurement Team maintains a contract register and also continuously updates and manages a three year procurement plan for the renewal of existing contracts. All existing contracts will be reviewed to ensure that best value is being secured and amendments, revisions and renegotiations are undertaken as appropriate, having regard to contractual terms and conditions, the services/goods being provided, risks to the Council and available alternative provision.

The negotiation and agreement of new contracts will be subject to scrutiny having regard to the contract specification, the tendering process and the Councils service requirements.

It is anticipated that an initial phased contract review and a continuous work programme throughout 2018/19 should produce savings across the financial year of up to £0.250m.

2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment

£000

Employees	0
Other Operational Expenses	106,485
Income	(0)
Total	106,485

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

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)	0.00
--	------

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	(250)	0	0	0
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Is your proposal a "one-off" in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?	Ongoing
---	---------

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following? :

Property
There will be no impact on property from this proposal.
Service Delivery
There will be no impact on service delivery from this proposal.
Future expected outcomes
The proposal will contribute to the achievement of the 2018/19 budget reduction target and ensure that the Council continues to achieve value for money from its contractual arrangements with suppliers including partner organisations.
Organisation
There will be no impact on the organisation from this proposal, other than the reduction in certain contractual values and the requirement for contract client arrangements to ensure that contracts continue to be effectively managed.
Workforce
There will be no impact on the workforce from this proposal.
Communities
There will be no impact on communities from this proposal.
Service Users
There will be no impact on service users from this proposal.
Partner Organisations
There will be no direct impact on partner organisations from this proposal, however contracts with partner organisations will be subject to the same reviews and the Council will endeavour to achieve savings in contracts as appropriate.

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)	Yes
Suppliers of services via contractual arrangements including partner organisations.	
Other Council Departments (if yes please specify below)	No
N/A	
Other (if yes please specify below)	Yes
Suppliers of services via contractual arrangements including partner organisations.	

Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements

A £0.250m contribution to the achievement of the 2018/19 budget reduction target and the achievement of improved value for money via the driving down, where possible, of contract prices.

Section C

Key Risks and Mitigations:

Risk	Mitigation
Suppliers may not work with the Council to assist in the delivery of contract efficiencies.	The Council employs appropriately skilled officers who can undertake complex contract reviews and negotiations.
The availability of suitably skilled procurement and service staff to identify savings opportunities.	The Council employs appropriately skilled officers who can identify and deliver contractual savings.
Contractual savings may have been relied upon already by services when undertaking the review of budgets for 2018/19.	The Procurement and Service teams work closely and have a clear understanding of contract values, opportunities for savings and the allocation of potential cashable efficiencies.

Key Development and Delivery Milestones:

Milestone	Timeline
Commencement of review of contract register and identification of opportunities for savings and scrutiny of forthcoming contracts.	Autumn 2017.
Completion of initial review and instigation of key lines of enquiry into contractual savings and initiation of a work programme.	March 2018.
On-going review with progress monitoring at: Quarter 1 Quarter 2 Quarter 3 Quarter 4	June 2018 September 2018 December 2018 March 2019
N/A	N/A

Section D

Consultation Required?	No
------------------------	----

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	not applicable	not applicable
Trade Union	not applicable	not applicable
Public	not applicable	not applicable
Service User	not applicable	not applicable
Other	not applicable	not applicable

Equality Impact Screening

Is there the 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? (automatically updates to Yes, if any of the above impacts are Yes)	No
---	----

Section E

Finance Comments
<p>Whilst at this stage, the savings from individual contracts cannot be determined, the budget reduction proposal is for an initial and then on-going review of contracts which should support the generation of savings, having regard to the requirement for service continuity and risk mitigation. The Finance Team will work with the Procurement Team to support the programme of contract reviews to facilitate the delivery of the budget reduction.</p> <p>There is sufficient scope within the wide range of Council contracts to support the delivery of a £0.250m target saving over the period to March 2019.</p>

Signed RO	08-Jan-2018
-----------	-------------

Signed Finance	08-Jan-2018
----------------	-------------

Cabinet Member Signature		
Name and Date	Cllr A Jabbar	10-Jan-2018

Responsible Officer :	Dami Awobajo
Cabinet Member :	Cllr A Jabbar
Support Officer :	Dami Awobajo

BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	Corporate and Commercial Services Management
Budget Reduction Title :	Review of General Business Processes

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

The Business Intelligence Service has been commissioned by the Executive Director of Corporate and Commercial Services (SRO) to identify Council business processes that are in need of review. This work will address #ourbit as it aims to identify waste and carry out necessary improvements to those business processes identified. It is expected that there will be process efficiencies identified through this project, which may also lead to budget savings.

Other programmes are already addressing resident facing processes namely Resident First, corporate projects, Traded Services Review, and service led review work. Work within this project will be undertaken in line with these other programmes of activity to prevent potential duplication, circumvention or undermining of that work underway.

The overall objective of this work is to deliver improved business process models, with waste removed, and budget savings identified, where appropriate. The initial focus will be on invoicing but there will be interfaces with other work programmes. The initial suggested themes are:

- Services delivered before payment
- Schools Service Level Agreement (SLA)
- Potentially Accounts Payable e-invoicing

Change management and new process implementation are expected to be the responsibility of the service(s) affected. As the review will include a range of service budgets, the information on budget and establishment will be collated and provided as each review commences.

*The proposal will cover a range of cross cutting budgets that are yet to be identified

2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment

£000

Employees	0
Other Operational Expenses	0
Income	(0)
Total	0

Current Forecast (under) / overspend

0

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)

0.00

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	(50)	0	0	0
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Is your proposal a "one-off" in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?

Ongoing

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following? :

Property
None expected.
Service Delivery
Business processes will change for the better, make services more efficient, and potentially improve service delivery.
Future expected outcomes
See impact on service delivery.
Organisation
More streamlined, standardised processes will be clearer for staff to operate. There could be an impact on staff numbers in the long term.
Workforce
Potential increase in productivity.
Communities
Potentially more accurate and timely financial interactions between Council and residents/business.
Service Users
The project will initially look at internal services but could in time contribute to improved service delivery for residents of the Borough.
Partner Organisations
There could potentially be a positive impact on partner organisations due to processes being standardised.

Who are the key stakeholders?

Staff	Yes
Elected Members	Yes
Residents	No
Local business community	Yes
Schools	Yes
Trade Unions	No
External Partners (if yes please specify below)	Yes
This could be any organisation we work with or provide services to.	
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

Improved processes (such as invoicing, income streams, internal recharging).
Better understanding of the processes within the services affected.
Potential process efficiency savings.
Potentially improved productivity.

Section C

Key Risks and Mitigations:

Risk	Mitigation
The processes in scope of the review are complex and have a number of dependencies. If the time allowed for delivery is curtailed, there is a risk of failure.	Continuously review progress against timescale and feed this into the SRO.
Resistance amongst staff to take part in the review.	We can help mitigate this by stressing the positive approach – i.e. looking for improvements.
The information we need to carry out a review may not be available.	Collect relevant information and data where possible from IT systems, procedures, and other sources.

Key Development and Delivery Milestones:

Milestone	Timeline
Investigation complete and proposal made for work to be carried out on the initial theme. Note that much of the investigation will be groundwork to support the ongoing project as well as to produce a plan for work on the agreed processes.	October / November 2017.
A more detailed report including potential efficiency and cost savings, based on results from the invoicing pilot. As-is model complete for agreed processes.	February / March 2018.
To-be model complete.	Early 2018/19.
Approach agreed for future work. Recommendations report complete.	Early 2018/19.

Section D

Consultation Required?	No
------------------------	----

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	not applicable	not applicable
Trade Union	not applicable	not applicable
Public	not applicable	not applicable
Service User	not applicable	not applicable
Other	not applicable	not applicable

Equality Impact Screening

Is there the 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? (automatically updates to Yes, if any of the above impacts are Yes)	No
---	----

Section E

Finance Comments
Members are advised that this proposal involves increasing general efficiency in service provision which may not be easily identifiable as a direct cashable saving. However, appropriate budget adjustments will be made to ensure that the proposal is delivered in full for 2018/19.

Signed RO	08-Jan-2018
-----------	-------------

Signed Finance	08-Jan-2018
----------------	-------------

Cabinet Member Signature		
Name and Date	Cllr A Jabbar	10-Jan-2018

Responsible Officer :	Ray Ward
-----------------------	----------

Cabinet Member :	Cllr A Jabbar
------------------	---------------

Support Officer :	Ray Ward
-------------------	----------

BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	Corporate and Commercial Services Management
----------------	--

Budget Reduction Title :	Review of Joint Ventures
--------------------------	--------------------------

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

The Council is currently negotiating with a key partner with the aim of reshaping the contractual arrangements between both organisations. This will achieve improved service delivery and reduced cost. It is anticipated that the negotiations will be completed before the start of 2018/19. Whilst some initial investment maybe required, it is expected that a saving of £1.400m can be delivered in 2018/19 and future years from efficiencies and a more effective operating arrangement.

2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment

£000

Employees	0
Other Operational Expenses	12,846
Income	(0)
Total	12,846

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

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)	0.00
--	------

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	(1,400)	0	0	0
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	(5.00)	0.00	0.00	0.00

Is your proposal a "one-off" in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?	Ongoing
---	---------

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following? :

Property
It is anticipated that property will be managed more effectively from 2018/19.
Service Delivery
Service delivery across all areas will be improved through enhanced contract management arrangements.
Future expected outcomes
Cost savings and more effective service delivery.
Organisation
There will be some revisions to service delivery within the key partner.
Workforce
There is a potential for some changes to roles and responsibilities in delivering service improvements.
Communities
There should be no specific impact on communities.
Service Users
Service users should see improvements in performance.
Partner Organisations
There will be some revisions to service delivery within the key partners organisation.

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
Key partner.	
Other Council Departments (if yes please specify below)	Yes
All departments.	
Other (if yes please specify below)	No
N/A.	

Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements

Service users (internal and external) should see improvements in performance.

Section C

Key Risks and Mitigations:

Risk	Mitigation
The negotiations are not completed before 2018/19.	A timeline of key milestones have been agreed.
Performance is not improved.	An action plan is being developed for each service area to ensure performance is improved.
Savings are not achieved.	An action plan is being developed for each service area to ensure performance is improved and savings are delivered.

Key Development and Delivery Milestones:

Milestone	Timeline
Report to Cabinet.	October 2017.
Negotiations with key milestones for achievement.	October 2017 - February 2018.
Report to Cabinet.	February 2018.
Conclusion of negotiations.	March 2018.

Section D

Consultation Required?	No
------------------------	----

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	not applicable	not applicable
Trade Union	not applicable	not applicable
Public	not applicable	not applicable
Service User	not applicable	not applicable
Other	not applicable	not applicable

Equality Impact Screening

Is there the 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? (automatically updates to Yes, if any of the above impacts are Yes)	No
---	----

Section E

Finance Comments
It is anticipated that there will be some initial investment to revise the contractual arrangements with the key partner but this will deliver an annual saving of at least £1.400m per annum.

Signed RO	08-Jan-2018
-----------	-------------

Signed Finance	08-Jan-2018
----------------	-------------

Cabinet Member Signature	
Name and Date	Cllr A Jabbar 10-Jan-2018

Responsible Officer :	Dianne Frost
-----------------------	--------------

Cabinet Member :	Cllr A Jabbar
------------------	---------------

Support Officer :	Mike Shepley
-------------------	--------------

BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	Development Academy
----------------	---------------------

Budget Reduction Title :	General Training Budget
--------------------------	-------------------------

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

To reduce the overall spend against the General Training Budget (inc Early years training provision) by £0.150m for the 2018/19 financial year.

All future training requirements will be reviewed to ensure that best value is being secured and amendments, revisions and renegotiations with providers are undertaken as appropriate, and available alternative provision being considered having regard to the services/products being provided, whilst managing any identified risks to the Council in terms of building capability across all service areas.

The introduction of the Apprenticeship levy and an annual Learning Needs Analysis will be subject to regular scrutiny and a flexible and responsive approach to these areas undertaken, having regard to the above proposal and the Councils training requirements and skills priorities.

2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment

£000

Employees	847
Other Operational Expenses	21
Income	(253)
Total	615

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

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)	9.68
--	------

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	(150)	150	0	0
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Is your proposal a "one-off" in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?	One-off
---	---------

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following? :

Property
There will be no impact on property from this proposal.
Service Delivery
There will be no impact on service delivery from this proposal.
Future expected outcomes
The proposal will contribute to the achievement of the 2018/19 budget reduction target and ensure that the Council continues to achieve value for money from its training and development arrangements with suppliers including partner organisations.
Organisation
See additional information.
Workforce
There will be no impact on the workforce from this proposal.
Communities
There will be no impact on communities from this proposal.
Service Users
There will be no impact on the service from this proposal.
Partner Organisations
There will be no direct impact on partner organisations from this proposal, however negotiations with training providers and partner organisations will be subject to the same review and the Council will endeavour to achieve savings in training procurement as appropriate.

Who are the key stakeholders?

Staff	Yes
Elected Members	Yes
Residents	No
Local business community	No
Schools	No
Trade Unions	Yes
External Partners (if yes please specify below)	Yes
Could be any training/learning organisation or professional body the Council work with.	
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 2018/19 budget reduction target and the achievement of improved value for money via the driving down where possible of training and development costs, improved processes (such as LNA, income generation, cancellation and non-attendance) leading to potential process efficiency savings and improved productivity within the Development Academy.

Section C

Key Risks and Mitigations:

Risk	Mitigation
General training provision will suffer as a result of this budget reduction.	Better financial management of the commissioning of standard training provision and its delivery underpinned by the application of a 70:20:10 learning model and appropriate development solutions identified against the backdrop of the apprenticeship levy.
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	not applicable	not applicable
Trade Union	not applicable	not applicable
Public	not applicable	not applicable
Service User	not applicable	not applicable
Other	not applicable	not applicable

Equality Impact Screening

Is there the 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? (automatically updates to Yes, if any of the above impacts are Yes)	No
---	----

Section E

Finance Comments
The proposal is to reduce the general training budget (including Early Years provision) for 2018/19 as a one year saving pending further review of the service. This will be met from reviewing the learning needs analysis of the Council on a best value basis.

Signed RO	08-Jan-2018
-----------	-------------

Signed Finance	08-Jan-2018
----------------	-------------

Cabinet Member Signature		
Name and Date	Cllr A Jabbar	10-Jan-2018

Additional Information (if required)

Organisational Impact:

Overall impact may see a change in applying certain training initiatives. To minimise the impact a new learning model has been introduced (70:20:10) and improved analysis using the data gained from the Annual Learning Needs Analysis (LNA) assessing all needs against agreed priority levels. Therefore, the higher priority level needs to include all mandatory and legally required development which will not be affected.

BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	Finance
Budget Reduction Title :	Insurance Review

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

Having regard to the benefits arising from the successful tendering exercise undertaken in 2016 and the awarding of a new insurance provider, together with ongoing fraud/defence strategies to reduce claims paid, a saving of £0.500m can be achieved from the insurance budget in excess of those already submitted in previous years.

The budgetary requirement has consistently reduced year on year and the continued good working practices employed by the Insurance team make this saving achievable in 2018/19. The position will be monitored and an assessment made about the adequacy of the remaining budget for 2019/20.

2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment

£000

Employees	131
Other Operational Expenses	4,648
Income	(72)
Total	4,707

Current Forecast (under) / overspend

0

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)

2.60

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	(500)	0	0	0
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Is your proposal a "one-off" in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?

Ongoing

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following? :

Property
Not applicable.
Service Delivery
No impact at this stage.
Future expected outcomes
Reduction to be monitored but should be achievable.
Organisation
No impact at this stage.
Workforce
No impact at this stage.
Communities
No impact.
Service Users
No impact.
Partner Organisations
No impact.

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)	Yes
Insurers and brokers	

Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements

Benefits are that a reduction in insurance premiums/costs provides savings, thus reducing the requirement for reductions in other Council service areas.

Staff continue to work efficiently to maintain and develop appropriate strategies to assist with the defence of insurance claims and hence manage resources effectively.

Section C

Key Risks and Mitigations:

Risk	Mitigation
Insurers impose further premium increases during the period of insurance.	A long term agreement has been entered into to mitigate any rate increases.
Claims history could deteriorate.	Ongoing monitoring and review of cases on a monthly basis.
N/A.	N/A.

Key Development and Delivery Milestones:

Milestone	Timeline
Review of insurance trends and claims to inform budget proposal.	Summer 2017.
Further review of insurance position prior to final budget decision.	December 2017 / January 2018.
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

Section D

Consultation Required?	No
------------------------	----

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	not applicable	not applicable
Trade Union	not applicable	not applicable
Public	not applicable	not applicable
Service User	not applicable	not applicable
Other	not applicable	not applicable

Equality Impact Screening

Is there the 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? (automatically updates to Yes, if any of the above impacts are Yes)	No
---	----

Section E

Finance Comments
The increase in the repudiation of insurance related claims coupled with changes to the Authority's structure due to the Government's austerity measures has led to the Authority being able to benefit in reduced external premia.

Signed RO	08-Jan-2018
-----------	-------------

Signed Finance	08-Jan-2018
----------------	-------------

Cabinet Member Signature	
Name and Date	Clr A Jabbar 10-Jan-2018

Responsible Officer :	Anne Ryans
Cabinet Member :	Cllr A Jabbar
Support Officer :	Mark Stenson

BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	Finance
Budget Reduction Title :	Audit Fee Reduction

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

Since 2014 the appointment of the Council's External Auditor has been undertaken by Public Sector Audit Appointments (PSAA). A key feature of these arrangements has been the audit fee economies delivered via the national contractual arrangement. The current contractual arrangements cease at the end of 2017/18.

Oldham Council has opted into the next phase of the PSAA auditor appointment arrangements. This is a new process to let audit contracts from 2018/19. PSAA carried out a robust procurement process applying various principles including ensuring auditor independence, accommodating joint/shared working arrangements and taking account of principal locations. The results of the procurement process indicate that a reduction in scale audit fees of 23 per cent is available for 2018/19. This confirms and consolidates the fee reductions from previous years and will allow a permanent adjustment to the budget. Oldham Council is therefore confident that this will translate to the delivery of a budget reduction of £0.100m which will be ongoing from 2018/19.

2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment

	£000
Employees	562
Other Operational Expenses	341
Income	(159)
Total	744

Current Forecast (under) / overspend

	(55)
--	------

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)

	12.10
--	-------

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	(100)	0	0	0
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Is your proposal a "one-off" in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?

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

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following? :

Property
No impact.
Service Delivery
No impact.
Future expected outcomes
No impact.
Organisation
No impact.
Workforce
No impact.
Communities
No impact.
Service Users
No impact.
Partner Organisations
No impact.

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)	Yes
External Auditor	

Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements

The procurement process carried out by PSAA will ensure a high level of performance is maintained whilst benefiting the Council through a reduced fee.

Section C

Key Risks and Mitigations:

Risk	Mitigation
Unsuitability of auditor appointed.	PSAA's robust procurement process.
Increase to the audit scale fee.	Contractual arrangements negotiated by the PSAA's robust procurement process.
N/A	N/A

Key Development and Delivery Milestones:

Milestone	Timeline
Consultation on auditor appointment process.	14 August 2017 to 22 September 2017.
Contract awarded.	December 2017.
Commencement of contract.	April 2018.
N/A	N/A

Section D

Consultation Required?	Yes
------------------------	-----

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	not applicable	not applicable
Trade Union	not applicable	not applicable
Public	not applicable	not applicable
Service User	not applicable	not applicable
Other	14-Aug-2017	22-Sep-2017

Equality Impact Screening

Is there the 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? (automatically updates to Yes, if any of the above impacts are Yes)	No
---	----

Section E

Finance Comments
Providing the contract process is effective a permanent reduction to the budget can be generated.

Signed RO	08-Jan-2018
-----------	-------------

Signed Finance	08-Jan-2018
----------------	-------------

Cabinet Member Signature		
Name and Date	Clr A Jabbar	10-Jan-2018

BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	Finance
Budget Reduction Title :	Reduction of Charges for Merchant Acquiring Services

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

Currently the Council pays £0.100m for its merchant acquiring charges (credit and debit card charges) within the bank charges budget. Following a tender exercise undertaken in the financial year 2017/18, it is estimated the transaction charges from 1 April 2018 will reduce to an estimated cost per annum of £0.065m.

The tender exercise undertaken was Official Journal of the European Union (OJEU) compliant and undertaken in conjunction with two other Councils (Burnley and Pendle). It will ensure in Oldham there is one provider of this service rather than the two separate providers at present.

It is estimated that it will take a minimum of three months in order to implement a change of provider for processing card transactions within Oldham.

2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment

£000

Employees	0
Other Operational Expenses	100
Income	(0)
Total	100

Current Forecast (under) / overspend

0

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)

0.00

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	(35)	0	0	0
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Is your proposal a "one-off" in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?

Ongoing

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following? :

Property
None.
Service Delivery
Integration required with Council systems to ensure members of the public do not experience any inconvenience from a change in supplier. The change can also be used as an opportunity to enhance Payment Card Industry (PCI) compliance.
Future expected outcomes
Reduced transaction charges and supports PCI compliance.
Organisation
Reduced transaction charges and supports PCI compliance.
Workforce
None.
Communities
Payment processing provider for debit and credit card payments.
Service Users
Enables services to continue to be paid for by debit and credit cards.
Partner Organisations
Joint procurement with Burnley and Pendle.

Who are the key stakeholders?

Staff	No
Elected Members	Yes
Residents	Yes
Local business community	Yes
Schools	No
Trade Unions	No
External Partners (if yes please specify below)	Yes
Burnley and Pendle Councils.	
Other Council Departments (if yes please specify below)	Yes
Unity Partnership re ICT support to implement.	
Other (if yes please specify below)	No
N/A	

Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements

Reduced transaction costs and improved money transfers by the card provider.

Section C

Key Risks and Mitigations:

Risk	Mitigation
The deadline for implementation is 31 March 2018 - the same as various other initiatives within the Council.	Planning for the change began in September 2017 with resources prioritised to support the implementation at the key phase.
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

Key Development and Delivery Milestones:

Milestone	Timeline
New card payment processor installed for new financial year.	01 April 2018.
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

Section D

Consultation Required?	No
------------------------	----

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	not applicable	not applicable
Trade Union	not applicable	not applicable
Public	not applicable	not applicable
Service User	not applicable	not applicable
Other	not applicable	not applicable

Equality Impact Screening

Is there the 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? (automatically updates to Yes, if any of the above impacts are Yes)	No
---	----

Section E

Finance Comments
The proposal will create a budget reduction of £0.035m per year for the length of the contract. The reduction will be from the base budget for a period of 5 years (the length of the contract).

Signed RO	08-Jan-2018
-----------	-------------

Signed Finance	08-Jan-2018
----------------	-------------

Cabinet Member Signature		
Name and Date	Clr A Jabbar	10-Jan-2018

Responsible Officer :	Anne Ryans
Cabinet Member :	Cllr A Jabbar
Support Officer :	Andrew Moran

BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	Finance
Budget Reduction Title :	New Investment Opportunities

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

In accordance with the Income Strategy approved by Cabinet on 18 Sept 2017, this proposal seeks to generate additional investment returns from a broader range of financial instruments beyond traditional Treasury Management investments such as Bank Deposits and Money Market Funds. The proposal will explore opportunities to invest in property funds and other funding arrangements linked to developments within the Borough and the Greater Manchester region.

The Council's top investment priorities remain the security of capital and the liquidity of investments. In seeking additional investment returns from a broader range of financial instruments, it will be necessary for the Council to accept that such investments carry a different risk profile to the cash-based investments typically utilised as part of traditional Local Authority Treasury Management activity (see key risks and mitigations below). In February 2018, the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government released the Government's consultation response to the proposed changes to the prudential framework for capital finance, in particular MRP guidance and investment guidance. Further guidance will be provided in the non-statutory explanatory notes to the MRP but the Council will ensure the pursuit of new investment opportunities will be delivered in accordance with the new guidance.

(Continued within additional information)

2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment

	£000
Employees	0
Other Operational Expenses	20,438
Income	(3,650)
Total	16,788

Current Forecast (under) / overspend

(3,637)

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)

0.00

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	(1,250)	0	0	0
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Is your proposal a "one-off" in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?

Ongoing

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following? :

Property
Although this proposal envisages potential investment in property funds, opportunities related to physical property assets already owned by the Council are covered by proposal ESN-PSV-101 (Driving Value from Assets).
Service Delivery
None.
Future expected outcomes
The Council will hold funds that are invested in a broader range of financial instruments beyond Bank Deposits and Money Market Funds.
Organisation
None.
Workforce
None.
Communities
None.
Service Users
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
N/A	
Other Council Departments (if yes please specify below)	Yes
Economy, Skills & Neighbourhoods to ensure continuity with proposal ESN-PSV-101	
Other (if yes please specify below)	No
N/A	

Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements

The successful delivery of additional investment returns and the associated income stream will reduce the budget reduction requirement without the need for service or staffing reductions of an equivalent value.

Section C

Key Risks and Mitigations:

Risk	Mitigation
Loss/impairment of capital invested due to the heightened level of risk associated with new investment opportunities. Underperformance of investment returns.	The Council will commission appropriately detailed assessments (due diligence) to determine the level of risk associated with investment proposals and, where possible, the likelihood of fluctuations in investment performance compared to original expectations.
The Council undertakes activity considered to be 'Ultra-Vires'.	The Council will seek to be clear as to which legal powers are being relied on to undertake such investments.
Amendments to the Local Authority Accounting and Treasury Management Codes of Practice as well as proposed changes to the statutory prudential framework potentially resulting in additional disclosure requirements and financial implications for the General Fund.	The Council will monitor developments in this regard and seek to adjust reporting practice, its investment holdings and/or Reserves Policy to mitigate or manage any General Fund implications.

Key Development and Delivery Milestones:

Milestone	Timeline
Horizon scanning for New Investment Opportunities.	Ongoing from September 2017.
Development of arrangements for undertaking assessment and due diligence of New Investment Opportunities.	October 2017 to February 2018.
Development of Governance arrangements to approve and monitor such investment activity.	October 2017 to February 2018.
N/A	N/A

Section D

Consultation Required?	No
------------------------	----

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	not applicable	not applicable
Trade Union	not applicable	not applicable
Public	not applicable	not applicable
Service User	not applicable	not applicable
Other	not applicable	not applicable

Equality Impact Screening

Is there the 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? (automatically updates to Yes, if any of the above impacts are Yes)	No
---	----

Section E

Finance Comments
Whilst the successful delivery of additional investment returns and the associated income stream reduces the need for service or staffing reductions of an equivalent value, it should be noted that such activity carries significant additional risks (set out in section C). Mitigating actions for such risks will need to be carefully managed and executed to secure the proposed financial saving.

Signed RO	08-Jan-2018
-----------	-------------

Signed Finance	08-Jan-2018
----------------	-------------

Cabinet Member Signature		
Name and Date	Cllr A Jabbar	10-Jan-2018

Additional Information (if required)

Detail and Objectives (continued)

Additional assessment and due diligence expenses associated with the exploration of new investment opportunities will be financed from Earmarked Reserves initially valued at £0.100m. The value of the reserve will be kept under review in accordance with the Council's Reserves Policy. The cost of each due diligence/assessment process will vary depending on the nature and complexity of the financial instruments under consideration. The Council will also assess the payback period for such investments in order to determine how long it will take for anticipated investment returns to cover up front due diligence/assessment costs.

This proposal is limited to activity which falls within the remit of the Council's approved Treasury Management Strategy which could include property acquisitions but does not contemplate, for example, activity associated with the disposal of property. Such activities form part of proposal ESN-PSV-101 'Driving Value from Assets'.

Responsible Officer :	Anne Ryans
Cabinet Member :	Cllr A Jabbar
Support Officer :	Andrew Moran

BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	Finance
Budget Reduction Title :	Treasury Management

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

In addition to considering new investment opportunities, as part of proposal CCS-PSV-119, a full review of Treasury Management income and expenditure budgets will be undertaken to examine the assumptions and forecasts underpinning investment interest and external income. It is anticipated that additional income of a least £0.500m can be generated in 2018/19.

2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment

£000

Employees	0
Other Operational Expenses	20,438
Income	(3,650)
Total	16,788

Current Forecast (under) / overspend

(3,637)

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)

0.00

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	(500)	0	0	0
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Is your proposal a "one-off" in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?

Ongoing

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following? :

Property
There will be no impact on property from this proposal.
Service Delivery
There will be no impact on service delivery from this proposal.
Future expected outcomes
The proposal will contribute to the achievement of the 2018/19 budget reduction target.
Organisation
There will be no impact on the organisation from this proposal.
Workforce
There will be no impact on the workforce from this proposal.
Communities
There will be no impact on communities from this proposal.
Service Users
There will be no impact on service users from this proposal.
Partner Organisations
There will be no impact on partner organisations from this proposal.

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
N/A	
Other Council Departments (if yes please specify below)	No
N/A	
Other (if yes please specify below)	Yes
Investment Counterparties.	

Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements
A £0.500m contribution to the achievement of the 2018/19 budget reduction target.

Section C

Key Risks and Mitigations:

Risk	Mitigation
Treasury Management Investments carry a level of risk in relation to security of capital, liquidity and level of return.	The Council's Treasury Management Policy sets out how the Council will manage and mitigate these risks.
External factors such as the decision to leave the European Union may affect future interest rate levels and economic activity with adverse consequences for the cost of borrowing and returns from investment.	Interest rate and income forecasts are kept under review in order to mitigate this risk.
External income / interest on investments received is not at the level anticipated.	Budget estimates are risk adjusted meaning a degree of adverse variation can be absorbed. The strategy / approach to calculating the Council's minimum recommended level of General Fund balances is also prepared accordingly.

Key Development and Delivery Milestones:

Milestone	Timeline
Commencement of review of Treasury Management budgets and commitments.	Autumn 2017.
Completion of initial review.	December 2017.
Further review to confirm estimates.	March 2018.
N/A	N/A

Section D

Consultation Required?	No
------------------------	----

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	not applicable	not applicable
Trade Union	not applicable	not applicable
Public	not applicable	not applicable
Service User	not applicable	not applicable
Other	not applicable	not applicable

Equality Impact Screening

Is there the 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? (automatically updates to Yes, if any of the above impacts are Yes)	No
---	----

Section E

Finance Comments
The review of the Treasury Management activities and opportunities to maximise external income for the Council is a key function of the Finance Service. The budget proposal has therefore been subject to appropriate consideration and analysis and the £0.500m target is considered to be achievable.

Signed RO	08-Jan-2018
-----------	-------------

Signed Finance	08-Jan-2018
----------------	-------------

Cabinet Member Signature	
Name and Date	Cllr A Jabbar 10-Jan-2018

Responsible Officer :	Anne Ryans
Cabinet Member :	Cllr A Jabbar
Support Officer :	Andrew Moran

BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	Finance
Budget Reduction Title :	Reduction in General Inflation Estimates

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

In accordance with good practice, the Council's initial budget estimates were prepared having regard to funding an inflationary increase to non-pay budgets. However, it is proposed to cash freeze non-pay budgets other than those linked to contracts and this will provide a saving of £0.500m. The actual Consumer Price Index (CPI) 12 month rate as at December 2017 was confirmed at 3.0% which effectively reduces the spending power within directorates. This proposal is however deemed necessary to support the delivery of a balanced budget.

2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment

£000

Employees	0
Other Operational Expenses	113,861
Income	(0)
Total	113,861

Current Forecast (under) / overspend

0

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)

0.00

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	(500)	0	0	0
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Is your proposal a "one-off" in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?

Ongoing

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following? :

Property
There will be no impact on property from this proposal.
Service Delivery
Although this proposal marginally reduces spending power within directorates, it is anticipated this can be managed without impacting on service delivery.
Future expected outcomes
The proposal will contribute to the achievement of the 2018/19 budget reduction target.
Organisation
There will be no impact on the organisation from this proposal.
Workforce
There will be no impact on the workforce from this proposal.
Communities
There will be no impact on communities from this proposal.
Service Users
There will be no impact on service users from this proposal.
Partner Organisations
There will be no impact on partner organisations from this proposal.

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
N/A	
Other Council Departments (if yes please specify below)	Yes
All departments	
Other (if yes please specify below)	No
N/A	

Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements

The saving will contribute towards the Council's budget reduction target.

Section C

Key Risks and Mitigations:

Risk	Mitigation
Spend exceeds the limits set at the Council Budget Setting Meeting in February 2018.	Maintenance of spend against budgets will be managed throughout the year via robust monthly budget monitoring.
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

Key Development and Delivery Milestones:

Milestone	Timeline
Proposals scrutinised by Overview & Scrutiny Performance and Value for Money (PVFM) Select Committee.	25 January 2018.
Proposal approved.	28 February 2018.
Budget monitoring to ensure spend within the set budget.	Throughout 2018/19.
N/A	N/A

Section D

Consultation Required?	No
------------------------	----

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	not applicable	not applicable
Trade Union	not applicable	not applicable
Public	not applicable	not applicable
Service User	not applicable	not applicable
Other	not applicable	not applicable

Equality Impact Screening

Is there the 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? (automatically updates to Yes, if any of the above impacts are Yes)	No
---	----

Section E

Finance Comments
The delivery of this saving will be reviewed through the regular budget monitoring processes.

Signed RO	08-Jan-2018
-----------	-------------

Signed Finance	08-Jan-2018
----------------	-------------

Cabinet Member Signature		
Name and Date	Cllr A Jabbar	10-Jan-2018

Responsible Officer :	Anne Ryans
Cabinet Member :	Cllr A Jabbar
Support Officer :	Andrew Moran

BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	Finance
Budget Reduction Title :	Development Fund

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

There was initially a budget of £1m in 2018/19 and future years to support transformational projects and unforeseen service demand pressures that might be identified during the budget process. In 2018/19 £0.500m has been allocated to priority areas leaving £0.500m available. This is no longer required in 2018/19 and is therefore offered as a saving. It is therefore suggested that an allocation of £0.500m is adequate in future years, thus reducing the budget reduction requirement by £0.500m in 2019/20 onwards.

2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment

£000

Employees	0
Other Operational Expenses	1,000
Income	(0)
Total	1,000

Current Forecast (under) / overspend

0

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)

0.00

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	(500)	(500)	(500)	(500)
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Is your proposal a "one-off" in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?

Ongoing

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following? :

Property
There will be no impact on property from this proposal.
Service Delivery
There will be no impact on service delivery from this proposal.
Future expected outcomes
The proposal will contribute to the achievement of the 2018/19 budget reduction target.
Organisation
There will be no impact on the organisation from this proposal.
Workforce
There will be no impact on the workforce from this proposal.
Communities
There will be no impact on communities from this proposal.
Service Users
There will be no impact on service users from this proposal.
Partner Organisations
There will be no impact on partner organisations from this proposal.

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
N/A	
Other Council Departments (if yes please specify below)	Yes
All departments	
Other (if yes please specify below)	No
N/A	

Benefits to the organisation/staff/customers including performance improvements

The saving will contribute towards the Council's budget reduction target.

Section C

Key Risks and Mitigations:

Risk	Mitigation
Insufficient funds available within the Development Fund to cover any unforeseen demand.	Any risks associated with this proposal are mitigated by the availability of revenue reserves. The availability of reserves will be reviewed at regular intervals to ensure that there are adequate resources available to finance appropriate projects.
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

Key Development and Delivery Milestones:

Milestone	Timeline
Proposals scrutinised by Overview & Scrutiny Performance and Value for Money (PVFM) Select Committee.	25 January 2018.
Proposal approved.	28 February 2018.
Budget monitoring to ensure spend within the set budget.	Throughout 2018/19.
N/A	N/A

Section D

Consultation Required?	No
------------------------	----

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	not applicable	not applicable
Trade Union	not applicable	not applicable
Public	not applicable	not applicable
Service User	not applicable	not applicable
Other	not applicable	not applicable

Equality Impact Screening

Is there the 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? (automatically updates to Yes, if any of the above impacts are Yes)	No
---	----

Section E

Finance Comments
The delivery of this saving will be reviewed through the regular budget monitoring processes.

Signed RO	08-Jan-2018
-----------	-------------

Signed Finance	08-Jan-2018
----------------	-------------

Cabinet Member Signature	
Name and Date	Cllr A Jabbar 10-Jan-2018

Responsible Officer :	Carolyn Wilkins
Cabinet Member :	Cllr J Stretton
Support Officer :	Lewis Greenwood

BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	Chief Executive Management
Budget Reduction Title :	Senior Management Restructure

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

A review of the Council's senior operational management structure is underway. This incorporates both the Senior Leadership Team, Senior Managers and Heads of Service. It is proposed that this will result in a £0.250m budget reduction ongoing from 2018/19. This is aimed at producing a more streamlined management structure to support corporate requirements going forward and having regard to initiatives arising from the integration of Health and Social Care services, approaches to joint/shared services and developments in technology.

2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment

£000

Employees	1,755
Other Operational Expenses	0
Income	(450)
Total	1,305

Current Forecast (under) / overspend

0

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)

13.00

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	(250)	0	0	0
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	(1.00)	0.00	0.00	0.00

Is your proposal a "one-off" in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?

Ongoing

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following? :

Property
The reduction in the number of senior members of staff will not have a significant impact on the accommodation required.
Service Delivery
It is not anticipated that there will be any change arising from a revision to the senior management structure.
Future expected outcomes
No specific outcomes are expected to be impacted by this option as the redesign of the structure has had regard to expected outcomes.
Organisation
No specific issues other than a realignment of line management responsibilities.
Workforce
No specific issues other than a realignment of line management responsibilities.
Communities
None anticipated.
Service Users
None anticipated.
Partner Organisations
None anticipated.

Who are the key stakeholders?

Staff	Yes
Elected Members	Yes
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

It is intended that the corporate management structure will reflect corporate requirements and so ensure the Council continues to deliver services in line with its co-operative objectives.

Section C

Key Risks and Mitigations:

Risk	Mitigation
The structure is redesigned and capacity issues are identified subsequently.	The proposed new structure is the result of a thorough review of key issues impacting on local priorities and has regard to the evolving service integration initiative and the devolution agenda.
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

Key Development and Delivery Milestones:

Milestone	Timeline
Staff consultation.	Summer / Autumn 2017.
Revised outline structure(s) prepared.	August 2017 - December 2017.
Presentation of review to Selection Committee (as appropriate) or approval of service restructure report.	Summer 2017 - February 2018.
Implementation of revised structure.	On approval from Selection Committee / Cabinet / Delegated decision (as appropriate).

Section D

Consultation Required?	Yes
------------------------	-----

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	13-Nov-2017	15-Feb-2018
Trade Union	13-Nov-2017	15-Feb-2018
Public	not applicable	not applicable
Service User	not applicable	not applicable
Other	not applicable	not applicable

Equality Impact Screening

Is there the 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? (automatically updates to Yes, if any of the above impacts are Yes)	No
---	----

Section E

Finance Comments
The saving that has been proposed will be met initially by the deletion of a vacant Director post then other restructuring proposals. Any balance will be delivered by non-pay elements within the Senior Leadership budget.

Signed RO	08-Jan-2018
-----------	-------------

Signed Finance	08-Jan-2018
----------------	-------------

Cabinet Member Signature		
Name and Date	Cllr J Stretton	10-Jan-2018

Responsible Officer :	Carl Marsden
-----------------------	--------------

Cabinet Member :	Cllr J Stretton
------------------	-----------------

Support Officer :	Lewis Greenwood
-------------------	-----------------

BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	Marketing and Communications
----------------	------------------------------

Budget Reduction Title :	Permanent reduction in Reputation Tracker
--------------------------	---

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

There are two reputation trackers that are undertaken each financial year. During 16/17 only one of the reputation trackers was undertaken and this saving was used to support the 2017/18 budget (via earmarked reserves). It is now proposed that there is a permanent reduction each year thus providing a saving of £0.011m.

2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment

£000

Employees	792
Other Operational Expenses	161
Income	(164)
Total	789

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

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)	19.00
--	-------

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	(11)	0	0	0
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Is your proposal a "one-off" in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?	Ongoing
---	---------

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following? :

Property
None.
Service Delivery
There will be no impact on service delivery.
Future expected outcomes
None.
Organisation
There will be no impact on the organisation.
Workforce
There will be no impact on the workforce.
Communities
There will be no impact on communities as only one reputation tracker has been undertaken in each of the past two financial years.
Service Users
There will be no impact on service users.
Partner Organisations
There will be no impact on partner organisations.

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
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

Achievement of a budget reduction within the Communications Team.

Section C

Key Risks and Mitigations:

Risk	Mitigation
None.	None.
None.	None.
None	None.

Key Development and Delivery Milestones:

Milestone	Timeline
Delivery of savings from 18/19 onwards.	April 2018.
None.	None.
None.	None.
None.	None.

Section D

Consultation Required?	No
------------------------	----

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	not applicable	not applicable
Trade Union	not applicable	not applicable
Public	not applicable	not applicable
Service User	not applicable	not applicable
Other	not applicable	not applicable

Equality Impact Screening

Is there the 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? (automatically updates to Yes, if any of the above impacts are Yes)	No
---	----

Section E

Finance Comments
This proposal will generate a permanent budget reduction of £0.011m from the Marketing and Communications budget by utilising the residents reputation tracker only once instead of twice within a financial year.

Signed RO	08-Jan-2018
-----------	-------------

Signed Finance	08-Jan-2018
----------------	-------------

Cabinet Member Signature		
Name and Date	Cllr J Stretton	10-Jan-2018

BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	Marketing and Communications
Budget Reduction Title :	Reduction in Borough Life Publication

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

It is proposed to reduce the publication of Borough Life magazine from four editions to three on a permanent basis.

2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment

£000

Employees	792
Other Operational Expenses	161
Income	(164)
Total	789

Current Forecast (under) / overspend

0

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)

19.00

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	(14)	0	0	0
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Is your proposal a "one-off" in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?

Ongoing

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following? :

Property
There will be no impact on property.
Service Delivery
There will be no impact on service delivery.
Future expected outcomes
There will be no impact on future expected outcomes.
Organisation
There will be no impact on the organisation.
Workforce
There will be no impact on the workforce.
Communities
There will be no impact on communities as this proposal was undertaken in 17/18 and as a result of this being successful, it is now proposed to make this a permanent arrangement.
Service Users
There will be no impact on service users.
Partner Organisations
There will be no impact on partner organisations.

Who are the key stakeholders?

Staff	No
Elected Members	Yes
Residents	Yes
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

Information will be streamlined and will be communicated via a range of channels. It will provide a cost saving to the organisation.

Section C

Key Risks and Mitigations:

Risk	Mitigation
There are no risks or impact on service delivery.	N/A
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

Key Development and Delivery Milestones:

Milestone	Timeline
Responsible Officer approval.	October 2017.
Cabinet Member approval.	October 2017.
Implementation.	April 2018 onwards.
N/a	N/a

Section D

Consultation Required?	No
------------------------	----

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	not applicable	not applicable
Trade Union	not applicable	not applicable
Public	not applicable	not applicable
Service User	not applicable	not applicable
Other	not applicable	not applicable

Equality Impact Screening

Is there the 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? (automatically updates to Yes, if any of the above impacts are Yes)	No
---	----

Section E

Finance Comments
The proposal to reduce the Borough Life magazine by one issue per year will result in an on-going saving of £14,000 per year.

Signed RO	08-Jan-2018
-----------	-------------

Signed Finance	08-Jan-2018
----------------	-------------

Cabinet Member Signature		
Name and Date	Cllr J Stretton	10-Jan-2018

BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	Marketing and Communications
Budget Reduction Title :	Reduction in non-pay budget

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

To reduce the level of non-pay budget for the Communications Team.

2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment

£000

Employees	792
Other Operational Expenses	161
Income	(164)
Total	789

Current Forecast (under) / overspend

0

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)

19.00

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	(15)	0	0	0
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Is your proposal a "one-off" in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?

Ongoing

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following? :

Property
There will be no impact on property.
Service Delivery
There will be no impact on service delivery.
Future expected outcomes
There will be no impact on future expected outcomes as there are a number of alternative communication channels already in place both internally and across the borough.
Organisation
There will be no impact on the organisation.
Workforce
There will be no impact on the workforce.
Communities
There will be no impact on communities.
Service Users
There will be no impact on service users.
Partner Organisations
There will be no impact on partner organisations.

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)	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

The saving will contribute towards the Council's budget reduction target.

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
Implementation from April 2018 onwards.	April 2018.
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

Section D

Consultation Required?	No
------------------------	----

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	not applicable	not applicable
Trade Union	not applicable	not applicable
Public	not applicable	not applicable
Service User	not applicable	not applicable
Other	not applicable	not applicable

Equality Impact Screening

Is there the 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? (automatically updates to Yes, if any of the above impacts are Yes)	No
---	----

Section E

Finance Comments
A review of the non pay budgets within the Marketing and Communications service will take place to identify a permanent reduction of £15,000.

Signed RO	08-Jan-2018
-----------	-------------

Signed Finance	08-Jan-2018
----------------	-------------

Cabinet Member Signature		
Name and Date	Cllr J Stretton	10-Jan-2018

BR1 - Section A

Service Area :	Policy
Budget Reduction Title :	Review of Strategy, Partnerships & Policy Team functions and budget

Budget Reduction Proposal - Detail and Objectives :

A review of the functions of the Strategy, Partnerships and Policy Team will undertaken, taking into account priorities of the organisation and in the context of a local care organisation. This will include a review of how posts within the team are funded; maximising opportunities for alternative funding in order to deliver particular work programmes. It is proposed that this will result in savings of £0.153m each year over 18/19 and 19/20.

2017/18 Service Budget and Establishment

£000

Employees	606
Other Operational Expenses	125
Income	(100)
Total	631

Current Forecast (under) / overspend

0

Number of posts (Full time equivalent)

10.59

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Proposed Budget Reduction (£000)	(153)	0	0	0
Proposed Staffing Reductions (FTE)	(2.00)	0.00	(2.00)	0.00

Is your proposal a "one-off" in 2018/19 or is it ongoing?

Ongoing

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on the following? :

Property
No impact.
Service Delivery
To be considered as options are developed.
Future expected outcomes
No specific outcomes are expected to be impacted by this option, as the review of functions in the team will have regard to expected outcomes in the business plan.
Organisation
To be considered as options are developed.
Workforce
To be considered as options are developed.
Communities
N/A.
Service Users
N/A.
Partner Organisations
N/A.

Who are the key stakeholders?

Staff	Yes
Elected Members	Yes
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

It is intended that the review will reflect corporate requirements and so will ensure the Council continues to deliver services in line with its co-operative objectives.

Section C

Key Risks and Mitigations:

Risk	Mitigation
Potential of capacity issues will be identified through ongoing options.	Role and function of team will address corporate priorities.
N/A.	N/A.
N/A.	N/A.

Key Development and Delivery Milestones:

Milestone	Timeline
Staff and Trades Unions engagement and consultation.	Consultation commenced on 12 December 2017.
Conclusion of consultation	15 February 2018.
N/A.	N/A.
N/A.	N/A.

Section D

Consultation Required?	Yes
------------------------	-----

	Start	Conclusion
Staff	12-Dec-2017	15-Feb-2018
Trade Union	12-Dec-2017	15-Feb-2018
Public	not applicable	not applicable
Service User	not applicable	not applicable
Other	not applicable	not applicable

Equality Impact Screening

Is there the 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? (automatically updates to Yes, if any of the above impacts are Yes)	No
---	----

Section E

Finance Comments
<p>This proposal will result in a reduction of two posts in 2018/19 and 2019/20. These will be permanent deletions with two other posts being offered for reduction as a result of external funding being secured to cover the costs of the posts.</p> <p>A review will be undertaken for Year 3 to consider options including further funding or restructuring, depending on future requirements.</p>

Signed RO	08-Jan-2018
-----------	-------------

Signed Finance	08-Jan-2018
----------------	-------------

Cabinet Member Signature		
Name and Date	Cllr J Stretton	10-Jan-2018