

Supplement

Cabinet



Date: Wednesday, 20 December 2017

Time: 4.00 pm

Venue: Committee Room 1 - Civic Centre

To: Councillors D Wilcox (Chair), P Cockeram, G Giles, D Harvey, R Jeavons, D Mayer, J Mudd, R Truman and M Whitcutt

Item

Wards Affected

- a Background papers - revenue budget and MTFP - savings implemented under delegated authority - business cases (Pages 3 - 148)

All Wards

These savings proposals are being implemented under delegated authority by Heads of Service. They are background papers for the revenue budget and MTFP report, and are being published as additional information, not for decision.

This page is intentionally left blank

APPENDIX 3 – NEW BUDGET SAVINGS IMPLEMENTED UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY (Head of Service)

Head of Service

Service Group	Activity Short Code	Activity Description	Unique ID	Proposal Title	18/19 (£'000)	19/20 (£'000)	20/21 (£'000)	21/22 (£'000)	Staff Impact FTE
PEOPLE									
Education	EDU3/7/14/15/21/23/24	Various	EDU181905	Reduction in budget lines	321	0	0	0	0.0
Education	EDU9/18	Inclusion Management Account/ Service	EDU181906	Staff Reductions	68	0	0	0	-2.0
Children & Family Services	SOC23	Child Safeguarding & Missing Children	CFS181903	Gwent Missing Children Service	20	0	0	0	0.0
Children & Family Services	SOC20	Leaving care	CFS181905	Use of Grant Funding to Support Care Leavers	35	0	0	0	0.0
Children & Family Services	SOC26	Integrated Family Support Service	CFS181906	Use of grant funding for services to children at risk of going into care (Edge of Care)	200	0	0	0	0.0
Children & Family Services	SOC20	Leaving care	CFS181907	Use of grant funding for Leaving Care	50	0	0	0	0.0
Children & Family Services	SOC28	Child Protection	CFS181908	Funding for Asylum Seekers	20	0	0	0	0.0
Children & Family Services	SOC28	Child Protection	CFS181909	Childcare Legal Fees Budget	50	50	0	0	0.0
Children & Family Services	SOC33	In House Fostering	CFS181910	Remodelling of the Fostering Service	41	26	26	0	0.0
Children & Family Services	SOC28	Child Protection	CFS181911	Children's Day-care Support	17	0	0	0	0.0
Children & Family Services	SOC33	In House Fostering	CFS181912	Psychologist Secondment	46	0	0	0	0.0
Children & Family Services	SOC21/22/24/35/36/37/39	Various	CFS181914	Reduction in budget lines to be achieved with a mix of efficiencies and reduction in hours for some posts	44	0	0	0	-0.5

Service Group	Activity Short Code	Activity Description	Unique ID	Proposal Title	18/19 (£'000)	19/20 (£'000)	20/21 (£'000)	21/22 (£'000)	Staff Impact FTE
---------------	---------------------	----------------------	-----------	----------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	------------------

PEOPLE

Adult & Community Services	SOC14	Service Day & Commissioning	ACS181905	Changes to staffing arrangements within Adult Services	100	0	0	0	-1.8
Adult & Community Services	SOC16	Adult Services Contract Support	ACS181906	South East Wales Commissioning Arrangements	75	0	0	0	0.0
Adult & Community Services	SOC5/9/11/13	Various	ACS181908	Reduction in Staffing Budgets in Adult & Community Services	147	0	0	0	-4.0

PLACE

Streetscene & City Services	STR1	Environmental Services	SS181906	Review Pitch Markings	10	0	0	0	0.0
Streetscene & City Services	STR11	Sustainable Waste	SS181907	Savings from Fuel Efficiencies	16	0	0	0	0.0
Streetscene & City Services	STR4/5/6/8/12/13/14/16/17/23/24/25	Various	SS181908	Service Improvement & Efficiency Savings	325	0	0	0	3.0
Regeneration, Investment & Housing	RIH8	Station Buildings	RIH181901	Asset Rationalisation: Information Station	180	0	0	0	0.0
Regeneration, Investment & Housing	RIH27	Partnerships	RIH181902	Grants for Family Information Service	26	0	0	0	0.0
Regeneration, Investment & Housing	RIH 11/ 13/16	Various	RIH181903	Modernised Development Services	59	0	0	0	-2.0
Regeneration, Investment & Housing	RIH21	Youth Core	RIH181904	Review of Youth Service	27	0	0	0	-1.0
Regeneration, Investment & Housing	RIH7	Civic Centre Facilities Management	RIH181905	Housing and Maintenance efficiencies	203	0	0	0	0.0
Regeneration, Investment & Housing	RIH20	Community Development Core	RIH181906	Co funding of service delivery for Community Development Worker	14	0	0	0	-1.0

Service Group	Activity Short Code	Activity Description	Unique ID	Proposal Title	18/19 (£'000)	19/20 (£'000)	20/21 (£'000)	21/22 (£'000)	Staff Impact FTE
Regeneration, Investment & Housing	RIH19/21/22/36	Various	RIH181907	Efficiency savings in Community Regeneration	14	0	0	0	0.0
Regeneration, Investment & Housing	RIH24/25/26/28/30	Various	RIH181908	General reduction in Budgets	28	0	0	0	0.0
Regeneration, Investment & Housing	RIH11/12/14/17/18	Various	RIH181909	Efficiency savings in Development Services	16	0	0	0	0.0
Regeneration, Investment & Housing	RIH10/12	Strategy & Development / Private Sector Housing	RIH181910	Housing and Assets general efficiencies	17	0	0	0	0.0
Regeneration, Investment & Housing	RIH1/3	Homelessness & Housing Needs	RIH181911	Housing & Assets - Housing Needs (Supporting People & Homelessness)	54	0	0	0	0.0
CORPORATE									
People & Business Change	PBC3	Business Change Improvement	PBC181901	Core Resource Reduction in Business Improvement Team	10	0	0	0	0.0
People & Business Change	PBC10/11/13/14/15/16	Various	PBC181902	Reduction in Digital and Information Budgets	10	0	0	0	0.0
People & Business Change	PBC8	Health & Safety	PBC181903	Reduction in Health & Safety Budget	3	0	0	0	0.0
People & Business Change	PBC9	Social Services Training	PBC181904	Reduction in Social Services Workforce Development Budget	8	0	0	0	0.0
People & Business Change	PBC2	HR Employment Services	PBC181905	Vacancy Deletion in Transactional HR & Payroll	14	0	0	0	-0.5
People & Business Change	PBC11	Information Governance & Development	PBC181906	Deletion of Post in Digital and Information Governance	31	0	0	0	-1.0
People & Business Change	PBC7	Partnership & Policy	PBC181907	Reduction in Partnership Budgets	17	0	0	0	0.0

Head of Service

Service Group	Activity Short Code	Activity Description	Unique ID	Proposal Title	18/19 (£'000)	19/20 (£'000)	20/21 (£'000)	21/22 (£'000)	Staff Impact FTE
Finance	FIN5	Council Tax NNDR Revenue	FIN181901	Increase in Council Tax Collection Rate to 98.9%	350	0	0	0	3.0
Finance	FIN5	Council Tax NNDR Revenue	FIN181902	Advanced Charging of Court Fees	5	0	0	0	0.0
Finance	FIN 1/3/4	Accountancy/ Purchase to Pay/ Strategic	FIN181903	Miscellaneous Efficiency Savings	22	0	0	0	0.0
Law & Regulation	LAW1	Communications & Marketing	LR181901	Reduction in Tourism Budget	10	0	0	0	0.0
Law & Regulation	LAW2	Registrars	LR181902	Reduction in Grounds Maintenance Budget for Mansion House	10	0	0	0	0.0
Law & Regulation	LAW3	Democratic Services	LR181903	Reprovision of Services within Democratic Services	42	0	0	0	-1.0
Law & Regulation	LAW8	Insurance	LR181904	Reduction in Insurance Premiums for Works of Art	10	0	0	0	0.0
Law & Regulation	LAW9	Community Safety	LR181905	Deletion of Vacant Part Time Post	12	0	0	0	-0.5
Law & Regulation	LAW11	Trading Standards	LR181906	Review of Regulatory Service Support	14	0	0	0	-0.8
Council Wide	Various - TBC	TBC	CC181901	Digital Council	34	0	0	0	2.0
Council Wide	Various - TBC	TBC	CC181902	Our People	122	0	0	0	1.0
				NEW BUDGET SAVINGS TOTAL - Delegated Head of Service	2,947	76	26	0	-7.1

HEAD OF SERVICE BUDGET DECISION

Service area: Education	Activity code: EDU3 Autistic Spectrum Disorder EDU7 Special Educational Needs Equip & Resource EDU14 Breakfast Clubs EDU21 Early Years EDU23 Joint Services EDU24 Transport EDU15 School Meals	Ref No: EDU181905
--------------------------------	---	--------------------------

Saving title: Reduction in budget lines

Saving description:

1. Breakfast club reduction in budget: £81k
2. Autism budget 40k.
3. Special educational needs equipment 13k.
4. Reduction in Early Years spend 45k.
5. Reduction in joint services 60k. Some joint services have provided rebates at the end of each financial year. LAs have the ability to reduce joint service contributions on an annual basis.
6. Reduction in school meal repairs 22k
7. Special educational needs transport £60K

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Net Savings (£000's)	321	0	0	0
FTE's impact	0	0	0	0

Implementation Costs (- £000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Revenue (state type):	0	0	0	0
Capital (state what):	0	0	0	0

Any impact on (i) service ? (ii) performance ? (iii) risk ?	Yes No Yes
--	---------------------------

If yes, please state impact on each applicable area:

Reduction in school meal repairs 22k: School kitchen repairs and maintenance is essential to secure good standards of health and safety. Repairs are also linked to hygiene inspections. Deferment of maintenance or repairs may results in poor hygiene ratings and reputational damage. Careful procurement and spending will need to be put in place in order to mitigate this risk. A budget of 282k will remain.

Breakfast club reduction in budget: £81k

This will be achieved by reducing school breakfast club supervisor funding to 40 minutes per session instead of one hour. Welsh Government request that breakfast clubs run for 30 minutes sessions. This funding will still allow for clearing up time. This may cause staff retention issues as staff may not choose to work for this short amount of time.

Reduction in Early Years budget: 45k. This budget provides funding for rising 3 placements and training and support for nursery and pre-school staff. Rising 3 placement costs continue to be met within the available budget. Training may need to reduce, however much training has taken place

across the city and has resulted in good CSSIW and Estyn reports. Good practice is well embedded and can be approached through a more targeted approach in the future. There is also scope to support lower cost training provision.

Autism budget 40k. This funding is used to support autism activities across the city. The budget generally supports training activities. Staff will still be available to advise and develop autism friendly work. Training will need to be cost free.

Reduction in joint services 60k. Some joint services have provided rebates at the end of each financial year. LAs have the ability to reduce joint service contributions on an annual basis. Reducing the education advisory service (EAS) budget may reduce the capacity to support area school improvement work within the city. The reduction would be minimal.

Reduction of special educational needs/additional learning needs transport £60K

Are we missing text/background here??

Does this require a Fairness and equalities impact assessment?		Yes
Any impact on Future Generations Act?. (If yes, explain impact)		
Integration (Yes)	Yes, if breakfast club staff retention is not maintained, breakfast clubs will cease to operate in some areas. Breakfast clubs are designed, in the long term, to break the cycle of poverty. This risk of breakfast clubs ceasing is low.	
Long Term (Yes)	If breakfast clubs reduce, this will not support pupil health and well-being in the long term. However the reduction in funding is still above Welsh Government funding recommendations. The risk in breakfast clubs not running is low.	
Prevention (Yes)	The reduction in kitchen grant may limit the capacity to maintain or repair school kitchens. A budget will still be available and essential repair will still take place.	
Collaboration (No)		
Involvement (Yes)	Schools and partners (health, parent partnership, education advisory service, hearing impaired and visually impaired services) will be notified of the reduction in budgets.	

HEAD OF SERVICE BUDGET DECISION

Service area: Education	Activity code: EDU9 Inclusion management account EDU18 Service development and business	Ref No: EDU181906
--------------------------------	---	--------------------------

Saving title: Staff reductions

Saving description:

It is proposed that 2 positions within the service area are reduced. The first position links to a fixed-term contract which is due to come to an end. This is the seamless learning pathway's leader who is contracted to work until July 31st 2018. There are no redundancy implications.

The second position is linked to a business support officer (grade 4) which is surplus to requirement. This position is currently filled. This will result in a redundancy situation. In total the cost saving associated with these two posts is 68k.

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Net Savings (£000's)	68			
FTE's impact	2			

Implementation Costs (- £000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Revenue (state type):	50			
Capital (state what):				

Any impact on (i) service ? (ii) performance ? (iii) risk ?	Yes No No
--	-----------------

The service area will require more support from the education senior management team to embed the culture of seamless learning pathways in Newport schools. However this was a two year project which was time specific and was intended to launch the concept of enhanced school cluster working. Newport schools have improved their approach to cluster working. The service area may be at risk of losing momentum in this area and will need to work closely with schools to ensure this practice is progressed, owned and embedded.

The business support officer reduces the capacity for education senior management team support, however in the light of austerity, senior leaders have successfully changed their approach to working and have become more self-sufficient.

Does this require an 'equalities impact assessment?	No
--	----

Any impact on Future Generations Act?. (If yes, explain impact)

Integration (YES/NO)	No
Long Term (YES / NO)	No

Prevention (YES / NO)	No
Collaboration (YES / NO)	No
Involvement (YES / NO)	No

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Service Area	Children's Services
Unique Reference Number	CFS181903
Proposal Title	Gwent Missing Children Service
Version	20 th December 2017
Proposal Summary Description	Reducing funding to the Gwent Missing Service
Impact on Performance	The service will need to assess the way the service is delivered in order to minimise impact
Impact on FTE Count	The service will need to assess the way the service is delivered in order to minimise impact on staffing levels
Impact on other Service Areas	None
Impact on Citizens	There may be a reduction in the service delivered
Delegated Decision (Head of Service/Cabinet Member/ Cabinet)	Head of Service
Activity Code	SOC23 Child safeguarding and missing children

Net Savings (£000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
	20			

Implementation Costs (- £000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Revenue – Redundancy/Pension	0			
Revenue – External consultants	0			
Revenue - Other	0			
Capital – Building related	0			
Capital - Other	0			
Implementation Cost - Total	0			

Current Position

The Gwent Missing service is a Gwent wide service with funding from across the five councils, Big Lottery funding and support from Gwent Police.

Although there is evidence that the service is helpful where children go missing once or twice, there is limited evidence that the service is effective for children who are persistently missing. The direct service offered to looked after children and those with a care and support plan often duplicates other services. This proposal is to reduce the current contribution to the service to bring it in line with the contributions made by other partners.

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

The proposal will be challenging because of the high profile of the provision with other agencies and differing views about the contribution the service makes.

Key Objectives and Scope

The proposal is to reduce the current funding to the Gwent Missing Children service.

Newport provides the largest element of the local authority funding and while Newport also has the highest number of Missing reports, many of these are for children who already have a significant number of professionals involved in their lives and for whom the benefits of the service could be provided from elsewhere.

Options considered

Option 1 Retain the current arrangements

Option 2 Secure a saving of £20k

Recommended Proposal/Option

Option 2

Required Investment

None

High Level Milestones and Timescales

The proposal if agreed will require discussion with the partners of the Gwent Missing Children service to agree timing.

Key Risks/issues

Risk Description	Risk Score (as per matrix below)	Mitigation Measures
Saving requires greater time with the service to achieve	3 x 3	Commence discussions with Gwent Police

Specific linkage with Future generation act requirements

The proposal is a saving which would result in a reduction in service. There is no positive linkage with Future Generation Act requirements.

Fairness and Equality Impact Assessment

No

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Service Area	Childrens Services
Unique Reference Number	CFS181905
Proposal Title	Use of Grant Funding to Support Care Leavers
Version	20 th December 2017
Proposal Summary Description	To offset core funding that supports care leavers against the Welsh Government St David's Day Fund.
Impact on Performance	There will be no impact on existing performance. There will be an impact on our ability to deliver the expectations of "Hidden Ambitions" and the requirements of Welsh Government to increase support for care leavers.
Impact on FTE Count	None
Impact on other Service Areas	None
Impact on Citizens	Care leavers will receive a lower level of support than in other Council areas.
Delegated Decision (Head of Service/Cabinet Member/ Cabinet)	Head of Service
Activity Code	SOC 20 Leaving Care

Net Savings (£000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
	35			

Implementation Costs (- £000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Revenue – Redundancy/Pension	0			
Revenue – External consultants	0			
Revenue - Other	0			
Capital – Building related	0			
Capital - Other	0			
Implementation Cost - Total				

Current Position

Welsh Government (WG) are of the view that the current funding arrangements to support care leavers are inadequate. Care leavers are a group of young people who are over represented in a range of vulnerable groups as adults. They are more likely to experience homelessness, mental and physical ill health, prison and income poverty

With this in mind WG have awarded a grant for 17/18 and 18/19 of £63,900 to provide

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

additional support for care experienced young people. The criteria of the grant funding are to support care experienced young people on an individual basis to help them achieve independence. Care leavers in Newport already access support to set up in accommodation and any items they may require to facilitate access to education and training. The budget does vary depending on the number of care leavers each year.

This saving will offset £35K of the budget against the St David's Day fund. The reporting to WG on the grant will therefore be in the context of the existing spend.

Key Objectives and Scope

Please see current position.
The objective is to offset existing expenditure against the grant funding.

Options considered

Option 1 - Retain the current arrangements

No saving would be realised

Option 2 - Offset £35K of the Children's Services budget against the St David's Day fund

Recommended Proposal/Option

Option 2 - a saving from Children's Services of £35K.

Offsetting the grant against existing planned expenditure is a straightforward step. The grant is for two years and will then go into the RSG.

Offsetting the grant in this way means there will be limited enhancement of provision for care leavers. Care leavers do receive support from the Council and the grant is explicitly to attempt to improve this support.

Using the grant in this way risks disadvantaging Newport care leavers against their peers in other Local Authorities. The grant would assist the Council in meeting the objectives of the Children's Commissioner's report Hidden Ambitions. Limiting the grant limits the opportunity to meet the objectives.

Required Investment

None

High Level Milestones and Timescales

There is no timetable required for this form of offsetting. It will have an immediate effect.

Key Risks/issues

Risk Description	Risk Score (as per matrix below)	Mitigation Measures
Disadvantaging care leavers compared to their peers across Wales	5 x 2	None

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Risks should be scored using the following matrix and scoring mechanism

Probability description	Score
Very Low probability	1
Low probability	2
Medium probability	3
High probability	4
Very high probability	5

Impact description	Score
Negligible	1
Low	2
Medium	3
High	4
Very High	5

Probability	5	5	10	15	20	25
	4	4	8	12	16	20
	3	3	6	9	12	15
	2	2	4	6	8	10
	1	1	2	3	4	5
		1	2	3	4	5
		Impact				

Specific linkage with Future generation act requirements

The proposal is a saving against the potential for an improved service for care leavers. There is therefore no positive linkage with FG Act requirements.

Fairness and Equality Impact Assessment

TBC

This page is intentionally left blank

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Service Area	Children's Services
Unique Reference Number	CFS181906
Proposal Title	Use of grant funding for services to children at risk of going into care (edge of care)
Version	20 th December 2017
Proposal Summary Description	Use the funding from the increase in the revenue support grant to expand edge of care services to secure savings.
Impact on Performance	There will be no impact on existing performance. There will be an impact on our ability to deliver the expectations of Welsh Government to expand edge of care services in order to minimise numbers of children becoming looked after
Impact on FTE Count	None
Impact on other Service Areas	None
Impact on Citizens	None
Delegated Decision (Head of Service/Cabinet Member/ Cabinet)	Head of Service
	SOC 26 Integrated family support service

Net Savings (£000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
	200			

Implementation Costs (- £000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Revenue – Redundancy/Pension	0			
Revenue – External consultants	0			
Revenue - Other	0			
Capital – Building related	0			
Capital - Other	0			
Implementation Cost - Total	0			

Current Position

Welsh Government (WG) and the regulator have over the past two years been emphasising the need to reduce the numbers of looked after children in order to improve outcomes for children and to reduce the costs associated with high numbers of looked after children.

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

WG has provided grant funding across Wales for 17/18. For Newport this grant totals £319,497. This is funding specifically for expanding edge of care services to support families and reduce the numbers of children becoming looked after. For 18/19 and beyond this funding will go into the RSG.

Newport already has edge of care services in the form of IFSS and to some extent preventions. The numbers of looked after children in Newport has been maintained at a comparatively low rate for the past four years. Newport had not seen the rapid increases seen other council areas, particularly in south east Wales. However, in recent weeks there has been something of a shift with an increase in numbers of children in care proceedings and in numbers of looked after children.

Current Resources

The current budget for the IFSS is £795,842. This is part of the Collaborative Partnership with Barnardo's. The majority of the staff are Barnardo's staff.

This proposal would not change the service and would not impact on the numbers of staff.

Key Objectives and Scope

The Welsh Government expects and enhancement of the services provided under the banner of Integrated Family Support Services. Newport already has a well-established IFSS with positive, well evidenced outcomes.

There are pressures on this service but offsetting in this way will not impact on the existing services and this proposal does allow for a small increase in the existing provision which may alleviate some of the increasing pressures.

Options considered

Option 1 Retain the current arrangements

The increase in the RSG as a result of the consequential is used elsewhere in the budget

Option 2 Secure a saving of £200k

Use the funding from the increase in the RSG to secure a saving of £200K against the existing IFSS budget

Recommended Proposal/Option

Recommendation

Option 2

Required Investment

None

High Level Milestones and Timescales

None required

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Key Risks/issues		
Risk Description	Risk Score (as per matrix below)	Mitigation Measures
Failure to increase services as demand increases	5 x 2	Contractual review of existing services will commence shortly as part of the recommissioning of the IFSS contract
Specific linkage with Future generation act requirements		
The proposal is a saving against the potential for an improved edge of care service for families. There is therefore no positive linkage with FG Act requirements.		
Fairness and Equality Impact Assessment		

This page is intentionally left blank

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Service Area	Children's Services
Unique Reference Number	CFS181907
Proposal Title	Use of grant funding for leaving care
Version	20 th December 2017
Proposal Summary Description	Use the funding from the increase in the revenue support grant to expand care leavers services to secure savings.
Impact on Performance	There will be no impact on existing performance. There will be an impact on our ability to deliver the expectations of Welsh Government to expand leaving care services to improve outcomes for care leavers and expand personal advisor provision to care leavers aged up to 25
Impact on FTE Count	None
Impact on other Service Areas	None
Impact on Citizens	None
Delegated Decision (Head of Service/Cabinet Member/ Cabinet)	Head of Service
Activity Codes	SOC20 Leaving care

Net Savings (£000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
	50			

Implementation Costs (- £000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Revenue – Redundancy/Pension	0			
Revenue – External consultants	0			
Revenue - Other	0			
Capital – Building related	0			
Capital - Other	0			
Implementation Cost - Total	0			

Current Position
<p>Welsh Government (WG) has provided grant funding for care leavers from the consequential allocation across Wales for 17/18. For Newport, this grant totals £103,837. It is aimed at introducing a personal advisory service for all care leavers aged up to 25 and to improve outcomes in the form of more work placements and traineeships.</p> <p>Newport already has some personal advisors – however, the grant conditions and</p>

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

monitoring reports requires evidence of expansion and proof of better outcomes. For 18/19 this funding goes into the RSG.

Current Resources

The current budget for Leaving Care is £680,494.

This proposal if agreed would offset existing spend

Key Objectives and Scope

Welsh Government (WG) is of the view that current funding arrangements to support care leavers are inadequate. Care leavers are more likely to experience homelessness, mental and physical ill health, prison and income poverty than other groups of young people.

The Welsh Government expectation of the increased funding is to enhance the leaving care services to improve outcomes for young people leaving care.

There are pressures on this service but offsetting in this way will not impact on the existing services and this proposal does allow for a small increase in the existing provision which may alleviate some of the increasing pressures.

Options considered

Option 1 - Retain the current arrangements

The increase in the RSG is used elsewhere in the budget

Option 2 - Use the funding from the increase in the RSG to secure a saving of £50K

Recommended Proposal/Option

Option 2

Required Investment

None

High Level Milestones and Timescales

None required

Key Risks/issues

Risk Description	Risk Score (as per matrix below)	Mitigation Measures
Failure to increase services as demand increases	5 x 2	Limited increase to meet statutory need to increase PAs for all care leavers up to age of 25

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Specific linkage with Future Generation Act Requirements
The proposal is a saving against the potential for an improved leaving care service for young people. There is therefore no positive linkage with FG Act requirements.
Fairness and Equality Impact Assessment
No

This page is intentionally left blank

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Service Area	Children's Services
Unique Reference Number	CFS181908
Proposal Title	Funding for asylum seekers
Version	20 th December 2017
Proposal Summary Description	Reducing part of the budget to reflect current usage.
Impact on Performance	None
Impact on FTE Count	None
Impact on other Service Areas	None
Impact on Citizens	Assuming the current demand none
Delegated Decision (Head of Service/Cabinet Member/ Cabinet)	Head of Service
Activity codes	SOC 28 child protection

Net Savings (£000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
	20			

Implementation Costs (- £000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Revenue – Redundancy/Pension	0			
Revenue – External consultants	0			
Revenue - Other	0			
Capital – Building related	0			
Capital - Other	0			
Implementation Cost - Total	0			

Current Position

Section 115 of the Immigration and Asylum Act 1999 (IAA) states that a person will have 'no recourse to public funds' if they are subject to immigration control; public funds include welfare benefits and public housing. However, under the legislation councils have to assess families in this position and then provide subsistence and accommodation. A budget in Children's Services is used for the subsistence element. The call on this has diminished significantly over the past five years.

Current Resources

The current full year budget is £25K. For 16/17 the usage again fell to £4,840, mirroring

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

the trajectory of the past three years. This proposal is to reduce the budget by £20K.

Key Objectives and Scope

The proposal is to reduce the current non-recourse to public funds (NRPF) budget in line with the past five years trajectory of spend. The risk would be if there was an increase in demand that would have to be met by the council. .

Options considered

Option 1 - Retain the current arrangements

Option 2 - Reduce the budget by £20K

Recommended Proposal/Option

Option 2

Required Investment

None

High Level Milestones and Timescales

None required

Key Risks/issues

Risk Description	Risk Score (as per matrix below)	Mitigation Measures
Change in demand could lead to increased spend	2 x 4	Continue to monitor demands

Specific linkage with Future generation act requirements

The proposal is a direct saving against a reducing demand. There is therefore no positive linkage with FG Act requirements.

Fairness and Equality Impact Assessment

No

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Service Area	Children's Services
Unique Reference Number	CFS181909
Proposal Title	Childcare legal fees budget
Version	20 th December 2017
Proposal Summary Description	Reducing the budget for legal fees incurred by Children's Services to pay for court ordered testing and the use of external legal counsel to represent the council in Family Court proceedings.
Impact on Performance	There will be no direct impact on performance. However, it is likely there will be an impact as a result of challenging court work and greater pressures on those presenting cases in the Family Court.
Impact on FTE Count	None
Impact on other Service Areas	Potential impact on legal services with increased pressures on solicitors. Protracted cases because of lack of representation will impact on teams in Children's Services and legal teams.
Impact on Citizens	If the council were to become less effective in court this would impact directly on children and families.
Delegated Decision (Head of Service/Cabinet Member/Cabinet)	Head of Service
Activity codes	SOC 28 child protection

Net Savings (£000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
	50	50		

Implementation Costs (- £000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Revenue – Redundancy/Pension	0			
Revenue – External consultants	0			
Revenue - Other	0			
Capital – Building related	0			
Capital - Other	0			
Implementation Cost - Total	0			

Current Position
The legal fees budget in Children's Services is used for court ordered testing and the

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

use of counsel to represent the local authority in family proceedings.

Currently all requests for counsel are agreed by service managers and are already fully scrutinised. The impact of reducing access to counsel will be two fold. Firstly it will place additional pressure on the council's legal teams and secondly it is likely to impede the council's ability to effectively act in the court arena.

Current Resources

The full year budget for 17/18 is £604,860. Over the past two years there has been an underspend against this budget.

Key Objectives and Scope

The proposal is a saving to represent the shift in trajectory over the past two years in the legal budget.

The majority of the spend is for counsel in care proceedings. Use of counsel is vital in complex cases and the current position is already tightly controlled and monitored.

Over the past number of weeks there has been an increase in the proceedings rate and the use of counsel has increased. This will need to be carefully monitored for the rest of this financial year as if this continues it would jeopardise this proposed saving.

Options considered

Option 1 - Retain the current budget provision

Option 2 - Saving of £100K

Recommended Proposal/Option

Option 2

Required Investment

None

High Level Milestones and Timescales

None

Key Risks/issues

Risk Description	Risk Score (as per matrix below)	Mitigation Measures
Increased pressure on legal and Children's Services teams.	4 x 4	Monitor the recent increase for the final half of 16/17
Increased difficulties in family court cases	4 x 5	Monitor for the final half of 16/17

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Specific linkage with Future Generation Act requirements
The proposal is a direct saving against a reducing spend. There is therefore no positive linkage with FG Act requirements.
Fairness and Equality Impact Assessment
No

This page is intentionally left blank

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Service Area	Children's Services
Unique Reference Number	CFS181910
Proposal Title	Remodelling of fostering service
Version	20 th December 2017
Proposal Summary Description	To reduce the number of external fostering assessments commissioned. To reduce the provision of career and specialist carers.
Impact on Performance	None
Impact on FTE Count	None
Impact on other Service Areas	None
Impact on Citizens	None
Delegated Decision (Head of Service/Cabinet Member/ Cabinet)	Head of Service
Activity code	SOC 33 in house fostering

Net Savings (£000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
	41	26	26	

Implementation Costs (- £000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Revenue – Redundancy/Pension	0			
Revenue – External consultants	0			
Revenue - Other	0			
Capital – Building related	0			
Capital - Other	0			
Implementation Cost - Total	0			

Current Position

The fostering savings proposal has two components

1. Career and specialist carers

The fostering team currently provides a tiered system of foster carer payments. The career and specialist carers were introduced in 2011 to enhance payments for certain carers to offer placements to children with particularly challenging behaviours. The scheme has had a limited success and targeted support is proving more effective than the payment system. This proposal further reduces this budget as no additional carers will be recruited following the retirement of some of the existing group. There will be a

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

saving each year until there are no carers left in the scheme.

Current resources for career and specialist carers

Career carers = £83,343 which allows for 16 career carers @ £100 per week to be engaged

Specialist carers = £157,854 which allows for nine specialist carers @£300 per week and three carers @£100 per week who provide additional support for disabled children to be engaged

2. Professional fees

Currently £34,000 for professional fees is included within the fostering team budget. This is used for the assessment of proposed foster carers by external assessors. As a result of staffing changes arising from changes in management posts the work of the fostering team is being reviewed. As a result it is proposed to speed up the existing assessment processes and reduce some elements of the role by negotiation with the courts. This will ensure more assessments can be completed by the in house staff and so reduce the need for external assessments.

Current Resources

£34,000 - a bank of external assessors is retained for regular use

Key Objectives and Scope

The current position above covers the objectives and the scope. The changes proposed will not impact on current carers or looked after children and the scheme has not proved effective in recruiting carers for children with more challenging behaviours. Reducing the external assessors budget will be part of a wider piece of work to improve outputs within the fostering service.

Options considered

Option 1 - Retain the current arrangements with no savings

Option 2 - Saving of £41K

Recommended Proposal/Option

Option 2

Required Investment

None

High Level Milestones and Timescales

None required

Key Risks/issues

Risk Description	Risk Score (as per matrix below)	Mitigation Measures

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

No specific risks identified		
Specific linkage with Future generation act requirements		
The proposal is a direct saving against a reducing cost a result of recognising an ineffective payments structure for carers and improving the outputs of the fostering team. There is therefore no positive linkage with FG Act requirements.		
Fairness and Equality Impact Assessment		

This page is intentionally left blank

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Service Area	Children's Services
Unique Reference Number	CFS181911
Proposal Title	Children's day care support
Version	20 th December 2017
Proposal Summary Description	To reduce the provision of day care support attached to the social work teams
Impact on Performance	None
Impact on FTE Count	None
Impact on other Service Areas	None
Impact on Citizens	None
Delegated Decision (Head of Service/Cabinet Member/ Cabinet)	Head of Service
Activity code	SOC 28 child protection

Net Savings (£000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
	17			

Implementation Costs (- £000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Revenue – Redundancy/Pension	0			
Revenue – External consultants	0			
Revenue - Other	0			
Capital – Building related	0			
Capital - Other	0			
Implementation Cost - Total	0			

Current Position

Reduce the budget provision of day care services provided by the social work teams by £17,000.

There is currently a provision across all of the above teams to provide day care and activities to support children, young people and families. These are focussed to directly ensure children benefit and relieve the stresses experienced by families. In this financial year the teams have already shifted their way of working to demonstrate this saving can be achieved.

Current Resources

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Current budget provision = £97,420											
Key Objectives and Scope											
To reduce the existing budget in line with the reduced spend as a result of changing working practices.											
Options considered											
Option 1 - Retain the current arrangements											
Option 2 - Reduce the current budget by £17,000											
Recommended Proposal/Option											
Option 2											
Required Investment											
None											
High Level Milestones and Timescales											
None required											
Key Risks/issues											
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Risk Description</th> <th>Risk Score (as per matrix below)</th> <th>Mitigation Measures</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>No specific risks identified</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Risk Description	Risk Score (as per matrix below)	Mitigation Measures	No specific risks identified					
Risk Description	Risk Score (as per matrix below)	Mitigation Measures									
No specific risks identified											
Specific linkage with Future Generation Act requirements											
The proposal is a direct saving as a result of reducing the spend on day care in the social work teams. There is therefore no positive linkage with FG Act requirements.											
Fairness and Equality Impact Assessment											
No											

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Service Area	Children's Services
Unique Reference Number	CFS181912
Proposal Title	Psychologist secondment
Version	20 th December 2017
Proposal Summary Description	To reduce the provision of clinical psychology for the matching and placement support (MAPS) team
Impact on Performance	None
Impact on FTE Count	None
Impact on other Service Areas	The work of MAPS will need reviewing to ensure support can be implemented in different ways
Impact on Citizens	None
Delegated Decision (Head of Service/Cabinet Member/ Cabinet)	Head of Service
Activity code	SOC 33 In house fostering

Net Savings (£000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
	46			

Implementation Costs (- £000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Revenue – Redundancy/Pension	0			
Revenue – External consultants	0			
Revenue - Other	0			
Capital – Building related	0			
Capital - Other	0			
Implementation Cost - Total	0			

Current Position

Since 2012 a clinical psychologist has been seconded from Aneurin Bevan University Health Board to support the work of the MAPS team. The post holder has supported staff and offered direct work to some looked after children. As part of a wider review different ways of offering support to looked after children are being explored. This proposal is to end the secondment.

Current Resources

Budget provision for the psychologist of £45,905

Key Objectives and Scope

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

The clinical psychologist has supported placements and worked with staff to ensure there are psychological formulations in place for carers to offer consistent care to meet the needs of looked after children who present with behaviours which require exceptional levels of understanding. The majority of children who are looked after experience difficulties with attachment. The psychologist has been able to provide advice for carers and social workers.

With the use of the Integrated Care Fund, the health board is rolling out an attachment and trauma service to all teams which will operate firstly by providing training and then regular consultation. This, as well a need to more widely review the council's placements strategy, should assist in minimising the impact of the loss of the post.

Options considered

Option 1 - Retain the current arrangements

Option 2 - Saving of £45,905 by ending the secondment arrangement currently in place

Recommended Proposal/Option

Option 2

Required Investment

None

High Level Milestones and Timescales

The ending of the secondment will be by negotiation with ABUHB.

Key Risks/issues

Risk Description	Risk Score (as per matrix below)	Mitigation Measures
No specific risks identified		

Specific linkage with Future Generation Act requirements

The proposal is a direct saving as a result of ending the clinical psychology support for the Matching and Placement Support team. There is therefore no positive linkage with FG Act requirements.

Fairness and Equality Impact Assessment

HEAD OF SERVICE BUDGET DECISION

Service Area: Children's and Family Services	Activity code:		Ref No: CFS181914
	SOC21	Southwark 16+	
	SOC22	LAC family contact	
	SOC24	Child and Family management account	
	SOC36	Direct payments	
	SOC37	Child Disabled aid	
	SOC39	Child safeguarding	
	SOC35	Education support team	

Saving Title: Reductions in budget lines to be achieved with a mix of efficiencies and reduction in hours for some posts

Saving description:

		£000's
SOC21	Southwark 16+	1
SOC22	LAC family contact	3
SOC24	Child and family management A/C	16
SOC36	Direct payments	2
SOC37	Child disabled aid	1
SOC39	Child safeguarding	18
SOC35	Education support team	3
Total		44

This proposal relates to a range of small savings across a number of cost centres. The areas in themselves are not related but the savings are similar. All will require relatively small changes in service delivery with some reduction in sessional hours used.

There is one part time post which will be deleted in the Safeguarding team. The post is currently vacant and the deletion of the post can be managed without an impact on frontline services.

Any impact on (i) service ?	Yes
(ii) performance ?	Yes
(iii) risk ?	Yes
If yes, please state impact on each applicable area:	
i) service	
Each saving will mean a small diminution of service but are such that they can be absorbed without families receiving services being aware. The largest saving of £18K is an existing post which has been held as a vacancy for the past six months.	
(ii) performance	
As the savings are spread across a number of areas the impact on performance on each individual area will be minimal. However, the cumulative impact of these and the other savings will inevitably impact on performance.	

(iii) risk

The risk in this case does not come from each of the individual savings but as with performance from the cumulative impact of the range of these and other savings. As the margins become ever tighter across the service there are increasing pressures on staff and the risk of overspends in the future as the likelihood of errors and poor performance increases

Does this require an 'equalities impact assessment?' No

Any impact on Future Generations Act?. (If yes, explain impact)

Integration (YES/NO)	Individually none of these savings impacts on the areas highlighted by the FGA but again it is the cumulative impact of multiple savings across areas with interdependency which will lead to impact.
Long Term (YES / NO)	
Prevention (YES / NO)	
Collaboration (YES / NO)	
Involvement (YES / NO)	

	<i>2018/19</i>	<i>2019/20</i>	<i>2020/21</i>	<i>2021/22</i>
Net Savings (£000's)	44			
FTE's impact	0.5			

	<i>2018/19</i>	<i>2019/20</i>	<i>2020/21</i>	<i>2021/22</i>
Implementation Costs (- £000's)				
Revenue (state type):	12.5			
Capital (state what):	0			

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Service Area	Adult Community Services
Unique Reference Number	ACS181905
Proposal Title	Changes to staffing arrangements within Adult Services
Version	20 th December 2017
Proposal Summary Description	<p>To delete 2 posts within Commissioning & Business Development</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quality Assurance post 2. Performance Team Officer
Impact on Performance	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quality Assurance post– the original remit for this role changed in 2015. Since then, the postholder has been undertaking various project based pieces of work specifically around the implementation of the Social Services & Well Being Act. The need for this role has now reduced so the impact on wider departmental performance will be minimal. The post-holder provides some resilience to the Deprivation of Liberty work (DoLs) as and when required and is a trained Best Interest Assessor (BIA). The post-holder will be redeployed within the organisation and can continue to offer support to this area of work. 2. Performance Team Officer – this role sits within the Performance Information Team and has been vacant since 2015. The team has since been re-structured and the role is deemed surplus to requirements. 3. Strategy & Partnership Manager - this role will remain within the service area but an opportunity has arisen to charge the full cost to the permanent recurring element of ABUHB Intermediate Care Funding.
Impact on FTE Count	<p>Reduction of 1.8 FTE</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quality Assurance Co-ordinator (filled) 2. Process Management Development Officer (vacant)
Impact on other Service Areas	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quality Assurance post – the original remit for this role has now changed. The

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

	<p>impact on other service areas will be in relation to DoLs and to the commitment that the postholder has made to the implementation of WCCIS in terms of the delivery of training. The continuation of this work will need to be negotiated as part of the redeployment process.</p> <p>2. Performance Team Officer – this post has been vacant for ... therefore no detrimental impact on other service areas can be identified.</p> <p>3. Strategy & Partnership Manager – this role will remain within the service area but an opportunity has arisen to charge the full cost to the permanent recurring element of ABUHB Intermediate Care Funding.</p>
Impact on Citizens	None of the posts are operational and do not deliver front line services, the posts being deleted will have no impact on service delivery as both were involved with managing internal processes that have been subject to re-structure and no longer require the same level of resource
Delegated Decision (Head of Service/Cabinet Member/ Cabinet)	Head of Service
Activity Short Code	SOC14 Service Day and Commissioning

Net Savings (£000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
	100			

Implementation Costs (- £000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Revenue – Redundancy/Pension	25			
Revenue – External consultants				
Revenue - Other				
Capital – Building related				
Capital - Other				
Implementation Cost - Total	25			

Current Position
<p>1. Quality Assurance Post Currently the postholder is engaged in work that is different to the original function of QA. Since 2015 the remit of the QA function has changed from overseeing the quality of all assessments and ensuring a</p>

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

consistent approach to resource allocation. This work has now been delegated to operational teams and a new system of quality assurance called ECO (equality, consistency and outcomes) has been implemented across adult services.

Since 2015 the postholder has been engaged in work to support the implementation of the Social Services & Well Being Act and this has now been largely achieved. The work that the postholder is currently engaged with in relation to DoLs has been minimal but this function has a natural synergy with the Safeguarding Senior Practitioner role so the involvement will continue and be retained within adult services.

The Quality Assurance Officer is a grade 10 and there is a Senior Practitioner vacancy in the safeguarding team that is deemed to be a direct match. The postholder has entered into a period of formal consultation to determine transition arrangements, at which point the substantive Quality Assurance Co-ordinator post can be deleted. This will deliver a full year saving in 2018/19 of £36k and a 0.8 FTE reduction

2. Process Management Development Officer

This post has been vacant within the Performance Information Team since 2015. The team has recently been re-structured and no longer has a need for this role. The deletion of this post will have no impact on the ability of the team to deliver the newly defined objectives of the service area.

The deletion of this post will deliver a full year saving of £24,948

3. Strategy & Partnership Manager

This role, currently occupied, is responsible for the management of the Community Connector service and Carers Development Officer which are all Integrated Care Funds projects. The postholder is also the lead officer for older persons within the context of the Welsh Government's strategy for older people in Wales and the ageing well in Newport programme.

This post is currently funded from the Community care staffing budget but recent Health led initiatives such as the Older Persons Pathway and the Care Closer to Home strategy presents an opportunity to permanently support from the Integrated Care Fund (ICF)

Key Objectives and Scope

To identify savings from the 2018/19 staffing budget

- delete 1.8 FTE posts from within the Commissioning & Business Development service area

Options considered

To delete the posts of Quality Assurance Co-ordinator and Process Management Development Officer and re-align the funding of the Strategy and Partnership Manager to the ICF.

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

This will result in a reduction of 1.8 FTE

Recommended Proposal/Option

To proceed with the proposal to deliver a saving of £100k in 2018/19 and deliver a reduction of 1.8 FTE

Required Investment

N/A

High Level Milestones and Timescales

Fully achieved by 31st March 2018

Key Risks/issues

Risk Description	Risk Score (as per matrix below)	Mitigation Measures
Risk 1	Deletion of the QA role could impact on the post-holders commitment to the WCCIS project	Negotiations with the Safeguarding Team Manager around continued involvement – based on quantified time resource.
	Deletion of the QA role could impact on the capacity of post-holder to continue involvement with DoLs 1/1	Redeployed role is within the Safeguarding Team so expertise and resource will be protected

Specific linkage with Future generation act requirements

Integration – Improvement Plan Priority – a safer city (investment in the safeguarding role)

Long Term –Improvement Plan Objective 2 – ensuring people have access to the right services

Prevention – protecting jobs to prevent loss from the organisation – matching experience and skills to evidenced organisational needs

Collaboration – Identifying where roles have cross cutting objectives and integrating responsibilities to achieve maximum impact

Involvement – Consultation processes in place for all staff affected

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Fairness and Equality Impact Assessment
No

This page is intentionally left blank

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Service Area	Adult Community Services
Unique Reference Number	ASC181906
Proposal Title	South East Wales Commissioning Arrangements
Version	
Proposal Summary Description	<p>Commissioning arrangement for information, advice and assistance (IAA) and South East Wales Improvement Collaborative (SEWIC)</p> <p>Identified savings from</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • commissioned services • regional arrangements <p>1. Commissioned services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to reduce the budget of the Newport Support Partnership in relation to the delivery of the appropriate adult service • to reduce the budget of the mental health consortium in relation to the provision of information advice and assistance <p>2. Regional arrangements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To reduce the contribution to South East Wales improvement Collaborative (SEWIC)
Impact on Performance	<p>There are no specific KPIs associated with this service but the business case supports the improvement plan priority IP2</p> <p>Ensuring people have the right social services to meet their needs.</p>
Impact on FTE Count	
Impact on other Service Areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Newport Support Partnership – this element of the service ended in March 2017. There has been no evidenced impact on other service areas • Mental Health Consortium – this is a commissioned service with third sector partners, the post is already vacant and work is underway to absorb the demand within existing provision such as internal First Contact information advice and

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

	<p>assistance(IAA) functions, the Newport Support Partnership IAA service and IAA offered by organisations funded by Supporting People</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South East Wales Improvement Collaborative – there is regional consensus that this work is no longer required and financial contributions will end.
Impact on Citizens	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Newport Support Partnership – the appropriate adult service is provided by the police and continues to be available to Newport citizens at no cost to the council • Mental Health Consortium – the IAA component of the consortium is under review and Newport services are being mapped to ensure people are signposted to the most appropriate source of support. • South East Wales Improvement Collaborative – this team were responsible for supporting internal processes so have no direct impact on Newport citizens
Delegated Decision (Head of Service/Cabinet Member/ Cabinet)	Head of Service
Activity Codes	SOC 16 Adult services contracts support

Net Savings (£000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
	75			

Implementation Costs (- £000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Revenue – Redundancy/Pension				
Revenue – External consultants				
Revenue - Other				
Capital – Building related				
Capital - Other				
Implementation Cost - Total				

Current Position

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Newport Support Partnership

A third sector consortium commissioned in 2016 and led by Reach who deliver community support, carers respite and the appropriate adult services. Citizen's Advice deliver the information advice and assistance element with support from volunteering matters and Dewis provide the advocacy.

When the service was initially commissioned there was a requirement to deliver an appropriate adult service in Newport. Reviews identified that referrals to the service were much lower than expected due to the police making alternative arrangements and directing their referrals to the new service.

Negotiations held with Reach agreed that the funding could be removed with no detriment to the wider service model.

The proposal is:

- To remove the £18k associated with the delivery of the appropriate adult service as alternative provision is available

NB: Already agreed and implemented in full consultation with the provider

Mental Health Consortium.

The mental health consortium was jointly commissioned by Newport City Council and Aneurin Bevan University Health Board (ABUHB) and is led by Growing Space and includes MIND and HAFAL.

From December 2016 the service provided a single point of contact for people with mental health issues to access information, advice and assistance (IAA), counselling and day activities. The model is based on prevention and recovery and allows people to move freely between services.

A review is looking at the availability of IAA across all services. Information, advice and assistance on offer should be the same for everyone, regardless of their care need. For example, financial and welfare benefit advice is available from the Citizens Advice Bureau as a member of the Newport Support Partnership so specialist welfare benefit advice from the mental health consortium represents duplication.

Providers of information, advice and assistance have regular meetings to map provision and develop referral protocols.

Newport City Council funds the Newport Support Partnership to deliver information, advice and assistance, employs seven community connectors, delivers a First Contact service and commissions housing related support to the sum of £6m from Supporting People funding across the city.

The proposal is:

- Remove the local authority contribution for information, advice and assistance from the consortium
- Map the provision of information, advice and assistance across Newport and strengthen referral protocols
- Continue to work with the mental health consortium through contract review to ensure service continuity

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

South East Wales Improvement Collaborative

This regional arrangement was set up to support the five Gwent councils in regional commissioning initiatives. Newport's contribution is £30k per annum.

The work has not delivered the benefits originally intended and all partner agencies are considering removing funding to focus on local priorities. The removal of this funding will have no detriment to Newport and no impact on FTE. The decision by other councils to remove contributions will make the current position unsustainable.

A new National Commissioning Board has been set up by the Welsh Government to address residential care capacity and sustainability and the implementation of pooled budgets with health boards. Three staff members previously funded from this regional arrangement have been re-designated and continue to work regionally.

The proposal is

- Remove Newport City Council's £30k contribution to SEWIC with effect from 1 April 2018.

Key Objectives and Scope

To reduce funding to the Newport Support Partnership, Mental Health Consortium and South East Wales Improvement Collaborative as outlined above.

Options considered

The option described will deliver a total cost saving of £75k in 2018/19

There is no impact on staffing.

Recommended Proposal/Option

As above

Required Investment

N/A

Time from the first contact service manager, supporting people team manager, commissioning and contracts team manager
Staff investment required

High Level Milestones and Timescales

Discussions with information, advice and assistance providers October 2017

Full implementation by 31 March 2018

Key Risks/issues

For the recommended option detail all of the key risks and issues along with any

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

mitigation measures which can be taken.

Risk Description	Risk Score (as per matrix below)	Mitigation Measures
Risk 1	Reduction in SEWIC contribution creates tension between the five Gwent authorities – perceived negative impact on wider regional agenda. 1/2	Discussions already underway to achieve consensus
Risk 2	Removal of appropriate adult service funding from the Newport Support Partnership affects the availability of appropriate adults to support vulnerable people. 1/2	Gwent Police have commissioned a service that has resulted in very few appropriate adult referrals to the Newport Support Partnership since September 2016.
Risk 3	The removal of funding from the mental health consortium could impact on the effectiveness of the information, advice and assistance service 1/2	Consultation and engagement with all Newport information, advice and assistance providers to ensure people are signposted to the most appropriate service, whatever the original referral source.

Specific linkage with Future generation act requirements

Integration –To improve people’s lives, developing early intervention and prevention approaches that are tailored to the needs of the individual

Long Term –Improvement Plan Objective 2 – to ensure people get the right services

Prevention – To ensure preventative services are sustainable and operating in a way that is cost effective and efficient.

Collaboration – The proposal demonstrates collaboration with our commissioned providers to find sustainable and effective solutions.

Involvement –The proposal requires consultation and involvement with our key stakeholders in order to effect necessary ongoing change.

Fairness and Equality Impact Assessment

No

This page is intentionally left blank

HEAD OF SERVICE BUDGET DECISION

Service Area: Adult & Community Services	Activity code: SOC 5 First contact, SOC9 Community Care team SOC11 Mental health, SOC13 Adults Management account	Ref No: ACS181908
---	--	--------------------------

Saving Title:
Reductions in Staffing Budgets in Adult and Community Services

Saving description:
This savings proposal will reduce a number of posts across adult services. Where possible vacant posts will be targeted and those that are not responsible for frontline service delivery. This will achieve a savings of 147k

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Net Savings (£000's)	147			
FTE's impact	4			

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Implementation Costs (- £000's)				
Revenue (state type):	100			
Capital (state what):				

Any impact on (i) service? (ii) Performance? (iii) Risk?	Yes No No
---	-----------------

If yes, please state impact on each applicable area:

Service: There will be reduction in staffing resources which may impact on service delivery and capacity within teams.

Does this require an 'equalities impact assessment?'	No
---	----

Any impact on Future Generations Act?. (If yes, explain impact)

Integration Yes	Improvement Plan Priority – a safer city (investment in the safeguarding role)
Long Term Yes	Improvement Plan Objective 2 – ensuring people have access to the right services

Prevention Yes	Protecting jobs to prevent loss from the organisation – matching experience and skills to evidenced organisational needs
Collaboration Yes	Identifying where roles have cross cutting objectives and integrating responsibilities to achieve maximum impact
Involvement Yes	Consultation processes in place for all staff affected

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Service Area	Streetscene and City services
Unique Reference Number	SS181906
Proposal Title	Review itch markings
Version	20/12/2017
Proposal Summary Description	To consider the reduction in the frequency of sports pitch marking of council facilities
Impact on Performance	No significant impacts are envisaged as a result of this proposal , resources will be able to be diverted to more essential tasks within grounds maintenance
Impact on FTE Count	There will be no impact on current FTE engaged on grounds maintenance activities. This proposal enables diversion of workforce onto alternative essential maintenance tasks.
Impact on other Service Areas	There is an anticipated increase in sports user enquiries regarding this service , but this will be mitigated through adequate communications and liaison with clubs and users
Impact on Citizens	The impact of the proposal is restricted to users of sports pitch facilities and is not envisaged to cause major impact.
Delegated Decision (Head of Service/Cabinet Member/ Cabinet)	HoS
Activity Code	STR1 Environmental Services

Net Savings (£000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
	10			

Implementation Costs (- £000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Revenue – Redundancy/Pension				
Revenue – External consultants				
Revenue - Other				
Capital – Building related				
Capital - Other				
Implementation Cost - Total				

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Current Position

The Streetscene grounds maintenance teams currently maintain 68 sports pitches around the city for the benefit of clubs, schools and social organisations. These facilities are currently line marked weekly throughout the season at a cost of £90,000 per year. This current practice is resource intensive and utilises valuable staffing time which could be better diverted onto other essential maintenance activities. Current income projections for sports pitch income 2017/18 is £19,600 so the service is heavily subsidised by council funding.

Key Objectives and Scope

This proposal seeks to consider reasonable amendments in service delivery that will not have an adverse effect on the continued usage and standards of sports pitch facilities in the future. It will allow diversion of resource onto alternative essential maintenance activities

Options considered

Options considered as part of this review are;

- Status Quo: continue with the weekly marking of pitches achieving no financial savings
- Adopt the proposed reduction in the frequency of markings achieving a financial saving of £10k per season. The savings are achieved through reduction of materials, labour and plant associated with this task.
- Pursue a project to consider if any forms of self-management of pitches is a viable option in the future thus transferring the pitch marking responsibility to clubs, groups .This will be a significant longer term project involving consultation and support with all user groups.

Recommended Proposal/Option

The recommended proposal is adopting the reduced frequency of pitch markings. There is nominal impact on current FTE as resources will be diverted onto other essential maintenance activities for the positive improvement of city`s environmental green spaces.

Required Investment

There is no required investment required for the delivery of this proposal

High Level Milestones and Timescales

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Key Risks/issues

Users will react negatively to reduced standards of pitch markings.

Risk Description	Risk Score (as per matrix below)	Mitigation Measures
Negative reaction from sports users	9	Ensure adequate communications are maintained and regular monitoring
Increased complaints received requiring officer investigation and back office administration	9	Site monitoring including fixture frequency and weather

Risks should be scored using the following matrix and scoring mechanism

Probability description	Score	<p>Probability</p> <table border="1"> <tr><td>5</td><td>5</td><td>10</td><td>15</td><td>20</td><td>25</td></tr> <tr><td>4</td><td>4</td><td>8</td><td>12</td><td>16</td><td>20</td></tr> <tr><td>3</td><td>3</td><td>6</td><td>9</td><td>12</td><td>15</td></tr> <tr><td>2</td><td>2</td><td>4</td><td>6</td><td>8</td><td>10</td></tr> <tr><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td colspan="5">Impact</td></tr> </table>	5	5	10	15	20	25	4	4	8	12	16	20	3	3	6	9	12	15	2	2	4	6	8	10	1	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5		Impact				
5	5		10	15	20	25																																						
4	4		8	12	16	20																																						
3	3		6	9	12	15																																						
2	2		4	6	8	10																																						
1	1		2	3	4	5																																						
	1		2	3	4	5																																						
	Impact																																											
Very Low probability	1																																											
Low probability	2																																											
Medium probability	3																																											
High probability	4																																											
Very high probability	5																																											
Impact description	Score																																											
Negligible	1																																											
Low	2																																											
Medium	3																																											
High	4																																											
Very High	5																																											

Specific linkage with Future generation act requirements

Communication with organisations affected by this proposal is key to its success and the service must be flexible to the needs of stakeholders and prevailing weather conditions. Opportunities for collaboration and forms of self-management will be a long term target.

Communications and consultation will be required for the positive outcome.

Fairness and Equality Impact Assessment

None

This page is intentionally left blank

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Service Area	Streetscene and City Services
Unique Reference Number	SS181907
Proposal Title	Savings from fuel efficiencies
Version	20/12/2017
Proposal Summary Description	Reduced payments for waste services Reduced fuel costs linked to Wastesavers contract and cessation of contributions to South Wales Waste Management Group
Impact on Performance	Proposal will not impact on performance as it will not affect current waste services being delivered
Impact on FTE Count	No impact as proposal does not involve operational changes on staff
Impact on other Service Areas	The proposal only impacts internally to Highways and Waste departments within Streetscene
Impact on Citizens	As changes will only apply to internal processes and they will not affect services delivered to residents, no impact on citizens is expected
Delegated Decision (Head of Service/Cabinet Member/ Cabinet)	HoS
Activity Code	STR11 Sustainable Waste

Net Savings (£000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
	16			

Implementation Costs (- £000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Revenue – Redundancy/Pension				
Revenue – External consultants				
Revenue - Other				
Capital – Building related				
Capital - Other				
Implementation Cost - Total	0			

Current Position
Regarding the refuelling system, under the current contract (kerbside recycling collections), fuel costs for the Wastesavers fleet form part of the operational costs used to calculate the rate per tonne paid to Wastesavers from Newport City Council (NCC). The current system involves Wastesavers refuelling at local petrol stations at normal market rates. By contrast, NCC purchases fuel through a consortium so NCC vehicles are able to refuel in pumps located either at

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Telford or Docksway depot.

As for the South Wales Waste Management Group (SWWVG) membership, Resource Efficiency Wales Ltd (who are an organisation that has been working together with waste authorities in Wales to achieve environmental and economic efficiency savings for a number of years) introduced a Wastes Partnership Initiative to examine the potential for benefits arising from a collaborative and co-operative liaison, and SWWVG was created as a result. Currently NCC is a member of this group, together with 12 other Local Authorities, and the main aim of the group is to work collaboratively and share resources and work in regional contracts. This group is led by a regional coordinator and funded by its members' contributions. There are quarterly meetings and one annual conference NCC officers attend.

Key Objectives and Scope

Key objectives of this proposal are:

- Improved efficiency in recycling collections: proposal involves allowing Wastesavers access to the NCC pumps for refuelling, which means NCC would be in control of the recycling fleet fuel's consumption plus there would be added benefits linked to discounted fuel rates due to all the fuel being bought by NCC through a consortium, which would result in savings in the Streetscene budget.
- Avoidance of duplications by taking part in different groups who deal with the same waste issues and are in contact with all key players. As NCC already collaborates with neighbouring local authorities through different regional projects and is also a member of the CSS Waste group and keeps a close relationship with Welsh Government and other organisations as WLGA or WRAP, ceasing SWWVG membership would avoid this duplication plus would save NCC the corresponding fee payments from 2018/2019.

Options considered

1. Option 1: To implement the proposals

By implementing this proposal NCC would be saving £16,000 on an ongoing basis, with no effect on current services or resources.

A. Changes to Wastesavers refuelling system:

By implementing this proposal, forecast is a saving of approximately

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

£9k/year.

The proposal is based on removing fuel costs from Wastesavers budget, so NCC will be charged a reduced rate per tonne and the reduced fuel cost will be added to the Transport Unit budget to allow for the additional fuel expenditure, with a saving of approximately £9k/year.

By implementing this proposal NCC would benefit from a tighter fuel consumption control and reduced fuel rates that bring in savings. As a negative impact the changes would require traffic management on site to ensure Wastesavers' vehicles have access to NCC depots without interfering in day to day operations.

B. Cease SWWMG membership:

By implementing this proposal NCC would be saving £7,000 on an ongoing basis, with no effect on current services or resources. Negative impacts may arise from losing access to regional projects arranged through this partnership, but NCC already take part in similar groups or is in contact with other LAs etc. so this can be counteracted. On the positive side, NCC would be saving the membership fees.

2. Option 2: keep Status Quo

No changes would be implemented, there would not be any operational impact to current services but NCC would not achieve the key objectives detailed above or achieve the proposed savings

Recommended Proposal/Option

The recommended option is to implement the proposal:

A. Changes to Wastesavers refuelling system:

By implementing this proposal, forecast is a saving of approximately £9k, as detailed below:

	Annual consumption	WS price Q1	NCC price Q1	Cost/Saving
Fuel	137,820.00	0.9987	0.9322	9,165.04

Calculations are based on the estimated annual consumption of fuel and the average prices paid for fuel by Wastesavers and NCC, respectively, for Q1 this year.

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Wastesavers vehicles would operate in a similar way to NCC owned vehicles: they would be issued a key and pin numbers so the drivers can operate the pumps, and regular monitoring on fuel consumption etc. could be done as part of the monitoring system currently in place.

Hence a small initial outlay for purchasing keys for refuelling needs to be added:

Additional costs	Price	Number	Total
Keys	6	19	114

The proposal is based on removing fuel costs from Wastesavers budget (coded to NN02 46170 3409), so NCC will be charged a reduced rate per tonne (£138k deducted from total operational costs) and an extra £129k will be added to the Transport Unit budget to allow for the additional fuel expenditure, with a saving of approximately £9k/year.

The proposal does not have any impact on staffing levels.

- B. By implementing this proposal NCC would be saving £7,000 on an ongoing basis, with no effect on current services or resources.

Fee gets paid on an annual basis in April at the beginning of the financial year; implementation would imply a saving of £7,000 from NN02 46170 3812

Required Investment

There are no implementation costs involved:

- Regarding SWWMG the only action needed is to cease membership
- As for refuelling, NCC already has a fuelling system in operation, Wastesavers drivers would just need to be set up in the system and new fuelling keys distributed. This would have a one-off cost of £114 that has been netted off the savings.

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

High Level Milestones and Timescales

Activity	Action	Implementation date	Comments
Changes to refuelling system	Budget realignment	February 2017	Agree 2018/2019 draft budget with Wastesavers-fuel costs excluded Agree changes to NCC budgets with Finance
	Drivers training	March 2017	Keys ordered and distributed Training to drivers provided
SWWMG	Cease payments	April 2018	

Key Risks/issues

Risk Description	Risk Score (as per matrix below)	Mitigation Measures
Congestion at fuel pumps	9	Traffic management and imposition of time restrictions for Wastesavers to access pumps
Missed out information or exclusion from consultation processes etc.	3	NCC already takes part in all collaborative arrangements in the region and has arrangements in place to share information with neighbouring Local Authorities, Welsh Government and relevant organisations in the sector

Risks have been scored using the following matrix and scoring mechanism

Probability description	Score
Very Low probability	1
Low probability	2
Medium probability	3
High probability	4
Very high probability	5

Impact description	Score
Negligible	1
Low	2
Medium	3
High	4
Very High	5

Probability	1	2	3	4	5
5	5	10	15	20	25
4	4	8	12	16	20
3	3	6	9	12	15
2	2	4	6	8	10
1	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5

Impact

Specific linkage with Future generation act requirements

Integration – This proposal contributes to the Greener city objective.

Long Term – The proposal allows for a better management of the recycling collections contract.

Prevention – This proposal allows for a more efficient use of resources and more streamlined operations.

Collaboration – By reviewing SWWMG partnership the service area has assessed current collaboration arrangements in place and it has been

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

determined that current situation is very strong in terms of partnerships, group memberships etc..

Involvement – The proposal contributes to further integration of the council activities with Wastesavers, a third sector organisation, and adds resilience to the partnership, allowing them to continue their work with the community.

Fairness and Equality Impact Assessment

Not required

HEAD OF SERVICE BUDGET DECISION

Service Area: Streetscene & City Services	Activity code: STR 4 5 6 8 12 13 14 16 17 23 24 25	Ref No: SS181908
--	---	----------------------------

Saving Title: Service improvement and efficiency savings

Saving description: Creation of a service development officer and performance information analyst to support Streetscene and City Services in improvement and delivery of MTRP savings, including historical non achieved MTRP savings from 2016.

The posts will be funded through an Invest To Save on a 2 year fixed term contract, subject to approval. These arrangements will be reviewed at the end of the period, and consideration will be given to incorporating the resource into the proposed central based Intelligence Hub. (what is the Intelligence Hub??)

Over the past four months the head of service and senior finance business partner have overseen a budget realignment and series of departmental budget changes which has seen the forecast overspend reduce from £1M to £250K for the current year. , However it is recognised that for this progress to continue an improved management structure and improved data analysis are needed. The former process is in progress with the imminent move to a functional team manager structure and suitable alignment of budget responsibilities.

There is a requirement for a dedicated Streetscene resource to review and recommend the performance analysis and management requirements of the service area to improve service performance and delivery. The proposed resource will help the service deliver MTRP savings

The proposed team will consist of the following 3 posts:

- 1 x service development o grade 7 (£36,248 including on costs)
- 2 x performance information analysts grade 5 (£22,754 including on costs)

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Net Savings (£000's)	325			
FTE's impact	3 increase			

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Implementation Costs (- £000's)				
Revenue (state type):	82	61		
Capital (state what):	0	0		

Any impact on (i) service ?	No
(ii) performance ?	No
(iii) risk ?	No

If yes, please state impact on each applicable area:

Does this require an 'equalities impact assessment?		An FEIA is not required as these proposals do not impact on current service provision, policy or strategy.
Any impact on Future Generations Act?. (If yes, explain impact)		
Integration (YES/NO)	None	
Long Term (YES / NO)	None	
Prevention (YES / NO)	None	
Collaboration (YES / NO)	None	
Involvement (YES / NO)	None	

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Service Area	Regeneration, Investment & Housing
Unique Reference Number	RIH181901
Proposal Title	Asset rationalisation: Information Station
Version	20/12/2017
Proposal Summary Description	Asset rationalisation – enabling the National Software Academy (NSA) to remain and further develop within Newport City while increasing utilisation of the Civic Centre and other city centre buildings.
Impact on Performance	None
Impact on FTE Count	None
Impact on other Service Areas	Temporary moving arrangements relating to office moves are likely to have an impact on internal service areas that are based at the Information Station, Central Library and Civic Centre.
Impact on Citizens	Location for point of delivery will change for certain services but levels of service and access to service delivery will not change.
Delegated Decision (Head of Service/Cabinet Member/ Cabinet)	Head of Service
Activity Code	RIH8 Station Buildings

Net Savings (£000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
	180			

Implementation Costs (- £000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Revenue – Redundancy/Pension				
Revenue – External consultants				
Revenue - Other				
Capital – Building related	1,500			
Capital – Other				
Implementation Cost - Total	1,500			

Current Position
Newport City Council is the leaseholder of the Information Station, Queensway, Newport, until 2028. Network Rail owns the building. To date, the council has operated the building as a 'Face to Face' contact centre.
Key Objectives and Scope

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

1. To retain and develop the growth of the National Software Academy (NSA) within Newport City.
2. Asset rationalisation of key buildings.
3. Greater utilisation of retained buildings owned by the council.

Options considered

1. Continue to lease and occupy the entire five floors of the Information Station building, but this does not rationalise assets, neither does increase use of other city centre buildings or the Civic Centre.

2. To sub-lease three of the five floors to National Software Academy (NSA) for a similar duration as the head lease to Newport City Council.

Recommended Proposal/Option

Lease three floors of the five floors at the Information Station to the National Software Academy (NSA), Cardiff University, in conjunction with Welsh Government.

This is the National Software Academy for Wales and the Information Station has been identified as the most suitable building being close to the railway station

Required Investment

£1,500,000 of capital borrowing repaid over a period of 15 years funded from the revenue saving associated with the project.

High Level Milestones and Timescales

One floor leased to NSA	December 2017
Second and third floors leased to NSA	May 2018

Key Risks/Issues

Risk Description	Risk Score (as per matrix below)	Mitigation Measures
Increased repair and maintenance liability with external organisation (NSA) taking sub-lease from NCC head lease.	16	Suitable facilities management arrangements in place to manage day to day activities and interface.
Implementation of staff moves to the Civic Centre is not met in the timescales.	10	Newport City Council have established a project team to undertake this work and regular meetings and control is in place.

Specific linkage with Future Generation Act requirements

Joint working between the National Software Academy (Cardiff University), Newport City Council and Welsh Government is aimed at generating new businesses that are likely to share premises with, or be located close to, the NSA in order to access the

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

growing pipeline of highly skilled graduates.

More than 120 different organisations have all actively engaged with the NSA over the last 12-18 months and this is forecast to significantly increase in their larger premises at the Information Station building.

The NSA was set up to develop particular skills in computer software design, product development, entrepreneurial and market development skills. This has been a success as it is considered a centre of excellence and is a boost for the city of Newport. The council would prefer to see the NSA remain in Newport as it demonstrates the city is a place to invest in new business for the long term.

Fairness and Equality Impact Assessment

None.

This page is intentionally left blank

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Service Area	Regeneration Investment and Housing
Unique Reference Number	RIH181902
Proposal Title	Grants for Family Information Service (FIS)
Version	20/12/2017
Proposal Summary Description	Reduce grants and contribution budgets by £26k. The current budget is £128,357. This reduction will reduce the value of grants and support to the independent childcare sector.
Impact on Performance	The financial aid supports the work of the independent childcare sector and impact the amount of training and financial support
Impact on FTE Count	None
Impact on other Service Areas	None
Impact on Citizens	The private childcare sector will have reduced access to grants and training
Delegated Decision (Head of Service/Cabinet Member/ Cabinet)	HoS Delegated Decision
Activity Code	RIH27 Partnerships

**Only detail high level 'total' figures in tables below. Do not break down costs into separate elements within the table as more detailed description can be given in the 'Required Investment' section. In year savings 2017/18 should not be included in table.*

Net Savings (£000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
	26			

Implementation Costs (- £000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Revenue – Redundancy/Pension	0			
Revenue – External consultants	NA			
Revenue - Other	NA			
Capital – Building related	NA			
Capital - Other	NA			
Implementation Cost - Total				

Current Position

The council has a statutory duty to ensure there is adequate information, advice and assistance to parents, prospective parents and those with parental responsibility or care of a child, relating to childcare.

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

The statutory duty is not defined .

The council will need to monitor its gradual reduction in spending in service areas considered “statutory light” to avoid accidentally finding itself in special measures

Key Objectives and Scope

Reduce grants and contribution budgets by 26k. The current budget is £128,327. This reduction will reduce the value of grants and support to the independent childcare sector.

Options considered

It would be very difficult to cut further budget from the libraries or museums without further consequences. In terms of Library spend Newport is the lowest per head of population by some distance.

Further reductions in branches and/or opening hours will have further effect on library visitor numbers. The Museum and Art Gallery will almost certainly have to close if further savings are requested. Against this difficult backdrop the Family Information Service has remain unscathed and a reduction of 20 per cent % in support spending should be considered.

Recommended Proposal/Option

Reduce grants and contribution budget lines by 26k. The current budget is £128,357. This reduction will reduce the value of grants and support to the independent childcare sector.

Required Investment

This budget reduction does not require any investment.

High Level Milestones and Timescales

The measure can be introduced at the beginning of the next financial year yielding a full year saving.

Key Risks/issues

Risk Description	Risk Score (as per matrix below)	Mitigation Measures
Perceived failure to meet the Councils statutory duty under the Childcare Act 2006	9	The reduction retains 100k of investment in grants and support and within the wider context of local government can be argued as being reasonable
Reduction in provision at a time when the Welsh	9	The position regarding the 30 hour childcare offer for

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Government is investing a significant amount of money and political focus in to their 30 hour childcare offer to working parents,

working parents will be monitored, but early signs are that most working parents are solving their own childcare challenges

Risks should be scored using the following matrix and scoring mechanism

Probability description	Score
Very Low probability	1
Low probability	2
Medium probability	3
High probability	4
Very high probability	5

Impact description	Score
Negligible	1
Low	2
Medium	3
High	4
Very High	5

Probability	5	5	10	15	20	25
	4	4	8	12	16	20
	3	3	6	9	12	15
	2	2	4	6	8	10
	1	1	2	3	4	5
		1	2	3	4	5
		Impact				

Specific linkage with Future generation act requirements

Integration – The reduction in spending in this budget will help protect more critical areas of expenditure

Long Term - Operating within the set budget envelope is essential for long term sustainability of the Council service provision.

Prevention -

Collaboration - MTRP savings have been identified through working with colleagues across the Regeneration Investment and Housing department

Involvement

Fairness and Equality Impact Assessment

Yes

This page is intentionally left blank

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Service Area	Regeneration, Investment and Housing
Unique Reference Number	RIH181903
Proposal Title	Modernised Development Services
Version	20/12/2017
Proposal Summary Description	Removal of building control budget, increase in pre-application income and reduction in staff in pooled administration and technical support teams.
Impact on Performance	Building control - none. Pre-application advice – none. Admin and technical support – There will be some delay to undertake support tasks as workload is redistributed amongst existing staff. Unlikely to significantly affect target timescales and performance.
Impact on FTE Count	Building Control: 0 Development Management (Pre-app): 0 Pooled admin : Loss of one FTE from a Team of three FTEs. Technical support: Loss of one FTE from a team of eight FTEs
Impact on other Service Areas	Building control: None Development management (pre-application): additional cost for other Service areas as planning advice on potential development proposals, previously provided free, will now be charged in accordance with the existing schedule of fees. Fees are calculated on type of development and are calculated on a cost recovery basis. Pooled admin: loss of one FTE will affect the rate at which some support services are provided including processing Norse invoices and purchase orders, providing information for legal searches and coordinating FOI responses. Technical support (planning systems): Loss of one FTE will affect the speed at which some tech support services are provided including plotting of planning and building control applications which link into the website resulting in a slight delay in consultees being able to view new applications online.
Impact on Citizens	Building Control: None Development Management (Pre-app): planning advice on potential development proposals and permitted development, which were previously provided free of charge will now be charged in accordance with existing schedule of fees. Fees are calculated on type of development and are calculated on a cost recovery basis.

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

	<p>Pooled admin: Loss of 1FTE will affect the speed at which some support services are provided including providing information for legal searches and coordinating FOI responses.</p> <p>technical Support (planning systems): Loss of 1FTE will affect the speed at which some Tech Support services are provided including plotting of planning and building control applications which link into the website resulting in a slight delay in the public being able to view new applications online.</p>
Delegated Decision (Head of Service/Cabinet Member/ Cabinet)	Head of Service
Activity Code	RIH11 Building Control, RIH13 R&R Pooled Admin, AIH16 Development Management

**Only detail high level 'total' figures in tables below. Do not break down costs into separate elements within the table as more detailed description can be given in the 'Required Investment' section. In year savings 2017/18 should not be included in table.*

Net Savings (£000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
	59			

Implementation Costs (- £000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Revenue – Redundancy/Pension	70*			
Revenue – External consultants				
Revenue - Other				
Capital – Building related				
Capital - Other				
Implementation Cost - Total	70*			

**Subject to confirmation by HR*

Current Position
<p>Building Control:</p> <p>The building control team consist of one FTE building control manager, four FTE building inspectors and one FTE admin support. The team oversee the implementation and enforcement of the building regulations. This involves the processing of applications and undertaking site inspections with income derived from associated fees. Monitoring of construction projects can also be overseen by privately commissioned approved inspectors, therefore the service needs to be competitively priced. The enforcement of building regulations and dangerous structures is a statutory function which can only be undertaken by the council. It is estimated that the council have 79 per cent of the market share of building control applications, with the remaining 21 per cent undertaken via approved inspectors. Demand for the service is largely responsive to the private market and any periods of recession affect the amount of development taking place.</p>

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

The building control service currently has a net budget of £14,531 and completed the last financial year with an over recovery of £109,986. This was due to over recovery of income from fees and staff cost savings due to vacant posts. All posts are now filled.

Pre-application Advice:

The planning service provides pre-application advice for developers seeking informal discussions around proposed developments. The section provides a discretionary and a statutory service. The fees for the statutory service are prescribed by legislation and the fees for the discretionary service are required to be cost recovery only. The main difference between the two services is the discretionary service allows for a round the table meeting with the developer and a planning officer/technical specialist. The provision of pre-application advice is encouraged by Welsh Government on the basis that identifies potential problems before an application is formally submitted. There are 11.1 FTE planning officers delivering the pre-application service as part of their general development management duties. The cost of delivering the pre-application service is embedded within the current net budget for development management which currently stands at £269,671. Response times are subject to specified targets but performance is not part of the Welsh Government data returns.

The service currently has an income target of £20,000. The approved schedule of charges includes a number of exemptions for certain types of development and groups. These include heritage proposals (advice relating to works to listed buildings), tree proposals (for trees protected by Tree Preservation Orders or protected by a Conservation Area), small scale development for a non-profit making community facility, registered charity or voluntary sector organisation, development proposals for the council's own assets or community council proposals, and permitted development and general enquiries from householders. There is no difference in the level of advice provided between the paid and exempt service.

Pooled admin:

As part of a service review for the Regeneration, Investment and Housing Service in 2012, all general administrative staff were centrally pooled and provide administrative support to all service areas. Specific technical support functions were retained within the relevant teams. The pooled admin team has a budget of £66,358 and consist of three FTEs. They provide admin support for the head of service and service managers as well as processing invoices and purchase orders for the integrated property unit and internal room bookings. They provide information for legal searches to the land charges section and are also responsible for coordinating Freedom of Information responses and performance indicator data collection. The team manage operational issues such as stationary, photocopiers and incoming and outgoing mail.

Technical support (planning systems):

Development services covers the planning, planning policy and building control functions which are facilitated by the use of a back office IT system. The day to day operation, problem resolution and plotting/uploading of data to website is coordinated and overseen by 2FTEs. Corporate IT assistance is provided for network and server issues but as an IT package bespoke to development services, the day to day management of the system is the responsibility of the Service Area. The efficiency of the Planning Service is measured by the time taken to issue a decision, with the national target being 80% of all decisions made within eight weeks of receipt (monitored through a performance indicator). This data is collected on a quarterly basis by the Council and Welsh Government and the results published on the Welsh Government website. Every council also needs to submit an annual performance report which rates their performance against a number of indicators and benchmarks. In order to provide an efficient and timely service, it is necessary to ensure that the

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

registration of applications and the undertaking of the public and statutory consultation process is undertaken as quickly as possible. Residents and statutory consultees rely on the council's website to access uploaded documents. Any delay in completing the registration process impacts on the ability of the service to meet performance targets.

Key Objectives and Scope

Building control:

To make the building control service cost neutral by removing the allocated budget of £14,531. The team would be required to increase marketing and enforcement activity in order to increase income to cover the decrease in core budget. This would require an increase of at least 5 per cent in the market share of available building control submissions. No changes to existing staff levels are proposed.

Increasing pre-application Income:

To revise the list of existing exemptions and increase income by at least £3,000. The following exemptions would be removed and charges levied in accordance with the existing schedule of fees:

- Heritage proposals (advice relating to works to listed buildings),
- Development proposals for the Council's own assets, and
- Permitted development enquiries for householder development.

It is not proposed to amend the scale of fees as these are regularly reviewed in accordance with the requirement to be based on cost recovery only.

Deleting one FTE pooled admin:

To reduce the number of staff in the pooled admin Team by one FTE. This will be achieved through the reallocation of work within the service area.

Deleting 1FTE planning systems assistant:

To reduce the number of planning system support staff by one FTE. This will be achieved through the reallocation of work within the development management team.

Options considered

Building Control:

- 1) Increase staff numbers by 1FTE in order to be more proactive and secure more income.
 - Additional cost of £44,437 for an additional building control officer to enable more proactive marketing of the service, greater partnership working opportunities and increased enforcement work.
 - No noticeable difference to the service available to the public.
 - By increasing the market share of available building control work from 79 per cent to 90 per cent, this equates to an additional income in the region of £34,500. This would not cover the costs of employing an additional building control officer and would require increased budget allocation
 - There is no guarantee of securing additional income from building control applications. Private sector approved inspectors are able to offer better incentives to secure certain contracts and it is unlikely that councils would be able to realistically secure more than another 5per

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

cent of the market share without government intervention.

- 2) Retain existing staff numbers but make the service cost neutral.
 - Increasing income targets by £14,531 will require increased marketing and more proactive enforcement by existing staff to achieve at least a 5 per cent increase in the building control applications market.
 - No noticeable difference to the service available to the public.
 - Service is reliant on the construction market which is affected by the economy. During a recession period, income will be unpredictable and there may be pressures from the under recovery of income.
- 3) Ceasing to provide non statutory building control functions.
 - The loss of four FTE building control officers and one FTE admin support officer (currently filled posts). Only one FTE officer would be retained to cover statutory functions such as dangerous structures and enforcement. Income would be minimal as the service would be unable to process standard building control applications.
 - Existing budget would need to be retained and an additional cost of £35,000 to cover the cost of one FTE officer to undertake statutory functions.
 - Noticeable difference to the service offered to the public as they would no longer be able to submit applications for approval to the council

Increasing Pre-application Income:

- 1) Remove all exemptions and charge for all forms of pre-application advice.
 - Potential additional income Risk of people choosing not to use the service and proceeding to submit applications which require more amendment or negotiation. This impacts on the efficiency of the development management team and adversely affects performance figures and Welsh Government data returns.
 - Noticeable difference to service users as they would now be required to pay for a service which was previously provided free of charge. This would include householders, charities, community councils and the council's own property agents.
- 2) Review the list of exemptions.
 - Potential additional income as some exemptions are removed to reflect the amount of work involved in providing advice or to bring them in line with charging schedules at other authorities. Pre-application advice for listed buildings and the council's own assets involves a considerable amount of work for existing officers due to the nature of the proposals and the frequency of enquiries. While listed building applications incur no statutory fee, both types of enquiry are often very detailed and require significant officer involvement. In respect of householder permitted development enquiries, other councils such as Blaenau Gwent currently charge £25 for advice on permitted development. Pre-application advice for householder developments is already chargeable at £25 under the statutory system.
 - Risk of service users not using the service and proceeding to submit applications which require more amendment or negotiation. These applications would take more time to process which impacts on the efficiency of the development management team. This adversely affects performance figures and Welsh Government data returns.

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

- Noticeable difference to some service users as they would now be required to pay for a service which was previously provided free of charge, particularly householders.

- 3) Retain the exemptions list as currently approved.
 - Council continues to provide advice free of charge.
 - No noticeable difference to service users.

Deleting one FTE Pooled Admin:

- 1) Retain the pooled admin team as existing.
 - Retain the current level of admin support for the service area in order to provide greater resilience to the admin No change to existing filled posts.
- 2) Reduce the Pooled Admin team by one FTE.
 - Budget saving of £20,565 from the deletion of one FTE position, currently filled.
 - Reallocation of some work will be required.
 - Potential delay in administering and coordinating Freedom of Information enquiries, undertaking legal searches and processing purchase orders and invoices.
- 3) Delete the pooled admin team (three FTEs).
 - Budget saving of £66,358 with no admin function provided.
 - Reallocation of all work resulting in delays to other services.
 - Significant delays in administering and co-ordinating Freedom of Information enquiries, performance data returns, undertaking legal searches and processing purchase orders and invoices.

Deleting one FTE planning systems assistant:

- 1) Retain the technical support team as existing.
 - Retain the current level of technical support in order to provide greater resilience to the team.
 - No change to existing filled posts.
- 2) Reduce the technical support team by one FTE planning systems assistant.
 - Budget saving of £20,450 from the deletion of one FTE position, currently filled.
 - Reallocation of some work and training to provide some resilience to the Team.
 - Potential delay in plotting and registering planning applications resulting in delays to the public viewing development proposals and delays to the commencement of the consultation process. This would shorten the amount of time planning officers have to determine an application and could lead to delays which would affect performance targets.

Recommended Proposal/Option

Building Control
Option 2:

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Increasing pre-application income:
Option 2

Deleting one FTE pooled admin:
Option 2

Deleting 1FTE planning systems assistant:
Option 2

The proposals above will help modernise the delivery of the development management service.

Required Investment

Building Control Cost Neutral:
No financial cost.
Additional Support required from Corporate Marketing Team.

Increasing Pre-application Income:
No financial cost.
No additional support required to implement.

Deleting 1FTE Pooled Admin:
Redundancy Cost of approximately £25,000*
Potential pension strain cost (assumed £20,000*)
HR Support required.

Deleting 1FTE Planning Systems Assistant:
Redundancy Cost of approximately £25,000*
HR Support required.

*Awaiting confirmation of actual costs from Payroll

High Level Milestones and Timescales

Building Control Cost Neutral:
Budget reduction for 2018/19.

Increasing Pre-application Income:
Increase in income target for 2018/19.
Implementation of revised exemptions list by 1st April 2018.

Deleting 1FTE Pooled Admin:
Implementation by 1st April 2018.

Deleting 1FTE Planning Systems Assistant:
Implementation by 1st April 2018.

Key Risks/issues

Building Control

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Risk Description	Risk Score (as per matrix below)	Mitigation Measures
No increase in income to cover the cost of the Service	6	Increased public marketing of the Service will be undertaken in order to increase awareness of the Service and the Building Control Manager will negotiate partnership working arrangements with Developers.

Increase in Pre-application Income

Risk Description	Risk Score (as per matrix below)	Mitigation Measures
Not meeting income target as Service users choose not to engage with a fee paying service.	4	Increased marketing of the Service with Planning Agents and the public will be undertaken to increase awareness of the benefits of engaging with a paid pre-app facility.

Deletion of 1FTE Pooled Admin Officer

Risk Description	Risk Score (as per matrix below)	Mitigation Measures
Delay in undertaking tasks such as processing payments, Freedom of Information requests and providing information for legal searches	4	Tasks will be re-distributed amongst existing Pooled Admin and Tech Support staff within the Service Area.

Deletion of 1FTE Planning Systems Assistant

Risk Description	Risk Score (as per matrix below)	Mitigation Measures
Delay in undertaking tasks such as plotting and registering planning applications resulting in delays to the public viewing development proposals and delays to the commencement of the consultation process.	9	Tasks will be re-distributed amongst existing Technical Support Team and appropriate training given to undertake new tasks.

Risks should be scored using the following matrix and scoring mechanism

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

<i>Probability description</i>	<i>Score</i>
<i>Very Low probability</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Low probability</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Medium probability</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>High probability</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Very high probability</i>	<i>5</i>

<i>Impact description</i>	<i>Score</i>
<i>Negligible</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Low</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Medium</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>High</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Very High</i>	<i>5</i>

Probability	5	5	10	15	20	25
	4	4	8	12	16	20
	3	3	6	9	12	15
	2	2	4	6	8	10
	1	1	2	3	4	5
		1	2	3	4	5
		Impact				

Specific linkage with Future Generation Act requirements

Integration – The proposals seek to integrate with the aims of the emerging Corporate Plan which seeks to use our resources to best effect and provide service users with a Service that meets their needs. In particular the building control function and pre-application advice service is essential to meeting the Improvement Plan objective which prioritises and encourages city regeneration and development.

Long Term – The proposal will enable the council to continue to provide a good quality building control and pre-application advice service which meets the requirements of Service users and helps meet the Improvement Plan objective which prioritises city regeneration and development. Good quality development leads to more cohesive communities and a more prosperous Wales.

Prevention – Good quality and safe development will prevent further decline in key parts of the city which enables the council to build a better Newport and more cohesive communities. This is essential to meeting the Improvement Plan objective which prioritises and encourages city regeneration and development.

Collaboration – Development services work closely with other council departments and the private sector to deliver good quality, appropriate and safe developments. Early engagement with, and the provision of a good technical service enables the council to build a better Newport which leads to more cohesive communities and a more prosperous Wales.

Involvement – A modernised approach to delivering the development management service together with increased promotion of the benefits of the service will be targeted at key stakeholders. This will encourage increased use of the service and lead to the delivery of more a cohesive service.

Fairness and Equality Impact Assessment

No

This page is intentionally left blank

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Service Area	Regeneration, Investment & Housing
Unique Reference Number	RIH181904
Proposal Title	Review of Youth Service
Version	20/12/2017
Proposal Summary Description	Working with external funders to maintain the services while reducing costs. Reduce team by one youth worker
Impact on Performance	<i>There will be no impact on performance, as the role has been absorbed into a new programme that is externally funded.</i>
Impact on FTE Count	<i>Reduction of 1 x FTE (Vacant)</i>
Impact on other Service Areas	<i>The level of service has been maintained as it is delivered through a new externally funded programme.</i>
Impact on Citizens	<i>There will be no impact to citizens as the level of service has been maintained through an externally funded programme.</i>
Delegated Decision (Head of Service/Cabinet Member/ Cabinet)	HoS
Activity Code	RIH21 Youth Core

**Only detail high level 'total' figures in tables below. Do not break down costs into separate elements within the table as more detailed description can be given in the 'Required Investment' section. In year savings 2017/18 should not be included in table.*

Net Savings (£000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
	27			

Implementation Costs (- £000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Revenue – Redundancy/Pension	0			
Revenue – External consultants	0			
Revenue - Other	0			
Capital – Building related	0			
Capital - Other	0			
Implementation Cost - Total	0			

Current Position

- The position works with young people within schools who have been identified as being at risk of not achieving whilst in education.*

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

- *The position will provide interventions to a young person to improve attainment, attendance and wellbeing.*
- *The Youth Service through its core programme has delivered interventions to young people in schools who have been identified as at risk of not achieving. In 2016 Newport City Council Youth service gained approval to except an externally funded programme that identified young people within schools to improve attainment and achievement, therefore we identified duplication with the current delivery provided by core services. During 2017/18 the post holder requested redundancy from the local authority due to ill health. Therefore the post has been empty for almost 6 months, due to the recognition of the duplication with the new programme a stop to recruitment was implemented, there has been no impact on performance.*
- *Due to the new programme starting there has been no impact to the service or interventions to young people, schools and young people have seen greater support than previously delivered.*
- *Reduction in the core youth service budget of £27,269*
- *Performance of the post is measured by the number of young people engaged and a measure of their progression to improved attainment and attendance. Due to the introduction of a new team the previous targets set have been absorbed in to the team and therefore greater performance will be seen as a result.*

Key Objectives and Scope

- *To delete 1x Youth Worker position.*
- *This position was vacated in May 2017.*
- *The position delivered interventions in schools to young people who are not attending school or achieving.*
- *A new externally funded team was introduced to the Youth Service in 2016 that delivered exactly the same interventions.*
- *Duplication between the roles has been identified. Therefore no recruitment to the post has taken place.*
- *The post is not match funded to any programmes.*

Options considered

1. *Recruit to current position – This will add an additional resource to the new team and improve current performance.*
2. *Recruit to position and change its focus – This would support the core youth provision to improve the interventions the offer outside of the school. Focus activities on recently identified activities. Such as diversionary activities.*
3. *Delete the position – The position is duplication of the new introduced programme, it has been vacant since May 2017 and there has been no impact on performance.*

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Recommended Proposal/Option																																																																						
<p>Delete the position – The position is duplication of the new introduced programme, it has been vacant since May 2017 and there has been no impact on performance. Creating a financial saving of £27,269</p>																																																																						
Required Investment																																																																						
<p>The post is currently vacant, no resource required.</p>																																																																						
High Level Milestones and Timescales																																																																						
<p>Immediate effect</p>																																																																						
Key Risks/issues																																																																						
Risk Description	Risk Score (as per matrix below)	Mitigation Measures																																																																				
Performance	2	New programme delivering the activity																																																																				
New programme has funding for up to 5 years, what will happen post that.	25	Working with funders and partners to create further opportunities for funding.																																																																				
<p><i>Risks should be scored using the following matrix and scoring mechanism</i></p>																																																																						
<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Probability description</td> <td>Score</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Very Low probability</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Low probability</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Medium probability</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>High probability</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Very high probability</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Impact description</td> <td>Score</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Negligible</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Low</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Medium</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>High</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Very High</td> <td>5</td> </tr> </table>	Probability description	Score	Very Low probability	1	Low probability	2	Medium probability	3	High probability	4	Very high probability	5	Impact description	Score	Negligible	1	Low	2	Medium	3	High	4	Very High	5	<table border="1"> <tr> <td rowspan="5">Probability</td> <td>5</td> <td>5</td> <td>10</td> <td>15</td> <td>20</td> <td>25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>4</td> <td>8</td> <td>12</td> <td>16</td> <td>20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>3</td> <td>6</td> <td>9</td> <td>12</td> <td>15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>2</td> <td>4</td> <td>6</td> <td>8</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td colspan="5">Impact</td> </tr> </table>	Probability	5	5	10	15	20	25	4	4	8	12	16	20	3	3	6	9	12	15	2	2	4	6	8	10	1	1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			Impact				
Probability description	Score																																																																					
Very Low probability	1																																																																					
Low probability	2																																																																					
Medium probability	3																																																																					
High probability	4																																																																					
Very high probability	5																																																																					
Impact description	Score																																																																					
Negligible	1																																																																					
Low	2																																																																					
Medium	3																																																																					
High	4																																																																					
Very High	5																																																																					
Probability	5	5	10	15	20	25																																																																
	4	4	8	12	16	20																																																																
	3	3	6	9	12	15																																																																
	2	2	4	6	8	10																																																																
	1	1	2	3	4	5																																																																
		1	2	3	4	5																																																																
		Impact																																																																				
Specific linkage with Future generation act requirements																																																																						

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Integration – The implementation of this proposal will have no impact on the delivery of outcomes to any plans. The introduction of a new externally funded team has helped to enhance the delivery of;

- Improved skills, educational outcomes and employment opportunities
- Build cohesive and sustainable communities

Long Term – The proposal is to replace the core provision with externally funded provision which guarantees local delivery for up to 5 years. The impact such activities will have on young people as a result of the programme will provide a greater impact over further years.

Prevention – This proposal secures this activity for up to 5 years, impacting positively in meeting objectives such as;

- Improved school attainment and educational outcomes
- Supporting young people into education and employment
- Prevent offending and reoffending of young people
- Prevent and tackle instances of ASB

Collaboration - The implementation of the new project has created a working partnership with high schools, education service, Families First, Communities First and the Careers service. Previously the Youth worker was working only in partnership with the high schools.

Involvement – Key partners have been involved in the implementation of the new programme therefore they have seen the increase to provision not a decrease. Once the proposal is accepted, consultation with high schools and education partners will begin and assurances can be made that there will be no impact to services.

Fairness and Equality Impact Assessment

None

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Service Area	Regeneration, Investment & Housing
Unique Reference Number	RIH181905
Proposal Title	Housing and Maintenance Efficiencies
Version	20/12/2017
Proposal Summary Description	Housing and Assets – Efficient and improved ways of budget monitoring and processing to rates, response and carbon budget reductions. Carbon, rates and vacant properties response budget reductions.
Impact on Performance	Carbon consumption throughout the estate could increase.
Impact on FTE Count	None
Impact on other Service Areas	None
Impact on Citizens	None
Delegated Decision (Head of Service/Cabinet Member/ Cabinet)	Head of Service
Activity Code	RIH7 Civic Centre Facilities Management

Net Savings (£000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
	203			

Implementation Costs (- £000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Revenue – Redundancy/Pension				
Revenue – External consultants				
Revenue - Other				
Capital – Building related				
Capital - Other				
Implementation Cost - Total				

Current Position

The management of non-domestic (building) rates and water rates have been managed centrally within the Housing and Assets service area, until the financial year of 2018/19, where it will be managed by individual service areas.

The management of vacant properties has until recently been managed between service areas and the Housing and Assets service area. A protocol has been developed, communicated and implemented for the Management of Vacant Properties across the Newport City Council estate.

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Carbon management in previous years has been through an annual submission of the Carbon Reduction Commitment managed by Natural Resources Wales and due to the length of the scheme, credits have been permitted to be carried forward for use in subsequent years. The financial year 2018/19 is the final year of the CRC scheme and there are some carried forward credits which enable a budget saving to be made.

Key Objectives and Scope

To develop a modernised way of working, including improved monitoring of carbon consumption, vacant properties estate and service area management, including budget management as well as greater adherence to a revised scheme, policy and protocol.

Options considered

The disaggregation of rates budget management has resulted in an improved budget position as detailed in next section of this document.

Carbon budget management changes are legislative and governed by Natural Resources Wales, therefore no consideration for payment or options.

Recommended Proposal/Option

A total saving across Housing and Assets service area through efficient and improved ways of budget monitoring and processing to rates, response and carbon budget reductions of £203,000 within the financial year of 2018/19. This figure comprises the following budget areas;

- Reduction to the carbon management budget of £70,000
- Reduce the vacant properties response budget by £20,000
- De-centralised non-domestic rates budget to be reduced by £48,000
- Water rates have been de-centralised and budget reduced by £65,000

Required Investment

None.

High Level Milestones and Timescales

April 2018.

Key Risks/Issues

Risk Description	Risk Score (as per matrix below)	Mitigation Measures
Reduced budgets could be overspent against.	6	Monthly monitoring to be undertaken and approvals sought from Service Manager and Head of Service against the budget managers.
Vacant properties held by	12	Corporate Asset

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Housing & Assets service area could require additional in-year budget.		Management Plan (CAMP) is being revised for 2018/19 including disposals schedule and timeframe.
Carbon consumption throughout the estate could significantly increase the payment to be made to Natural Resources Wales.	8	Software has been introduced and a further enhancement is planned to enable an improved interface between carbon consumption and finance monitoring. Energy & Sustainability Manager to monitor position throughout the year.
Specific linkage with Future generation act requirements		
<p>These proposals include an integrated and modernised way of working through changes to process and budget monitoring which enable changes to the budgets.</p> <p>The longer term strategies and constraints of legislation have been accounted for within the forecasted financial pressures and have allowed reductions to be made to the carbon management budget line.</p> <p>Developing, implementing and managing these changes are due to the close internal working relationship between service areas.</p> <p>Key stakeholders, such as Newport Norse and other service areas are key to the success of these proposals and their engagement has been undertaken early in their development and will continue through their development.</p>		
Fairness and Equality Impact Assessment		
None.		

This page is intentionally left blank

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Service Area	<i>Regeneration, Investment & Housing</i>
Unique Reference Number	<i>RIH181906</i>
Proposal Title	<i>Co-funding for a community development worker</i>
Version	<i>20/12/2017</i>
Proposal Summary Description	<i>It is proposed to delete an existing post and work in partnership with a community association to make a 50 per cent contribution to maintain the role in the community. The association will fund the other 50 per cent of the role.</i>
Impact on Performance	<i>None</i>
Impact on FTE Count	<i>Reduction of one FTE post</i>
Impact on other Service Areas	<i>The level of service will be maintained as it will still be delivered through a partner.</i>
Impact on Citizens	<i>None</i>
Delegated Decision (Head of Service/Cabinet Member/ Cabinet)	<i>Head of Service</i>
Activity Code	<i>RIH20 Community Development Core</i>

**Only detail high level 'total' figures in tables below. Do not break down costs into separate elements within the table as more detailed description can be given in the 'Required Investment' section. In year savings 2017/18 should not be included in table.*

Net Savings (£000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
	14			

Implementation Costs (- £000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Revenue – Redundancy/Pension	24			
Revenue – External consultants	0			
Revenue - Other	0			
Capital – Building related	0			
Capital - Other	0			
Implementation Cost - Total	0			

Current Position
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The post holder works with community groups and individuals to identify gaps in activities and delivers projects to engage with residents and positively impact on</i>

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

their lives. The post holder also assists local community groups to access funding and manage community assets.

- The current position supports a number of community groups and organisations to design and deliver engagement events that empower residents to take ownership of local issues and assets. Due to the close working relationships with local groups and the success in achieving funding, the community group are now in a position to employ and fund 50 per cent of a community development Worker and have approached the local authority as a partner.*
- Due to this partnership approach we are able to maintain delivery at the same level.*
- Reduction in the community development core budget of £14,404*
- Performance of the post or the impact on residents will not change, and communities will see the same level of support it has always received.*
- There will be a requirement for human resources support as the current post holder will be offered the opportunity to transfer into the post. However, if they do not wish to transfer they may be entitled to redundancy payment from the council.*

Key Objectives and Scope

- To delete one community development worker post*
- The position provides support to local community groups*
- A new partnership arrangement that the council makes a contribution to a community organisation that will part fund the post and employ them.*
- There will be no change to performance and no impact on citizens.*
- The post is currently occupied and HR support will be required to consider options, the LA may be required to pay redundancy / pension strand costs.*

Options considered

- 1. Maintain current delivery – do not remove the post, work continues no saving applicable.*
- 2. Delete the position in the council and enter into a partnership with a local community organisation and share the costs equally.*
- 3. Delete the position with no contribution to a partnership approach – no delivery or support for local groups*

Recommended Proposal/Option

Option 2

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Required Investment

If redundancy and pension costs became eligible the total costs to the LA would be £24,211.64.

In that case, the saving would not be realised by the end of 2019/20

High Level Milestones and Timescales

- Consultation December 2017
- Implementation February 2018
- Mobilisation March 2018

Key Risks/issues

Risk Description	Risk Score (as per matrix below)	Mitigation Measures
Performance	2	No change to delivery
Funding falls through for the community group	2	Funding has been secured

Risks should be scored using the following matrix and scoring mechanism

Probability description	Score	<p>The matrix shows a 5x5 grid of risk scores. The y-axis is labeled 'Probability' and ranges from 1 to 5. The x-axis is labeled 'Impact' and ranges from 1 to 5. The scores are: Row 1: (1,1)=1, (1,2)=2, (1,3)=3, (1,4)=4, (1,5)=5; Row 2: (2,1)=2, (2,2)=4, (2,3)=6, (2,4)=8, (2,5)=10; Row 3: (3,1)=3, (3,2)=6, (3,3)=9, (3,4)=12, (3,5)=15; Row 4: (4,1)=4, (4,2)=8, (4,3)=12, (4,4)=16, (4,5)=20; Row 5: (5,1)=5, (5,2)=10, (5,3)=15, (5,4)=20, (5,5)=25.</p>
Very Low probability	1	
Low probability	2	
Medium probability	3	
High probability	4	
Very high probability	5	
Impact description	Score	
Negligible	1	
Low	2	
Medium	3	
High	4	
Very High	5	

Specific linkage with Future generation act requirements

Integration – The implementation of this proposal will have no impact on the delivery of outcomes to any plans. The proposal will maintain the objectives of;

- Building a cohesive and sustainable community
- Helping people to become healthy, independent and resilient

Long Term – This proposal ensures that there is a community development worker

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

secured for the next 2 years in the communities of Newport. Therefore supporting the identified objectives through integration.

Prevention – *Securing the development worker in this way we are ensuring that communities are investing in the development of their futures and continue to;*

- *Deliver community cohesion programmes that create opportunities to communities*
- *Prevent and tackle instances of anti-social behaviour*
- *Develop opportunities for community involvement, participation and engagement.*
- *Work with partners to promote healthy life styles*

Collaboration - *The proposal to share resource with an external partner demonstrates this commitment.*

Involvement – *The communities effected have been able to secure funding for their future and work in close partnership to deliver local strategies and plans by the community for the community.*

Fairness and Equality Impact Assessment

None

HEAD OF SERVICE BUDGET DECISION

Service Area: Regeneration Investment and Housing	Activity code: RIH19 Community centres, RIH36 Monwel, RIH21 Youth core, RIH22 playschemes	Ref No: RIH181907
---	---	--------------------------

Saving Title: Efficiency savings in community regeneration

Saving description:

- Play development - £2,000 – A reduction in staff costs by working in partnership with Newport Live to deliver outreach sessions.
- Community centres - £4,000 – A reduction in agency staff by restructuring working arrangements.
- Community development c - £3,000 – A reduction in staffing in 2018/19, means that the IT budget for community development will reduce from £5,267 to £2,267.
- Community development - £1,000 – A reduction in the budget as the gas utility services are paid from the premises budget.
- Youth service - £2,000 – The forecast spend for car allowance for 2017/18 is less than budgeted so there will be a reduction from £5,000 to £3,000.
- Youth service - £2,000 – The forecast spend for room hire is less than budgeted so there will be a reduction from £23,000 to £17,423. Partnership arrangements can reduce this further in 2018/19.

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Net Savings (£000's)	14			
FTE's impact	0			

Implementation Costs (- £000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Revenue (state type):	0			
Capital (state what):	0			

Any impact on (i) service? (ii) performance? (iii) risk?	No No No
---	----------------

If yes, please state impact on each applicable area:

Does this require an 'equalities impact assessment?'

An FEIA is not required as these proposals do not impact on current

		service provision, policy or strategy.
Any impact on Future Generations Act?. (If yes, explain impact)		
Integration (YES/NO)	No	
Long Term (YES / NO)	No	
Prevention (YES / NO)	No	
Collaboration (YES / NO)	No	
Involvement (YES / NO)	No	

HEAD OF SERVICE BUDGET DECISION

Service Area: Regeneration, Investment and Housing	Activity code: RIH24 Libraries, RIH25 Museum & Art Gallery, RIH26 Medieval Ship, RIH28 Tredegar House grounds, RIH30 Transporter Bridge	Ref No: RIH181908
---	--	--------------------------

Saving Title: General reduction in budget

Saving description: The cash limit will be reduced across the service area budgets

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Net Savings (£000's)	28			
FTE's impact	0			

Implementation Costs (- £000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Revenue (state type):	0			
Capital (state what):	0			

Any impact on (i) service ?	Yes
(ii) performance ?	Yes
(iii) risk ?	Yes

If yes, please state impact on each applicable area:

Tredegar House saving is dependent on negotiation with National Trust (NT) to agree a different format for support payments. NT is unlikely to agree to any reduction while visitor numbers remain below 100k. There is likely to be a small saving to the superannuation top up payment as two members of the transferred staff have left their employment during the past 12 months.

Libraries – The budget reductions will be applied to the supplies and services budget, principally the book fund and computer replacement budget. Spending on libraries in Newport is already the lowest per head of population in Wales and one of the lowest in f Britain.

Museum- The savings can only be made from the supplies and services budget as this is the only area that enables a discretionary spend. The proposed saving equates to a 16.5 per cent reduction. .

Transporter Bridge – A budget reduction will be applied across the supplies and services budget. However, income has been higher than target for the past two seasons so the actual effect of the budget reduction will be minimal The extra income would normally enable additional maintenance work to be carried out.

Does this require an 'equalities impact assessment?	No
--	----

Any impact on Future Generations Act?. (If yes, explain impact)

Integration (YES/NO)	None
Long Term (YES / NO)	None
Prevention (YES / NO)	None
Collaboration (YES / NO)	None
Involvement (YES / NO)	None

HEAD OF SERVICE BUDGET DECISION

Service Area: Regeneration Investment and Housing	Activity code: RIH14 Urban regeneration, RIH11 building control, RIH17 Planning policy & improvement, RIH12 Plan & development management accounts, RIH18 Local Development Plan	Ref No: RIH181909
---	--	--------------------------

Saving Title: Efficiency savings in development services

Saving description:

A reduction in budget lines within development services will reduce the overall budget by £16,000. Savings will be made from training, fees and publicity cost codes.

	<i>2018/19</i>	<i>2019/20</i>	<i>2020/21</i>	<i>2021/22</i>
Net Savings (£000's)	16			
FTE's impact	0			

Implementation Costs (- £000's)	<i>2018/19</i>	<i>2019/20</i>	<i>2020/21</i>	<i>2021/22</i>
Revenue (state type):	0			
Capital (state what):	0			

Any impact on (i) service? (ii) performance? (iii) risk?	No No Yes
---	-----------------

If yes, please state impact on each applicable area:

The fees codes are used to commission consultants for expert advice and reports, and also for barrister and counsel support for legal challenges. While the service endeavours to forecast potential legal challenges and programme specialist reports within the financial year, commissions can be reactive rather than planned and reductions in available budgets could result in in-year pressures and potential overspends.

Does this require an 'equalities impact assessment?'

An FEIA is not required as these proposals do not impact on current service provision, policy or strategy.

Any impact on Future Generations Act?. (If yes, explain impact)

Integration (YES/NO)	No
Long Term (YES / NO)	No

Prevention (YES / NO)	No
Collaboration (YES / NO)	No
Involvement (YES / NO)	No

HEAD OF SERVICE BUDGET DECISION

Service Area: RIH	Activity code: RIH10 Carbon reduction, RIH2 City playschemes	Ref No: RIH181910
--------------------------	--	--------------------------

Saving Title: Housing & assets – general efficiencies.

Saving description:

In previous years carbon management has been through an annual submission of the carbon reduction commitment (CRC) managed by Natural Resources Wales. Due to the length of the scheme, credits can be carried forward. The financial year 2018/19 is the final year of the CRC scheme and there are credits carried forward which will mean a budget saving of £11,000.

There will be a £6,000 reduction to the Ellen Ridge revenue budget of £20,000, leaving a balance of £14,000 for the operational delivery of the pitches.

£11,000 reduction

£6,000 reduction

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Net Savings (£000's)	17			
FTE's impact				

Implementation Costs (- £000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Revenue (state type):				
Capital (state what):				

Any impact on (i) service? (ii) performance? (iii) risk?	No No Yes
---	-----------------

If yes, please state impact on each applicable area:

Carbon consumption throughout the estate could increase, which would then increase the amount of tax to be paid through the CRC

Does this require an 'equalities impact assessment?'	An FEIA is not required as these proposals do not impact on current service provision, policy or strategy.
---	--

Any impact on Future Generations Act?. (If yes, explain impact)

Integration (YES/NO)	No
Long Term (YES / NO)	No
Prevention (YES / NO)	No

Collaboration (YES / NO)	No
Involvement (YES / NO)	No

HEAD OF SERVICE BUDGET DECISION

Service Area: RIH	Activity code: RIH1 Community centres, RIH3 Housing needs	Ref No: RIH181911
--------------------------	--	--------------------------

Saving Title: Housing & assets – housing needs (Supporting People & homelessness)

Saving description:

In advance of the Welsh Government's announcement of the Funding Flexibilities pilot with Newport City Council, the commissioning arrangements for a number of external funding sources are being reviewed. The following services will now be funded via Supporting People Grant:

1. Llamau Mediation
2. Newport Womens Aid
3. Housing Solutions officer (part funding)

This mitigates the impact of meeting the required £54,000 saving from within the service area.

Women's Aid, Llamau (H H01 30304 4311): £37,800; Housing Needs salary (H H01 30304 0000): £16,200.

	<i>2018/19</i>	<i>2019/20</i>	<i>2020/21</i>	<i>2021/22</i>
Net Savings (£000's)	54			
FTE's impact				

	<i>2018/19</i>	<i>2019/20</i>	<i>2020/21</i>	<i>2021/22</i>
Implementation Costs (- £000's)				
Revenue (state type):				
Capital (state what):				

Any impact on (i) service ? (ii) performance ? (iii) risk ?	NO NO NONE
--	------------------

If yes, please state impact on each applicable area:

Does this require an 'equalities impact assessment'?	NO
---	----

Any impact on Future Generations Act?. (If yes, explain impact)

Integration (YES/NO)	NO
Long Term (YES / NO)	NO
Prevention (YES / NO)	NO
Collaboration (YES / NO)	NO

Involvement (YES / NO)	NO
-------------------------------	----

HEAD OF SERVICE BUDGET DECISION

Service Area: People and Business Change	Activity code: PBC3 Business Change Improvement	Ref No: PBC181901
Saving Title: Core resource reduction in the business improvement team		
Saving description: A target saving of £10k will be realised by the permanent reduction in core budget of the business improvement team. This will be achieved by reducing the contracted hours for one of the project manager posts from 37 hours to 29.3 hours		

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Net Savings (£000's)	10			
FTE's impact				

Implementation Costs (- £000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Revenue (state type):				
Capital (state what):				

Any impact on (i) service? (ii) performance? (iii) risk?	No Yes No
If yes, please state impact on each applicable area:	
<p>Performance impact – Any reduction in resource levels will have a direct impact on the development and delivery of the Change programme which underpins the corporate plan.</p> <p>The reduction may also affect our ability to recruit to the project manager post in future as it will be advertised as a part-time role up to a maximum of 29.3 hours.</p>	
Does this require an 'equalities impact assessment?	No
Any impact on Future Generations Act?. (If yes, explain impact)	
Integration (YES/NO)	Not materially
Long Term (YES / NO)	Not materially
Prevention (YES / NO)	Not materially
Collaboration (YES / NO)	Not materially
Involvement (YES / NO)	Not materially

This page is intentionally left blank

HEAD OF SERVICE BUDGET DECISION

Service Area: People & Business Change	Activity code: PBC10 (Digital) PBC11 (Information Governance & Development) PBC 13 (Document Services) PBC14 (Spatial Data) PBC15 (Gazetteer & Address) PBC16 (Education Information Support Development)	Ref No: PBC181902
--	--	--------------------------

Saving Title: Reduction in core digital and information budgets

Saving description:

A target saving of £10k will be realised by a permanent reduction in the digital and information core budget.

It is proposed to reduce the budget allocations in relation to:

- stationery – reduce budget by £508
- computer purchase – reduce by £2,214
- hire of external plant and vehicles – reduce by £4,000
- general – reduce by £2,951
- officer expenses – reduce by £241

Total savings £9,914

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Net Savings (£000's)	10			
FTE's impact				

Implementation Costs (- £000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Revenue (state type):				
Capital (state what):				

Any impact on (i) service ?	No
(ii) performance ?	No
(iii) risk ?	No
If yes, please state impact on each applicable area:	
Does this require an 'equalities impact assessment?	No
Any impact on Future Generations Act?. (If yes, explain impact)	

Integration (YES/NO)	Not materially
Long Term (YES / NO)	Not materially
Prevention (YES / NO)	Not materially
Collaboration (YES / NO)	Not materially
Involvement (YES / NO)	Not materially

HEAD OF SERVICE BUDGET DECISION

Service Area: People and Business Change	Activity code: PBC8 Health & Safety	Ref No: PBC181903		
Saving Title: Reduction in health and safety budget				
Saving description: Reduction in health and safety budget (supplies and services)				
	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Net Savings (£000's)	3			
FTE's impact				

Implementation Costs (- £000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Revenue (state type):				
Capital (state what):				

Any impact on (i) service ? (ii) performance ? (iii) risk ?	Yes Yes Yes
--	-------------------

If yes, please state impact on each applicable area:

Whilst cutting budget on supplies and services is a low risk way of reducing budget due to no implications for employees, there is increased risk of service delivery and performance improvement being restricted due to having insufficient budget available for providing health and safety training and equipment.

Does this require an 'equalities impact assessment?'	No
---	----

Any impact on Future Generations Act?. (If yes, explain impact)

Integration (YES/NO)	No
Long Term (YES / NO)	No
Prevention (YES / NO)	No
Collaboration (YES / NO)	No
Involvement (YES / NO)	No

This page is intentionally left blank

HEAD OF SERVICE BUDGET DECISION

Service Area: People and Business Change	Activity code: PBC9 Social Services Training	Ref No: PBC181904		
Saving Title: Reduce social services workforce development budget (supplies and services)				
Saving description: Reduce social services workforce development budget (supplies and services)				
	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Net Savings (£000's)	8			
FTE's impact				

Implementation Costs (- £000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Revenue (state type):				
Capital (state what):				

Any impact on (i) service ?	Yes
(ii) performance ?	Yes
(iii) risk ?	Yes
If yes, please state impact on each applicable area:	
<p>Whilst cutting budget on supplies and services is a low risk way of reducing budget due to no implications for employees, there is increased risk of service delivery and performance improvement being restricted due to having insufficient budget available for providing the existing level of training.</p>	
Does this require an 'equalities impact assessment?'	No
Any impact on Future Generations Act?. (If yes, explain impact)	
Integration (YES/NO)	No
Long Term (YES / NO)	No
Prevention (YES / NO)	No
Collaboration (YES / NO)	No
Involvement (YES / NO)	No

This page is intentionally left blank

HEAD OF SERVICE BUDGET DECISION

Service Area: People and Business Change	Activity code: PBC2 – Employment Services	Ref No: PBC181905		
Saving Title: Vacancy deletion in transactional HR and payroll				
Saving description: Deletion of 0.5 FTE of vacant employment services assistant post (the other half is currently filled on a fixed term basis)				
	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Net Savings (£000's)	14			
FTE's impact	0.5			

Implementation Costs (- £000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Revenue (state type):				
Capital (state what):				

Any impact on (i) service ? (ii) performance ? (iii) risk ?	Yes Yes Yes
If yes, please state impact on each applicable area:	
Cutting budget on vacant posts and not replacing staff can result in an increased workload for other employees, leading to a risk of service delivery and performance improvement being reduced.	
This could lead to increased sickness absence, stress and anxiety and lower levels of performance.	
Does this require an 'equalities impact assessment?	No
Any impact on Future Generations Act?. (If yes, explain impact)	
Integration (YES/NO)	No
Long Term (YES / NO)	No
Prevention (YES / NO)	No
Collaboration (YES / NO)	Yes – we are working on a business case regarding collaboration in transactional HR and payroll services across south east Wales. This deletion will impact on the information already provided as part of that project.
Involvement (YES / NO)	No

This page is intentionally left blank

HEAD OF SERVICE BUDGET DECISION

Service Area: People and Business Change	Activity code: PBC11 Information Governance & Development	Ref No: PBC181906
---	---	--------------------------

Saving Title: Deletion of a post in digital and information governance

Saving description: **Deletion of vacant digital and information governance manager post.**

The digital and information governance manager post has been vacant since May 2016, when the post holder moved into an interim position which has now been made permanent. Since July 2016 the digital and information governance post has been undertaken jointly by the information development manager and corporate spatial data manager who have been paid to do this.

The proposal is to make this a permanent arrangement.

The current job descriptions and grades of both post holders will be reviewed to take account of the requirements of the role and part of the gross saving released will be used to do this.

The remaining difference between the gross and net saving will be reinvested in the digital and information governance service and will form part of the service area structural review subject to cabinet member approval.

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Net Savings (£000's)	31			
FTE's impact				

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Implementation Costs (- £000's)				
Revenue (state type):				
Capital (state what):				

Any impact on (i) service ?	No
(ii) performance ?	No
(iii) risk ?	Yes

If yes, please state impact on each applicable area:

As a small service area, the removal of one quarter of the third tier management structure will clearly impact on resilience. However, this arrangement has operated for over a year and as long as the remaining funding is invested in ensuring the structure is appropriate then we can manage the risk.

The other risk is about perception. The development of digital, the management of data and information security are priorities for the organisation and removing this post could be seen as lessening the resource and focus on these areas.

Does this require an 'equalities impact assessment?'	No
---	----

Any impact on Future Generations Act?. (If yes, explain impact)

Integration (NO)	No
Long Term (YES)	Marginal. We will need to ensure we deliver on Newport Intelligence Hub within the resources available.
Prevention (YES)	Marginal. We will need to ensure we deliver on Newport Intelligence Hub within the resources available
Collaboration (YES)	Marginal. A reduction in management capability could restrict our ability to develop collaborative arrangements.
Involvement (NO)	No

HEAD OF SERVICE BUDGET DECISION

Service Area: People and Business Change	Activity code: PBC7	Ref No: PBC181907		
Saving Title: Reduction in partnership and policy budgets				
Saving description: A target saving of £16,615k will be realised by the permanent reduction in core budget within the partnerships and policy budgets: Reductions of budget allocated to fairness commission (£1,000), strategic equalities (£1,512) fees (£1,684), Welsh language (£12,419). These budgets are unspent in the current year and in the case of strategic equalities and fairness commission have been discussed with the group leads.				
	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Net Savings (£000's)	17			
FTE's impact				
Implementation Costs (- £000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Revenue (state type):				
Capital (state what):				
Any impact on (i) service ? (ii) performance ? (iii) risk ?	No No No			
If yes, please state impact on each applicable area:				
Does this require an 'equalities impact assessment'?	No			
Any impact on Future Generations Act?. (If yes, explain impact)				
Integration (YES/NO)	Not materially			
Long Term (YES / NO)	Not materially			
Prevention (YES / NO)	Not materially			
Collaboration (YES / NO)	Although the work of the fairness commission remains an important partnership, the full budget has not been spent previously.			
Involvement (YES / NO)	Not materially			

This page is intentionally left blank

HEAD OF SERVICE BUDGET DECISION

Service Area: Finance	Activity code: FIN5 council tax / NNDR rev		Ref No: FIN181901	
Saving Title: Increase in council tax collection rate to 98.9%				
Saving description: An increase in council tax collection rate from 98.25% to 98.9%, would increase the tax income budget by £350k. To ensure collection is increased to the new level, it will require an additional 3 posts at Grade 5, costing c£90k. This is funded through a reduction in the overall saving and a contribution from the Council Tax Reduction Scheme budget...				
	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Net Savings (£000's)	350			
FTE's impact	+3			

Implementation Costs (- £000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Revenue (state type): Ongoing	90			
Capital (state what):				

Any impact on (i) service ? (ii) performance ? (iii) risk ?	Yes Yes Yes
If yes, please state impact on each applicable area:	
Service & Performance – There should be an increase in the collection of council tax from this proposal.	
Risk – Non achievement of the rate increase, leading to reduced C Tax income compared to budget. This is minimised by appointing a further 3 members of staff, to ensure the collection rate is achieved. Increased housebuilding rates also helps reduce this risk..	
Does this require an 'equalities impact assessment'?	No
Any impact on Future Generations Act?. (If yes, explain impact)	
Integration (YES/NO)	No
Long Term (YES / NO)	Yes – if we can improve collection of council tax this will protect the future long-term services of the council.
Prevention (YES / NO)	Yes – as above, this proposal prevents other services being cut due to increasing the level of council tax collected.
Collaboration (YES / NO)	No
Involvement (YES / NO)	No

This page is intentionally left blank

HEAD OF SERVICE BUDGET DECISION

Service Area: Income & Collection	Activity code:	Ref No:		
Saving Title: Court Fees				
Saving description: Changing the point at which court fees are charged - move away from issuing a charge after a court hearing to when a summons for court is issued in the first place. Currently those issued with a summons are not charged any court costs (£70) if the amount is paid in full before the hearing. However all the work and administration costs are incurred by the Council prior to the issue of the summons and the legislation allows the Council to recover this via 'court fees'. Even at summons stage, the tax payer has had multiple opportunities to pay beforehand or discuss a plan to pay any arrears. Charging court fees at summons stage is standard practice amongst most other Councils, in order to recoup additional costs involved in managing arrears. It is inequitable that those without the means to pay in a lump sum are charged the £70 fee whilst those best placed to pay at the appropriate time and choose for whatever reason not to do so, are not, changing the way that fees are charged goes some way to redressing this.				
	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Net Savings (£000's)	5			
FTE's impact				

Implementation Costs (- £000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Revenue (state type):	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
Capital (state what):	Nil	Nil	nil	nil

Any impact on (i) service ? (ii) performance ? (iii) risk ?	YES NO NO
If yes, please state impact on each applicable area: i. Service: likely to be increased correspondence and telephone calls from tax payers unhappy with the change in charging court fees.	
Does this require an 'equalities impact assessment?	NO (no impact on those that have difficulty in paying their council tax)
Any impact on Future Generations Act?. (If yes, explain impact)	
Integration (YES/NO)	No
Long Term (YES / NO)	No
Prevention (YES / NO)	No
Collaboration (YES / NO)	No
Involvement (YES / NO)	No

HEAD OF SERVICE BUDGET DECISION

Service area: Finance	Activity code: FIN1 accountancy FIN3 purchase to pay FIN4 strategic procurement	Ref No: FIN181903
------------------------------	---	--------------------------

Saving title: Miscellaneous efficiency savings

Saving description: The total savings below come from a review of individual budget lines which has identified a small number of efficiency savings:

- Postage savings in procurement team - £5k
- 'Rebates' received on use of council's procurement card - £5k
- Charging a small proportion of accountancy team to capital programme, primarily 21st century schools programme - £8k
- Take out consultancy support included within budget management system license fee as key areas of development are now complete and in-house staff can carry out some further development- £4k.

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Net Savings (£000's)	22			
FTE's impact				

Implementation Costs (- £000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Revenue (state type):				
Capital (state what):				

Any impact on (i) service ?	No
(ii) performance ?	No
(iii) risk ?	No

If yes, please state impact on each applicable area:

Does this require an 'equalities impact assessment'?	No
---	----

Any impact on Future Generations Act?. (If yes, explain impact)

Integration NO	N/A
Long Term NO	Back-office efficiency savings helps the council maintain core services to the public
Prevention (YES / NO)	Back-office efficiency savings helps the council maintain core services to the public
Collaboration (YES / NO)	N/A

Involvement (YES / NO)	N/A
-------------------------------	-----

HEAD OF SERVICE BUDGET DECISION

Service area: Law & Regulation	Activity code: LAW1 Communication & Marketing	Ref No: LR181901
---------------------------------------	---	-------------------------

Saving title: Reduction in tourism budget

Saving description:

Tourism is an entirely discretionary service under Section 144 of the Local Government Act 1972. The council has the power to encourage visitors and promote services, but has no duty or obligation to do so. The budget for tourism has been reduced in previous years from £63k to £45k, including the closure of tourist information centres.

It is proposed to reduce the tourism budget by a further £10k in 18/19.

This part of the tourism budget is predominantly used to attract grant funding from Welsh Government and other external agencies for tourism, events and projects. In future, any shortfall in match-funding would have to be provided 'in kind' though officer support.

	<i>2018/19</i>	<i>2019/20</i>	<i>2020/21</i>	<i>2021/22</i>
Net Savings (£000's)	10			
FTE's impact				

Implementation Costs (- £000's)	<i>2018/19</i>	<i>2019/20</i>	<i>2020/21</i>	<i>2021/22</i>
Revenue (state type):				
Capital (state what):				

Any impact on (i) service ? (ii) performance ? (iii) risk ?	Yes Yes No
--	------------------

If yes, please state impact on each applicable area:

The reduction in spending on tourism could have an adverse impact on the promotion of Newport as a tourist destination and could reduce the number of visitors.

The tourism budget is also used to attract grant funding from Welsh Government and other external agencies for tourism and other events. The loss of this match-funding budget could have an impact on the council's ability to secure external grant funding.

However, these impacts can be mitigated at little or no risk. There should be sufficient provision within the remaining budget to provide match-funding for key collaborative projects and any shortfall could be met from 'in-kind' contributions and officer time. There is no proposal to reduce the current staffing resources.

Does this require an 'equalities impact assessment?'	No
---	----

Any impact on Future Generations Act?. (If yes, explain impact)

Integration (YES/NO)	No
Long Term (YES / NO)	No
Prevention (YES / NO)	No
Collaboration (YES / NO)	Yes - The reduction in match-funding budgets will have an impact on potential collaborative projects, unless this can be provided 'in kind' through officer time and resources.
Involvement (YES / NO)	Yes - The reduction in the budget will require a re-focusing on greater community engagement and empowerment to encourage local voluntary and community groups to act as ambassadors and provide tourism information and guidance to the public.

HEAD OF SERVICE BUDGET DECISION

Service Area: Law & Regulation	Activity code: LAW2 Registrars		Ref No: LR181902	
Saving Title: Reduction in grounds maintenance budget for Mansion House				
Saving description:				
The current budget for the registration service includes approximately £20k for grounds maintenance at the Mansion House. The budget for 2017/2018 is likely to be underspent and a saving of £10k can be offered up for 2018/2019.				
	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Net Savings (£000's)	10			
FTE's impact				

Implementation Costs (- £000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Revenue (state type):				
Capital (state what):				

Any impact on (i) service ? (ii) performance ? (iii) risk ?	Yes No No
If yes, please state impact on each applicable area:	
The reduction in the grounds maintenance budget will affect the appearance of the lawns and gardens at the Mansion House and this could affect the numbers of bookings for weddings and ceremonies. However, the remaining budget should be sufficient to maintain the grounds to an acceptable standard and this saving will not have any material adverse impact or risk in terms of the statutory registration services.	
Does this require an 'equalities impact assessment?'	No
Any impact on Future Generations Act?. (If yes, explain impact)	
Integration (YES/NO)	No
Long Term (YES / NO)	No
Prevention (YES / NO)	No
Collaboration (YES / NO)	No

Involvement (YES / NO)	No
-------------------------------	----

HEAD OF SERVICE BUDGET DECISION

Service area: Law & Regulation	Activity code: LAW3 Democratic Services	Ref No: LR181903
---------------------------------------	---	-------------------------

Saving title: Re-provision of services within democratic services

Saving description:

The pending re-structure of democratic services, PR and communications and the creation of a combined management structure and integrated teams, provides an opportunity to deliver a number of savings as a result of the re-provision of various services.

1. A review of the current chauffeur arrangements provides an opportunity to decommission the use of the garages located at the rear of the Mansion House. These garages are still being used for two leased vehicles used to chauffeur the Mayor, leader and other senior council officials to civic and official functions. The cost of maintaining these garages is approximately £4k, including utilities costs, repairs and maintenance. However, the leased cars can now be garaged securely at Telford depot, at no additional cost, and the decommissioning of the garages would result in a saving of approximately £4k. In addition, this area of land at the rear of the Mansion House could then be declared surplus to requirements, re-appropriated for asset management purposes and disposed of for residential development, to generate a capital receipt.
2. The combination of member support roles within the new teams should facilitate a potential voluntary redundancy for 1 FTE post-holder. This would result in a potential saving of approximately £23k (including on-costs) at Grade 5. The one-off costs of the redundancy payment would need to be met from the invest to save fund.
3. There is a current budget of £25k for council-approved events, which can be used at the discretion of the leader to fund special civic or mayoral events. This budget is likely to be significantly underspent in the current year and £15k savings can be offered up for 18/19, with the balance being used for general marketing events in future years.

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Net Savings (£000's)	Garages 4 1 FTE VR 23 Civic events 15 Total 42			
FTE's impact	1 FTE			

Implementation Costs (- £000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Revenue (state type):	25			
Capital (state what):				

Any impact on (i) service ?	No
(ii) performance ?	No
(iii) risk ?	No

If yes, please state impact on each applicable area:

Does this require an 'equalities impact assessment?		No
Any impact on Future Generations Act?. (If yes, explain impact)		
Integration (YES/NO)	No	
Long Term (YES / NO)	No	
Prevention (YES / NO)	No	
Collaboration (YES / NO)	No	
Involvement (YES / NO)	No	

HEAD OF SERVICE BUDGET DECISION

Service Area: Law & Regulation	Activity code: LAW8 Insurance	Ref No: LR181904		
Saving title: Reduction in insurance premiums for works of art				
Saving description:				
The council currently pays approximately £680k in insurance premiums for cover against various risks and liabilities. Under the long term agreements, in-year reductions in premiums can be delivered as a consequence of risk management and a reduction in claims experience. We are forecasting a £10k under-spend in premiums for 17/18 for these reasons, and a similar saving could realistically be achievable for 18/19. Additional savings could also be delivered if specific insured assets are disposed of by other service areas and/or by reviewing the amount of risk cover.				
	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Net Savings (£000's)	£10k			
FTE's impact	None			

Implementation Costs (- £000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Revenue (state type):	NIL			
Capital (state what):	NIL			

Any impact on (i) service ? (ii) performance ? (iii) risk ?	No No No
If yes, please state impact on each applicable area:	
Does this require an 'equalities impact assessment'?	No
Any impact on Future Generations Act?. (If yes, explain impact)	
Integration (YES/NO)	No
Long Term (YES / NO)	No
Prevention (YES / NO)	No

Collaboration (YES / NO)	No
Involvement (YES / NO)	No

HEAD OF SERVICE BUDGET DECISION

Service Area: Law & Regulation	Activity code: LAW9 Com Safety	Ref No: LR181905
---------------------------------------	--	-------------------------

Saving Title: Deletion of vacant part-time post.

Saving description:

Following the restructure of the environment and community service and the creation of the combined neighbourhood team, there is a vacant 0.5 FTE community safety warden post (Grade 5), which is fully-funded within the existing budget. It was intended to fill this post in order to deal with the transfer of the stray dogs function.

However, the deletion of this vacant post would deliver immediate savings of approximately £14k (including on-costs), without the need for any compulsory redundancy or reduction in the current level of service.

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Net Savings (£000's)	12			
FTE's impact	0.5			

Implementation Costs (- £000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Revenue (state type):				
Capital (state what):				

Any impact on (i) service ? (ii) performance ? (iii) risk ?	Yes Yes No
--	------------------

If yes, please state impact on each applicable area:

This part-time community safety warden post was being held vacant pending the restructure and the creation of the combined neighbourhood team, to provide an additional resource to deal with the statutory stray dog function. Therefore, the deletion of this post will have an adverse impact on the delivery of the stray dog service and performance in relation to effective enforcement action. However, the post has been vacant for some time and an effective stray dog function has been maintained throughout that period. Although the intended service improvement cannot be delivered, the deletion of the post should not create any additional risk or a material adverse impact on current service levels.

Does this require an 'equalities impact assessment?	No
--	----

Any impact on Future Generations Act?. (If yes, explain impact)

Integration (YES/NO)	No
Long Term (YES / NO)	No

Prevention (YES / NO)	No
Collaboration (YES / NO)	No
Involvement (YES / NO)	No

HEAD OF SERVICE BUDGET DECISION

Service Area: Law & Regulation	Activity code: LAW11 Trading Standards	Ref No: LR181906
---------------------------------------	--	-------------------------

Saving Title: Review of Regulatory Services Support

Saving description:

Following the previous Public Protection Business Improvement Review and the centralisation of the general administrative support function, a smaller dedicated team was retained within Regulatory Services to deal with the more technical support work. This retained team comprises 2 clerks (Grade 3) and 2 support officers (Grade 4). One of the support officer posts is currently vacant.

One of the clerks (0.8 FTE) has recently requested voluntary redundancy to take effect on 1 April 2018.

A further work assessment has been undertaken and managers are satisfied that the work could be reallocated and delivered by three Grade 4 officers. It is therefore proposed to delete the two clerk posts (Grade 3) to allow one post holder to leave under voluntary redundancy, recruit to the vacant support officer position and create a third support officer position. The remaining displaced Grade 3 post holder would be slotted-in to the additional support officer post.

The current staffing costs for 3.8 FTE support staff are approximately £81k (including on-costs). The deletion of the 1.8 FTE Grade 3 Clerk posts and the creation of an additional Grade 4 Support officer post is approximately £67k, giving a net saving of approximately £14k.

The one –off voluntary redundancy costs for the 0.8 FTE would have to be funded through the Invest to Save fund.

	<i>2018/19</i>	<i>2019/20</i>	<i>2020/21</i>	<i>2021/22</i>
Net Savings (£000's)	14			
FTE's impact	0.8			

Implementation Costs (- £000's)	<i>2018/19</i>	<i>2019/20</i>	<i>2020/21</i>	<i>2021/22</i>
Revenue (state type):	25			
Capital (state what):				

Any impact on (i) service ?	No
(ii) performance ?	No
(iii) risk ?	No

If yes, please state impact on each applicable area:

Does this require an 'equalities impact assessment?		No
Any impact on Future Generations Act?. (If yes, explain impact)		
Integration (YES/NO)	No	
Long Term (YES / NO)	No	
Prevention (YES / NO)	No	
Collaboration (YES / NO)	No	
Involvement (YES / NO)	No	

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Service Area	Cross Council
Unique Reference Number	CC181901
Proposal Title	Digital Council
Version	For Informal Cabinet 24 th October 2017
Proposal Summary Description	Make cross council efficiencies related to digital and modernised council objectives.
Impact on Performance	No negative impact on performance. Improved performance
Impact on FTE Count	Increase of x2 FTE
Impact on other Service Areas	Proportionate reduction to service area budgets. Improved efficiency.
Impact on Citizens	None – efficiencies to internal practice and procedure
Delegated Decision (Head of Service/Cabinet Member/ Cabinet)	Head of Service

Net Savings (£000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
	34			

Implementation Costs (- £000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Revenue – Redundancy/Pension				
Revenue – External consultants				
Revenue - Other				
Capital – Building related				
Capital - Other				
Implementation Cost - Total				

Current Position

Under the Modernised Council programme, realise cross council efficiencies aligned to Digital Council objectives specifically related to:

- 21st Century Office - Mobile Phone Contract and Use
- 21st Century Office – Going Paperless
- Systems Integration and rationalisation

Key Objectives and Scope

21st Century Council – Mobile Phone Contract

The council currently spends around £200k a year on mobile phone costs for employees, an increase of £11k over four years. By reducing the number and type of

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

phones issued; reducing standard data usage allowances and associated costs; amending processes; centralisation of budget; and centralisation of the management of mobile phones an initial review has identified potential efficiencies.

To achieve and maintain mobile phone efficiencies and achieve longer term communication objectives - driving out efficiencies at a team, service, and corporate level - reinvestment of a portion of the cost benefit is required.

21st Century Office – Going Paperless

The council still produces a large amount of paper. Paper processes are costly and inefficient. Proposals include

- Replacing paper processes with electronic ones e.g. e-forms, e-mail
- Reduced printing, transport and storage costs
- Improving office facilities to provide greater effectiveness and agility
- Greater roll out of the council's Electronic Document Management System (EDMS) system to support increased agility, effectiveness and efficiency

Replacing paper process with electronic ones will result in actual cost reductions efficient processes. A modest cost saving for 18/19 is set out below. To maintain 18/19 savings and achieve longer term digital objectives - driving out efficiencies at a team, service, and corporate level - reinvestment of a portion of the cost benefit is required.

Systems Integration, Rationalisation and Review

The council uses a large number of IT systems that tend to be for a specific service/purpose. The existing cost for support and maintenance is £750,000 per annum across the council. The proposal is to:

- Review the systems used and associated licences
- Over a period of 1-5 years, rationalise systems used as a result of the partnership with the Shared Resource Service (SRS)

The aim is to reduce support and maintenance costs by 2%, per annum. Reduced support and maintenance costs are dependent upon increased collaboration between SRS partners. As systems are rationalised relevant service budgets will be reduced achieving cross council savings.

Options considered

1. Maintain the status quo and do nothing. This is in direct conflict with the council's Digital Strategy, Modernised Council and Way we Work objectives
2. Centralise £96k of relevant budgets, re-investing a proportion with the purpose of achieving £34k savings in 18/19. The re-investment will enable the action and maintenance of efficiencies; and contribute to the achievement, action and maintenance of future efficiencies aligned to digital objectives.
3. Centralise and re-invest 62k of relevant budgets with the purpose of reducing inefficient spend. The re-investment will enable the action and maintenance of efficiencies; and contribute the achievement, action and maintenance of further efficiencies aligned to digital objectives. The residual reduction of spend (projected at £34k for 18/19) to be retained by respective service areas to manage.
4. Centralise budges and realise £96k of savings. This option is not

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

achievable/sustainable. Resource is required to action and maintain efficiencies proposed; and contribute to the achievement, action and maintenance of efficiencies aligned to digital objectives.

Recommended Proposal/Option

In order to achieve savings, Option 2 (below) is recommended.

Centralise £96k of relevant budgets re-investing a proportion with the purpose of achieving £34k savings in 18/19. The re-investment will enable the action and maintenance of efficiencies; and contribute to the achievement, action and maintenance of future efficiencies aligned to digital objectives.

In order to go paperless, manage mobile phones effectively and contribute to the rationalisation of systems there is a need to create two permanent posts. The lack of resources to manage the existing mobile contract has resulted in an increased number of mobile devices and significant additional costs to the council. Therefore this proposal will not be feasible without additional resources to support it. In addition, it is important to invest in digital technology and the improvements in effectiveness, economy and efficiency this enables. An investment is required to drive forward these improvements as work has been carried out by a temporary resource with temporary funding to date. Existing resources within the team have no capacity to do this important work given existing responsibilities. The funding for these posts reduces expected savings but without these posts the savings will not be achievable/sustainable. This is a cost of £62k that reduces expected savings resulting in £34k net savings as detailed in the table below:

Proposal	Saving	Re-Investment
21 st Century Office - Mobile Phone Contract and Use	£50k	
21 st Century Office – Going Paperless	£31k	
Systems Integration and rationalisation	£15k	
Re-invest a proportion of the generated savings to action, maintain and grow digital efficiencies.		£62K
Total Saving 18/19	£34k	

Required Investment

None

High Level Milestones and Timescales

New mobile contract go live including rationalisation of phones	November 2017
Going paperless – initial forms identified	December 2017
An appropriate mechanism for removing the need for paper forms may require some form of investment e.g. Microsoft SharePoint.	March 2018
Review of initial retained IT contract spend	March 2018
Rationalisation of IT systems in line with Shared Resource Service (SRS) by 2%	April 2018 – March 2018

Key Risks/issues

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

The new mobile phone contract will reduce the number of phones but using agreed criteria and the ability to review will mean that risks are minimised to service delivery. Going paperless should reduce the potential for errors but the new systems will need to be fit for purpose. The removal of hand written signatures by going paperless may have a slightly reduced audit trail but appropriate IT solutions should be similar. The rationalisation of IT systems may result in slightly less tailored system facilities but this will be mitigated by improved support and sustainability.

Risk Description	Risk Score (as per matrix below)	Mitigation Measures
New mobile phone contract – reduction in devices	Risk score 4: Low probability (2), low impact	Based on agreed criteria. Ability to review as necessary
Going paperless – reduced audit trail	Risk score 4: Low probability (2), low impact (2)	IT systems will need to be identified to provide appropriate audit trails
Rationalisation of new IT systems results in less tailored system facilities	Risk score 9: Medium probability (3), medium impact (3)	Ensure IT systems still meet essential needs and other benefits offset these impacts

Probability description	Score
Very Low probability	1
Low probability	2
Medium probability	3
High probability	4
Very high probability	5

Impact description	Score
Negligible	1
Low	2
Medium	3
High	4
Very High	5

Probability	1	2	3	4	5
5	5	10	15	20	25
4	4	8	12	16	20
3	3	6	9	12	15
2	2	4	6	8	10
1	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5
	Impact				

Specific linkage with Future generation act requirements

Integration – these proposals are in line with the council's Corporate Plan, Digital Strategy and the People & Business Change Service Plan.

Long Term – Good asset management is environmentally friendly, reduces long term storage requirements.

Prevention – Reduce/remove duplication of effort, rationalise assets, increase resilience by preventing single point of failure in systems

Collaboration – Going paperless will be in conjunction with various council services and should benefit all parties (direct service providers and support services). Rationalising IT systems will be facilitated by partnership working with the Shared Resource Service (SRS) and its partners.

Involvement – Services will be involved in the review of mobile phone needs. Going paperless will include service involvement to meet their needs. Services will be involved in the rationalisation of IT systems in conjunction with the Shared Resource Service (SRS).

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Fairness and Equality Impact Assessment
None required.

This page is intentionally left blank

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Service Area	Cross Council
Unique Reference Number	CC181902
Proposal Title	Our People
Version	For Informal Cabinet 24 th October 2017
Proposal Summary Description	To make cross council efficiencies related to Our People and Modernised Council Objectives.
Impact on Performance	No negative impact on performance.
Impact on FTE Count	Increase to FTE x1
Impact on other Service Areas	Impact on managers to promote flexible benefits and proactively challenge and manage mileage claims.
Impact on Citizens	Directly – None, as proposed efficiencies relate to HR policy, procedure and practice
Delegated Decision (Head of Service/Cabinet Member/ Cabinet)	Head of Service

Net Savings (£000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
	122			

Implementation Costs (- £000's)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Revenue – Redundancy/Pension				
Revenue – External consultants				
Revenue - Other				
Capital – Building related				
Capital - Other				
Implementation Cost - Total				

Current Position

Under the Modernised Council programme consider cross council efficiencies aligned to Our People Project relevant to:

- Flexible Benefit Opportunities
- Reduction to Travel and Subsistence Claims

Key Objectives and Scope

Flexible Benefit Opportunities

The current flexible benefit offer which generates salary savings to staff includes the following:

- Childcare vouchers

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

- Cycle to Work Scheme
 - Car leasing scheme*
 - Additional annual leave purchase scheme*
- *these are new schemes and have only been introduced in 2017

The current salary deductions that are 'given up' by staff to benefit from the list above are in the region of £535k. We benefit from a reduction in employers NI savings and, in the case of car leasing, employers' pension contributions. Based on current levels for childcare and cycle to work, but scaling up for car leasing and annual leave purchase and introducing technologies later in the year, will save approximately £145k.

These savings are not currently attributed to the HR function as they appear in the budgets where the individual employees are assigned. Through introducing these policies, the HR function is generating the savings to the Council as a whole. In order to continue to generate further ideas for salary savings, a proportion of these savings could be reinvested into the HR function on the assumption that further work could be done in this area.

There is currently no resource available to analyse payroll data and identify further areas for efficiency savings on pay related activity. The exercise carried out to identify mileage and flexible benefits are only two elements of payroll. There are additional areas of pay that have not been analysed – overtime, use of enhancement, call out, additional hours, terms and conditions, etc. where there are possible future savings that could be identified. This work cannot be done without a proportion of savings reinvested in an HR resource within the business development team.

Reduction to Travel and Subsistence Claims

In 2016/17 over 1 million miles were claimed by employees in the course of their regular work conducting the Council's business, at a cost of £460,000. This excludes travel carried out by elected members, the senior leadership team who receive a block car allowance, and Council owned vehicles.

Options considered

1. Maintain the status quo and do nothing.
2. Centralise £167k of relevant service budgets, re-investing a proportion with the purpose of achieving £122k savings in 18/19. The re-investment of a portion of income generated from proposal 1 will enable future growth for income generation aligned to Our People objectives.
3. Centralise and re-invest 45k of relevant budgets with the purpose of reducing inefficient spend. The re-investment will enable the action and maintenance of efficiencies; and contribute to the achievement, action and maintenance of further efficiencies aligned to our people objectives. The residual reduction of spend (projected at £122k for 18/19) to be retained by respective service areas to manage.
4. Centralise budgets and realise £167k of savings. This option is not achievable/sustainable. Resource is required to action and maintain efficiencies proposed; and contribute to the achievement, action and maintenance of efficiencies aligned to Our People objectives.

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Recommended Proposal/Option

In order to achieve savings, Option 2 (below) is recommended.

Centralise £167k of relevant service budgets, re-investing a proportion with the purpose of achieving £122k savings in 18/19. The re-investment of a portion of income generated from proposal 1 will enable future growth for income generation aligned to Our People objectives.

In order to effectively promote and increase flexible benefit opportunities re-investment is required. The funding of additional resource reduces expected savings but without it savings will not be sustainable going forward. This is a cost of £45k, reducing net savings to £122k as detailed in the table below:

No	Proposal	Cost Benefit	Re-Investment	Net Saving
1	Flexible Benefit Opportunities – Assume percentage against each service budget based on 16/17 generated income.	£145k	£45k (to grow and promote opportunities)	£100k
2	Reduction to Travel and Subsistence Claims –Applying a percentage reduction against budgets for mileage – onus with the manager to challenge and manage travel. A 5% reduction on 16/17 mileage would equate to a £22k saving.	£22k		£22k
TOTAL				£122k

Required Investment

None

High Level Milestones and Timescales

Communication Plan	1 December 2017
Budget Realignment	31 March 2018
Recruitment	1 April 2018
Go Live	1 April 2018

Key Risks/issues

Risk Description	Risk Score (as per matrix below)	Mitigation Measures
Changes to tax and NI rules	Amber Risk Score 5: Probability low (2), Impact Medium (3)	Rules reviewed and amended in April 2017.

MTRP Proposal - 18/19 and Beyond - Business Case

Probability description	Score
Very Low probability	1
Low probability	2
Medium probability	3
High probability	4
Very high probability	5

Impact description	Score
Negligible	1
Low	2
Medium	3
High	4
Very High	5

Specific linkage with Future generation act requirements

Integration – these proposals are in line with the council’s Corporate Plan, and the People & Business Change Service Plan.

Long Term – Provide appropriate challenge supporting a culture of responsibility and accountability.

Prevention – Proposals aim to address inconsistencies in the promotion of flexible benefit opportunities and challenge of mileage claims.

Collaboration – Services working in collaboration to improve consistency of people management across the council.

Involvement – Improving stakeholder involvement through the quality assurance and consultation process.

Fairness and Equality Impact Assessment

None required.