

## LEWISHAM FUTURE PROGRAMME – SAVINGS REPORT APPENDICES – SEPTEMBER 2015

### APPENDIX 6 – SAVINGS PROPOSALS FOR SCRUTINY, SECTION I

#### Contents page

#### Section I: Management and Corporate Overheads

I2: Further review of policy, governance and administration support staff Includes: Policy, performance, service redesign and intelligence Senior management support service Governance	99
I3 Reorganisation of how Complaints are managed across the Council	107
I4: Review of Strategy and Comms Includes: Review of Programmes in Strategy and Mayor and Cabinet Office Restructure of Communications after voluntary redundancies	111
I5: Commissioning and Procurement	115
I6: Insurance recharge risk premium	119
I7: Further review of financial services team	123
I8: Legal: Streamlining procurement and legal administration.	127
I9: HR: Reduction in Human Resources Support Includes: HR Support TU Secondments Graduate Scheme Social Care Training Realign Schools HR Recharges	131
I10: IT: further consolidate ICT spend across the Council and digitise committee papers. Includes: Revising infrastructure support and arrangements Contract, systems and supplies review Committee Papers: move to digital access only	135



1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	policy development, support to senior management and council governance
Reference:	I2
LFP work strand:	Corporate & Management Overheads
Directorate:	Resources & Regeneration
Head of Service:	Barrie Neal
Service/Team area:	Policy & Governance
Cabinet portfolio:	Policy & Performance and Resources
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
a) policy, performance, service redesign and intelligence	No	No	Yes
b) senior management support service	No	No	Yes
c) governance	No	No	Yes

3. Description of service area and proposal
<b>Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:</b>
Savings on policy development, support to senior management and council governance.
<b><u>a) policy, performance, service redesign and intelligence</u></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- already the subject of a 50% saving for 15/16, staff numbers were reduced in the service area saving £900,000 and the function was remodelled around a single consolidated team</li> <li>- the smaller and newly modelled team was launched in the middle of June 2015</li> <li>- the team supports the organisation's need for policy development (including response to equalities duties), statutory publications, performance management, service redesign and intelligence</li> <li>- the newly formed function has begun to establish new ways of working that provide for greater economy, efficiency and effectiveness within a significantly reduced cost base</li> <li>- key service priorities relate to: policy development (including this year's renewal of the comprehensive equalities scheme and annual monitoring of the CES); statutory publications including the annual governance statement (AGS), comprehensive equalities scheme (CES) and annual CES review; support for the budget process and advice for service consultations and equalities analysis assessment; integration of key service areas across agencies (including social care – health integration); inspections (e.g. Ofsted and CQC inspections due this year); supporting a number of partnership boards; development and management of service related performance data,</li> </ul>

### **3. Description of service area and proposal**

performance management & review; service redesign for cost reduction and improved service delivery; intelligence (covering demographic trends and horizon scanning for key changes impacting on the borough)

#### **b) senior management executive support**

- executive directors and heads of service are supported by three teams of personal assistants
- cost reductions in the last year reduced the number of PAs supporting heads of service

#### **c) governance**

- supporting member decision making, scrutiny functions, member development, education appeals, civic events and international partnerships
- savings to date have impacted on staff numbers and though demand has increased with new committees to be served and the volume of governance activities increasing, these demands have been absorbed within a small staff complement with the adoption of technology, including 'modern.gov' and a bespoke software system to address the huge scale of education appeals
- pressures persist in particular in the management of education appeals and the wide range of popular civic events as well as the core responsibilities for committee management to both executive and scrutiny functions

### **Saving proposal**

#### **a) policy, performance, service redesign and intelligence £180,000 – 2017/18**

The proposed saving would, subject to staff consultations mean a further reduction in posts within the recently re-organised and consolidated function. The new team's impact on establishing new ways of working and streamlining processes will be evaluated after the first full year of operation. It is therefore proposed that relevant staff consultations follow the outcome of the first year and a review targets a £180,000 salaries saving to be delivered in 2017/18.

#### **b) senior management executive support £100,000 - 2016/17**

Alongside the reduction in posts in 2015/16 the potential for further savings to come were flagged-up in staff consultations. This included the scope for further consolidation and co-location of executive support to senior managers. Further consolidation of support and co-location of more posts might provide scope for additional savings of £100,000 for 2016/17, subject to the relevant staff consultations.

#### **c) governance £75,000 – 2017/18**

The service has taken salaries savings impacting on staffing over the last two years. Any further savings proposal will, subject to staff consultations, impact again on salaries budgets and the number of posts supporting the respective governance functions. Though demand has increased with new committees to be served and the volume of governance activities increasing, these demands have been absorbed within a small staff complement with the adoption of technology, including 'modern.gov' for committee management and a bespoke software system to address

### 3. Description of service area and proposal

the huge scale of education appeals.

The £75,000 proposed here would impact directly on salaries budgets and therefore posts supporting the function. The savings proposal is equivalent to up to two FTE posts. Proposals for savings in 2017/18 would impact, in generally what is the lighter of the four years of the administration since the saving does depend upon a reduction in the scale of governance activities.

### 4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:

#### **a) policy, performance, service redesign and intelligence**

Whilst not obviously a front-line service area, significant vulnerabilities exist around: statutory publications, statutory data returns, public consultations and data management for operational services, support & advice for Equalities Analysis Assessments (EAAs) and preparations for service inspections across adult social care and children's services. Efforts to mitigate the impact of further savings need to be set against the background of 50% savings taken in the last year. It is proposed to target any additional savings at 2017/18 taking the level of savings to 60% on 2014/15 base line.

Action being taken to accommodate current savings and prepare the ground for future savings proposals includes:

- the streamlining of business processes, systems and procedures
- reducing the scale of data demands and increasing the scale at which data risks can be managed
- consultation formats and procedures being streamlined with the potential for less corporate oversight and advice to service areas
- preparedness for inspection and external scrutiny being curtailed
- possibly reviewing the frequency of partnership boards & level of support

#### **b) senior management executive support**

The saving will, subject to staff consultations, impact on the number of posts supporting senior management. Each round of savings reduces the attention that can be provided to deal with senior management communications (letters, e-mails and telephone calls); preparations of senior officers for meetings (papers and briefings); support to council complaints, agenda planning and council questions; diary management and formal note taking & reporting. The need for a greater degree of self-servicing for basic administrative needs shifts to senior management.

#### **c) governance**

The saving, subject to staff consultations, would impact directly on the available support to the respective governance functions including committee management and scrutiny reviews. To try to mitigate the effect on committee management and scrutiny, options will be evaluated for managing the balance of that impact on the following activities: committee management, scrutiny, member development, education appeals, civic events, international partnerships. The year in which the saving is

4. Impact and risks of proposal
proposed is the final year of the current administration. This final year tends to have less committee activity, a reduced number of scrutiny reviews and less member development commitments.
Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:
<b>a) policy, performance, service redesign and intelligence</b> – as above <b>b) senior management executive support</b> – as above <b>c) governance</b> – as above

5. Financial information			
Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
a) policy, performance etc	900		900
b) senior management executive support	750	(35)	715
c) governance	600		600
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
a) policy, performance etc.		180	180
b) senior management executive support	100		100
c) governance		75	75
d)			
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>255</b>	<b>355</b>
<b>% of Net Budget</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
a) policy, performance etc	0%	20%	20%
b) senior management executive support	14%	0%	14%
c) governance	0%	13%	13%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	yes	no	no
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:			

6. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
<b>10</b>		1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
<b>Negative</b>		

6. Impact on Corporate priorities		
		economy
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people
<b>Medium</b>		9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity

7. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No Specific Impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	Low	Pregnancy / Maternity:	Low
Gender:	Low	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	Low
Age:	Low	Sexual orientation:	Low
Disability:	Low	Gender reassignment:	Low
Religion / Belief:	Low	Overall:	Low
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

9. a) Human Resources impact					
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					Yes
Workforce profile:					
Posts	Headcount in post	FTE in post	Establishment posts	Vacant	
				Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5					
Sc 6 – SO2					
PO1 – PO5	4	4			
PO6 – PO8	7	6.8			
SMG 1 – 3	3	3			
JNC					
Total	14	13.8			
Gender	Female	Male			
	7	7			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
	4	10			

9. a) Human Resources impact					
Disability	Yes	No			
	2	0			
Sexual orientation	Known	Not known			
	9	5			

9. b) Human Resources impact					
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					Yes
Workforce profile:					
Posts	Headcount in post	FTE in post	Establishment posts	Vacant	
				Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5					
Sc 6 – SO2	10	10			
PO1 – PO5	5	5			
PO6 – PO8					
SMG 1 – 3					
JNC					
Total	15	15			
Gender	Female	Male			
	14	1			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
	7	7	1		
Disability	Yes	No			
	1				
Sexual orientation	Known	Not known			

9.c) Human Resources impact					
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					Yes
Workforce profile:					
Posts	Headcount in post	FTE in post	Establishment posts	Vacant	
				Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5					
Sc 5 – SO2	1	1			
PO1 – PO5	5	5			
PO6 – PO8	1	1			
SMG 1 – 3	2	2			
JNC					
Total	9	9			
Gender	Female	Male			
	5	4			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
	2	7			
Disability	Yes	No			
	1				



**9.c) Human Resources impact**

Sexual orientation	Known	Not known			
	2	7			

**10. Legal implications**

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

The respective savings proposals will each be subject to staff consultations where appropriate and subject to the Council's Management of Change Policy.

**11. Summary timetable**

Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:

Month	Activity
August 2015	
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September Draft consultation papers where relevant for 2015/16 savings
October 2015	Consultations on-going
November 2015	Consultations on-going - reports returned to Scrutiny for review where relevant
December 2015	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 9 December (if appropriate)
January 2016	Transition work ongoing
February 2016	Transition work ongoing and budget set 24 February
March 2016	Savings implemented



<b>1. Savings proposal</b>	
<b>Proposal title:</b>	Customer Transformation – casework review
<b>Reference:</b>	I3
<b>LFP work strand:</b>	Corporate & Management Overheads
<b>Directorate:</b>	Cross council
<b>Head of Service:</b>	Led by Ralph Wilkinson
<b>Service/Team area:</b>	
<b>Cabinet portfolio:</b>	Policy and Performance
<b>Scrutiny Ctte(s):</b>	Public Accounts

<b>2. Decision Route</b>			
<b>Saving proposed:</b>	<b>Key Decision Yes/No</b>	<b>Public Consultation Yes/No</b>	<b>Staff Consultation Yes/No</b>
a) Casework Review	No	No	Yes

<b>3. Description of service area and proposal</b>
<b>Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:</b>
<p>The Council has a process in place for dealing with casework (complaints, casework and Freedom of Information Requests). There are Directorate teams in place to deal with this work as well as an Independent Adjudicator to deal with complaints that have escalated to stage 3 and Local Government Ombudsman liaison arrangements. The Council currently using the iCasework system to administer complaints.</p> <p>There are about 14 staff involved in casework administration but some have other responsibilities not covered by the review. The review will identify the exact number of staff involved.</p>
<b>Saving proposal</b>
<p>The casework review will look at the Council’s complaints process, the staff structure in place to deal with it and the IT system used. The review will consult with all stakeholders including the Mayor, Councillors, MP’s etc.</p> <p>It is estimated that the review will deliver a saving of £50K by restructuring the staffing arrangements that deliver the casework service.</p>

<b>4. Impact and risks of proposal</b>
<b>Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:</b>
<p>The review will focus on the early resolution to complaints and the streamlining of the process to improve (or in some cases maintain) the speed and quality of the response whilst making it more efficient.</p>
<b>Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:</b>
<p>The risk is that the outcome of the review does not achieve the objective for all stakeholders. To mitigate this the review will ensure that all the necessary input is</p>

#### 4. Impact and risks of proposal

gathered and considered in the redesign of the new process.

#### 5. Financial information

Controllable budget: (approximate)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
	400		400
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
a)	50		50
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>		<b>50</b>
<b>% of Net Budget</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>13%</b>
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	Yes	No	No
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:			

#### 6. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
<b>10</b>		1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
<b>Positive</b>		
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
<b>Low</b>		

#### 7. Ward impact

Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No specific impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

#### 8. Service equalities impact

Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	N/A	Pregnancy / Maternity:	N/A
Gender:	N/A	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	N/A
Age:	N/A	Sexual orientation:	N/A
Disability:	N/A	Gender reassignment:	N/A
Religion / Belief:	N/A	Overall:	N/A
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			

## 8. Service equalities impact

Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No		Yes
---	--	-----

## 9. Human Resources impact

Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees:		Yes			
Workforce profile:					
Posts	Headcount in post	FTE in post	Establishment posts	Vacant	
				Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5					
Sc 6 – SO2					
PO1 – PO5					
PO6 – PO8					
SMG 1 – 3					
JNC					
Total					
Gender	Female	Male			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
Disability	Yes	No			
Sexual orientation	Known	Not known			

## 10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

The Council will need to ensure any new complaints process is statutorily compliant where appropriate.

## 11. Summary timetable

Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:

Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposals prepared ( <b>this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation</b> )
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Consultations ongoing
November 2015	Consultations ongoing and ( <b>full decision</b> ) reports returned to Scrutiny for review

**11. Summary timetable**

December 2015	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 9 December
January 2016	Transition work ongoing
February 2016	Transition work ongoing and budget set 24 February
March 2016	Savings implemented

<b>1. Savings proposal</b>	
<b>Proposal title:</b>	Review of Strategy and Comms
<b>Reference:</b>	I4
<b>LFP work strand:</b>	Corporate & Management Overheads
<b>Directorate:</b>	Resources and Regen
<b>Head of Service:</b>	Robyn Fairman
<b>Service/Team area:</b>	Strategy
<b>Cabinet portfolio:</b>	Policy & Performance, Growth & Regeneration
<b>Scrutiny Ctte(s):</b>	Public Accounts

<b>2. Decision Route</b>			
<b>Saving proposed:</b>	<b>Key Decision Yes/No</b>	<b>Public Consultation Yes/No</b>	<b>Staff Consultation Yes/No</b>
a) Review of Programmes in Strategy and Mayor and Cabinet Office	No	No	Yes
b) Restructure of Comms after voluntary redundancies	No	No	No – already implemented

<b>3. Description of service area and proposal</b>
<b>Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:</b>
Programmes within Strategy include the apprenticeship programme, traineeships and the Young Mayor’s programme. The Communications Team proposal has already been implemented through the voluntary redundancy restructure.
<b>Saving proposal</b>
Increase the income to the team by applying for more European funding, reviewing the apprenticeship programme to suit labour market conditions, and maximising efficiencies. The Communications Team restructure has already delivered the savings through the implementation of voluntary redundancy.

<b>4. Impact and risks of proposal</b>
<b>Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:</b>
We expect to increase income and offer more apprenticeships and traineeships (circa 90 a year) in conjunction with ESF and LEP funding. We will review the operation of the apprenticeship programme- in order to achieve delivery of new programme we will have to realign roles and restructure may be necessary.
<b>Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:</b>
We may be unsuccessful in winning the full amount bid for, however the LEP funding is already available. We have high success rates in winning grant.

<b>5. Financial information</b>			
<b>Controllable budget:</b>	<b>Spend £'000</b>	<b>Income £'000</b>	<b>Net Budget £'000</b>
	2,491	(444)	2,047
<b>Saving proposed:</b>	<b>2016/17 £'000</b>	<b>2017/18 £'000</b>	<b>Total £'000</b>
a) Review of Programmes in Strategy and mayors office and increasing income	150		150
b) Restructure of Comms after voluntary redundancies	60		60
<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>		<b>210</b>
<b>% of Net Budget</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>10 %</b>
<b>Does proposal impact on: Yes / No</b>	<b>General Fund</b>	<b>DSG</b>	<b>HRA</b>
	Yes	No	No
<b>If impact on DSG or HRA describe:</b>			

<b>6. Impact on Corporate priorities</b>		
<b>Main priority</b>	<b>Second priority</b>	<b>Corporate priorities</b> 1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	
<b>Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative</b>	<b>Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative</b>	
<b>Positive</b>	<b>Positive</b>	
<b>Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low</b>	<b>Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low</b>	
<b>Low</b>	<b>Low</b>	

<b>7. Ward impact</b>	
<b>Geographical impact by ward:</b>	<b>No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more</b>
	<b>No specific impact</b>
	<b>If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?</b>

<b>8. Service equalities impact</b>			
<b>Expected impact on service equalities for users –N/A</b>			
<b>Ethnicity:</b>		<b>Pregnancy / Maternity:</b>	
<b>Gender:</b>		<b>Marriage &amp; Civil Partnerships:</b>	
<b>Age:</b>		<b>Sexual orientation:</b>	



8. Service equalities impact			
Disability:		Gender reassignment:	
Religion / Belief:		Overall:	
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

9. Human Resources impact					
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					Possibly
Workforce profile:					
Posts	Headcount in post	FTE in post	Establishment posts	Vacant	
				Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5					
Sc 6 – SO2					
PO1 – PO5					
PO6 – PO8					
SMG 1 – 3					
JNC					
Total					
Gender	Female	Male			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
Disability	Yes	No			
Sexual orientation	Known	Not known			

10. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:
None

11. Summary timetable	
Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:	
Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposals prepared ( <b>this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation</b> )
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Review of programmes within the Strategy Division
November 2015	Consultations if required
December 2015	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C

**11. Summary timetable**

	for decision on 9 December
January 2016	Transition work ongoing
February 2016	Transition work ongoing and budget set 24 February
March 2016	Savings implemented

<b>1. Savings proposal</b>	
<b>Proposal title:</b>	Commissioning and Procurement
<b>Reference:</b>	I5
<b>LFP work strand:</b>	Corporate & Management Overheads
<b>Directorate:</b>	Cross Directorate
<b>Head of Service:</b>	Head of Corporate Resources
<b>Service/Team area:</b>	Cross Directorate
<b>Cabinet portfolio:</b>	Resources
<b>Scrutiny Ctte(s):</b>	Public Accounts

<b>2. Decision Route</b>			
<b>Saving proposed:</b>	<b>Key Decision Yes/No</b>	<b>Public Consultation Yes/No</b>	<b>Staff Consultation Yes/No</b>
a) Commissioning and Procurement	Yes	No	Yes

<b>3. Description of service area and proposal</b>
<b>Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:</b>
<p>Across all its services the Council spends in the region of £240m (approximately half the gross general fund spend annually) with third party suppliers. This excludes other commissioning and procurement activity undertaken for and on behalf of our partners, in particular Health.</p> <p>The scale of procurement activity ranges from small scale purchases to support service delivery up to the very large (multi-million pound) contracts for the provision of care services and capital projects. Some procurement activity is very transactional (e.g. purchasing refuse trucks) while other areas require more involved work through commissioning activities (e.g. purchasing of care packages for individuals).</p>
<b>Saving proposal</b>
<p>To continue the work begun in 2015/16 in respect of assessing and reducing our spend on commissioning and procurement activity – approximately £4m annually which represents a cost for securing and running these contracts of just over 1.5% – and the amount we spend with suppliers. The intention is to reduce contract spend where possible (by varying or re-letting contracts) and identify opportunities for efficiencies, better co-ordination, and streamlining of activities to achieve in the region of £1m of savings over the next two years.</p> <p>A base lining exercise of commissioning and procurement activity across the Council will be completed by the end of September. The Council's contract register has also been refreshed and moved to an online platform. This information and options will be presented to the Lewisham Future Board to enable them to consider whether a new organisation model for managing commissioning and procurement is appropriate (including potentially sharing services) or the savings are best achieved within individual services in proportion to their commissioning and procurement activity.</p>

#### 4. Impact and risks of proposal

##### Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:

There should be no impact to service users. However, with the planned £1m reduction in spend there are likely to be staff redundancies. How and where these changes will impact has not yet been finalised and will depend on the assessment of how savings are to be implemented when the base line analysis is concluded – see description of proposal.

##### Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

The main risks to this proposal arise from reducing the resources available to complete the activities required. These might be that: 1) sub-optimal procurement decisions are made, or 2) that contract management does not maintain sufficient oversight and control - resulting in the Council not receiving the services it pays for or spending more on certain activities than is necessary.

The mitigations to these risks are through: the use of technology to help streamline procurement processes in line with EU procurement regulations (including new contract register and financial reporting tools in Oracle R12); the work of the Corporate Commissioning and Procurement Board to ensure the gateway approach introduced in 2014/15 continues and improves; guidance and training offered by the procurement team to facilitate the steps to achieving successful and value for money procurement; and the work of individual services to also use technology and their relationships with partners to improve efficiency and effectiveness in this area.

#### 5. Financial information

Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
General Fund (GF)	4,000 est.		4,000 est.
HRA			
DSG			
Health			
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
a) Commissioning and Procurement	500	500	1,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>1,000</b>
<b>% of Net Budget</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>25%</b>
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	Yes	No	No
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:			

#### 6. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
10		1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible

6. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
Negative		
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Low		

7. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No specific impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:		Pregnancy / Maternity:	
Gender:		Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	
Age:		Sexual orientation:	
Disability:		Gender reassignment:	
Religion / Belief:		Overall:	N/A
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

9. Human Resources impact					
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					Yes*
Workforce profile:					
Posts	Headcount in post	FTE in post	Establishment posts	Vacant	
				Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5					
Sc 6 – SO2					
PO1 – PO5					
PO6 – PO8					
SMG 1 – 3					
JNC					
Total					
Gender	Female	Male			

**9. Human Resources impact**

Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
Disability	Yes	No			
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	

\* this will be completed when the base lining exercise is concluded and the decision taken on whether the savings are to be made through a corporate ‘solution’ or locally by individual services.

**10. Legal implications**

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

Irrespective of the preferred operational arrangements, those involved in commissioning and procuring services on behalf of the Council will need to ensure they continue to comply with the EU procurement regulations as they pertain to local government.

**11. Summary timetable**

Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:

Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposal prepared ( <b>this template</b> )
September 2015	Proposal submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Analysis of detailed baseline and implementation options to the Futures Board
November 2015	
December 2015	Staff consultations undertaken as/if necessary
January 2016	
February 2016	
March 2016	Savings implemented

<b>1. Savings proposal</b>	
<b>Proposal title:</b>	Insurance
<b>Reference:</b>	I6
<b>LFP work strand:</b>	Corporate & Management Overheads
<b>Directorate:</b>	Resources and Regeneration
<b>Head of Service:</b>	Head of Corporate Resources
<b>Service/Team area:</b>	Insurance and Risk Management
<b>Cabinet portfolio:</b>	Resources
<b>Scrutiny Ctte(s):</b>	Public Accounts

<b>2. Decision Route</b>			
<b>Saving proposed:</b>	<b>Key Decision Yes/No</b>	<b>Public Consultation Yes/No</b>	<b>Staff Consultation Yes/No</b>
a) Insurance recharge risk premium	No	No	No

<b>3. Description of service area and proposal</b>
<b>Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:</b>
Insurance and Risk ensures the Council has sufficient insurance cover (in the market or by way of reserves) and manages claims promptly and fairly to reduce the impact of risks should they materialise. The Council's insurance services are also offered to schools and housing to enable them to access the expertise and economies of scale the Council's arrangements provide.
<b>Saving proposal</b>
Current arrangements ensure that insurance recharges to third parties - schools via the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) and housing via the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) - cover the direct (e.g. premiums) and operational (e.g. claims handling) costs for providing agreed levels of cover.
This proposal is to adjust the insurance recharge model to introduce a 'premium for risk'. The revised charges will more accurately reflect the whole risk to the Council arising from the higher levels of excess applicable to school properties and provide a contribution to the risk that the Council carries in respect of the gap between the level of risk insured (self-insured and via external premium) and the actual exposure.
This will represent income to the General Fund where the cost of insurance risk is held and an expense to each of the DSG and HRA as part of the cost to them of accessing this insurance cover.

<b>4. Impact and risks of proposal</b>
<b>Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:</b>
There is no direct impact to service users or staff. This proposal is about ensuring the Council has sufficiently robust and resourced insurance arrangements in place in the event of a serious incident that results in a claim against the Council.

#### 4. Impact and risks of proposal

##### Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

The risks associated with the proposal are that the income is not achieved because:  
 1) the offer to provide insurance services from the Council to schools and the HRA are declined; or  
 2) those activities leave the Council (e.g. schools become Academies or there is a housing stock transfer).

In respect of the first the mitigation is to ensure that the insurance offer (cost and level of service) continues to compare favourably with that which is offered on the open market. There is limited mitigation for the second so the risk remains.

#### 5. Financial information

Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
General Fund (GF)	4,021	(2,180)	1,841
HRA			
DSG			
Health			
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
a) Insurance recharge risk premium	300		300
<b>Total</b>	300		300
<b>% of Net Budget</b>	16%	0%	16%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	Yes	Yes	Yes
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:	Yes – this premium will be an increased cost (of less than one tenth of one percent) to each of the DSG and HRA.		

#### 6. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
10	4	1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
Neutral	Neutral	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
Low	Low	



7. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No specific impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?
	N/A

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:		Pregnancy / Maternity:	
Gender:		Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	
Age:		Sexual orientation:	
Disability:		Gender reassignment:	
Religion / Belief:		Overall:	N/A
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

9. Human Resources impact	
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	No

10. Legal implications
State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

11. Summary timetable	
Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:	
Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposal prepared ( <b>this template</b> )
September 2015	Proposal submitted to Scrutiny leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	
November 2015	
December 2015	Return to M&C, if decision not delegated or already taken, for decision on 9 December
January 2016	Finalise insurance recharge model for 2016/17
February 2016	
March 2016	Saving implemented



<b>1. Savings proposal</b>	
<b>Proposal title:</b>	Finance efficiency savings
<b>Reference:</b>	I7
<b>LFP work strand:</b>	Corporate & Management Overheads
<b>Directorate:</b>	Resources and Regeneration
<b>Head of Service:</b>	Selwyn Thompson
<b>Service/Team area:</b>	Financial Services Division
<b>Cabinet portfolio:</b>	Resources
<b>Scrutiny Ctte(s):</b>	Public Accounts

<b>2. Decision Route</b>			
<b>Saving proposed:</b>	<b>Key Decision Yes/No</b>	<b>Public Consultation Yes/No</b>	<b>Staff Consultation Yes/No</b>
a) Finance non-salary budget and vacancies review	No	No	No

<b>3. Description of service area and proposal</b>
<b>Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:</b>
Finance – The Council’s Finance Division provides a statutory accounting function; financial, business and management accounting advice to management as well as a payroll and pension function.
<b>Saving proposal</b>
There will be a review of non-salaried budgets following the recent restructure of the finance function. In addition to this, a number of staffing vacancies have been held pending a more detailed review which is planned to take place in April 2016. It is expected that a saving of £100k could be achieved in 2016/17 with minimal impact on staffing with a further £150k to follow in 2017/18.

<b>4. Impact and risks of proposal</b>
<b>Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:</b>
The Finance Division will need to continue working with limited flexibility in its staffing budget to deal with workload pressures should existing workloads not be reduced or contained following the recent restructure/downsizing and further savings being delivered.
<b>Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:</b>
The finance function has already delivered significant revenue budget savings over the course of the last three years which has had an impact on lessening the team’s capacity. In delivering these further savings for 2016/17 and 2017/18 it will become increasingly important to ensure a more direct focus on our statutory responsibilities whilst at the same time equipping budget holders with the appropriate tools and knowledge to be more self-reliant in managing their budgets

<b>5. Financial information</b>			
<b>Controllable budget:</b>	<b>Spend £'000</b>	<b>Income £'000</b>	<b>Net Budget £'000</b>
General Fund (GF)	5,382	(1,191)	4,191
HRA			
DSG			
Health			
<b>Saving proposed:</b>	<b>2016/17 £'000</b>	<b>2017/18 £'000</b>	<b>Total £'000</b>
a) Finance non-salary budget and vacancies review	100	150	250
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>250</b>
<b>% of Net Budget</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>6%</b>
<b>Does proposal impact on: Yes / No</b>	<b>General Fund</b>	<b>DSG</b>	<b>HRA</b>
	Yes	No	No
<b>If impact on DSG or HRA describe:</b>	N/A		

<b>6. Impact on Corporate priorities</b>		
<b>Main priority</b>	<b>Second priority</b>	<b>Corporate priorities</b>
10		1. Community leadership and empowerment
<b>Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative</b>	<b>Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative</b>	2. Young people's achievement and involvement
Positive		3. Clean, green and liveable
<b>Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low</b>	<b>Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low</b>	4. Safety, security and a visible presence
Medium		5. Strengthening the local economy
		6. Decent homes for all
		7. Protection of children
		8. Caring for adults and the older people
		9. Active, healthy citizens
		10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity

<b>7. Ward impact</b>	
<b>Geographical impact by ward:</b>	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No Specific Impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?
	N/A

<b>8. Service equalities impact</b>			
<b>Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A</b>			
<b>Ethnicity:</b>		<b>Pregnancy / Maternity:</b>	
<b>Gender:</b>		<b>Marriage &amp; Civil Partnerships:</b>	
<b>Age:</b>		<b>Sexual orientation:</b>	
<b>Disability:</b>		<b>Gender reassignment:</b>	
<b>Religion / Belief:</b>		<b>Overall:</b>	

## 8. Service equalities impact

For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:

N/A

Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No

No

## 9. Human Resources impact

Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No

No

## 10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

There are no specific legal implications

## 11. Summary timetable

Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:

Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposals prepared ( <b>this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation</b> )
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Consultations ongoing
November 2015	Consultations ongoing and ( <b>full decision</b> ) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
December 2015	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 9 December
January 2016	Transition work ongoing
February 2016	Transition work ongoing and budget set 24 February
March 2016	Savings implemented



<b>1. Savings proposal</b>	
<b>Proposal title:</b>	Streamlining procurement and legal administration.
<b>Reference:</b>	I8
<b>LFP work strand:</b>	Corporate & Management Overheads
<b>Directorate:</b>	Resources & Regeneration
<b>Head of Service:</b>	Kath Nicholson
<b>Service/Team area:</b>	Legal (Procurement/Administration)
<b>Cabinet portfolio:</b>	Resources
<b>Scrutiny Ctte(s):</b>	Public Accounts

<b>2. Decision Route</b>			
<b>Saving proposed:</b>	<b>Key Decision Yes/No</b>	<b>Public Consultation Yes/No</b>	<b>Staff Consultation Yes/No</b>
a) Minor reorganisation of Legal Services to incorporate Procurement function	No	No	yes

<b>3. Description of service area and proposal</b>
<b>Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:</b>
The procurement team provides advice to commissioners across the Council, maintains the Council's contract register and makes reports available to central government about council procurement activity through overseeing the Council's procurement portal.
<b>Saving proposal</b>
The procurement function transferred to Legal in 2015. With the merging of the two functions, legal and procurement, a mini-reorganisation of administrative support will net out a £50k salaries saving.

<b>4. Impact and risks of proposal</b>
<b>Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:</b>
Senior procurement practitioner posts will be recruited to minimising the impact on meeting the organisation's needs from the changes being made. However, reorganisation of the administrative support to legal/procurement will provide scope for the deletion of two posts.
The proposal should provide a more stable and resilient procurement team working closely with contract lawyers.
<b>Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:</b>
Inability to recruit to senior positions. External advert for procurement manager at appropriate grade

#### 4. Impact and risks of proposal

--

#### 5. Financial information

Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
	2,160	(387)	1,773
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
a)	50		50
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>		<b>50</b>
<b>% of Net Budget</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3%</b>
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	yes	no	no
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:			

#### 6. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
<b>10</b> <b>As procurement relates to all services, the proposal will impact on all political priorities</b>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Community leadership and empowerment</li> <li>2. Young people's achievement and involvement</li> <li>3. Clean, green and liveable</li> <li>4. Safety, security and a visible presence</li> <li>5. Strengthening the local economy</li> <li>6. Decent homes for all</li> <li>7. Protection of children</li> <li>8. Caring for adults and the older people</li> <li>9. Active, healthy citizens</li> <li>10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity</li> </ol>
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
<b>Positive</b>		
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
<b>Low</b>		

#### 7. Ward impact

Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No specific impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

#### 8. Service equalities impact

Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:		Pregnancy / Maternity:	
Gender:		Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	
Age:		Sexual orientation:	
Disability:		Gender reassignment:	
Religion / Belief:		Overall:	



### 8. Service equalities impact

For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:

Depends on outcome of reorganisation procedure and recruitment exercise

Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No No

### 9. Human Resources impact

Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No Yes

Workforce profile:

Posts	Headcount in post	FTE in post	Establishment posts	Vacant	
				Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5		1			
Sc 6 – SO2					
PO1 – PO5		1			
PO6 – PO8					1
SMG 1 – 3					
JNC					
Total					
Gender	Female	Male			
		2			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
Disability	Yes	No			
		2			
Sexual orientation	Known	Not known			
		2			

### 10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

The reorganisation will follow the Council's management of change and redeployment procedures.

### 11. Summary timetable

Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:

Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposals prepared ( <b>this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation</b> )
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Consultations ongoing

**11. Summary timetable**

<b>November 2015</b>	Consultations ongoing and ( <b>full decision</b> ) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
<b>December 2015</b>	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 9 December
<b>January 2016</b>	Transition work ongoing
<b>February 2016</b>	Transition work ongoing and budget set 24 February
<b>March 2016</b>	Savings implemented

<b>1. Savings proposal</b>	
<b>Proposal title:</b>	Reduction in Human Resources Support
<b>Reference:</b>	I9
<b>LFP work strand:</b>	Corporate & Management Overheads
<b>Directorate:</b>	Resources & Regeneration
<b>Head of Service:</b>	Andreas Ghosh
<b>Service/Team area:</b>	Human Resources
<b>Cabinet portfolio:</b>	Resources
<b>Scrutiny Ctte(s):</b>	Public Accounts

<b>2. Decision Route</b>			
<b>Saving proposed:</b>	<b>Key Decision Yes/No</b>	<b>Public Consultation Yes/No</b>	<b>Staff Consultation Yes/No</b>
a) HR Support	N	N	Y
b) TU Secondments	N	N	Y
c) Graduate Scheme	N	N	N
d) Social Care Training	N	N	N
e) Realign Schools HR Recharges	N	N	N

### **3. Description of service area and proposal**

#### **Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:**

The Council's HR services are made up of a strategic core of staff providing industrial relations, organisation change and development and business partner support, as well as recruitment and clearance function, reorganisation support and employee advice and learning and development provision.

The division supports service to the schools in the production of people management policies, occupational health service, trade union secondments, DBS checks and industrial relations.

A substantial part of the divisions learning resource also provides adult social care learning which in turn is substantially focussed on the private and voluntary sector.

#### **Saving proposal**

- a) To reduce the provision of support to managers, including advice on employee relations, reorganisations, change management, recruitment and learning. In the process review employee support provision such as Investors in People accreditation.
- b) To review the trade union secondment arrangements to reflect a reduction in the number of Council employees.
- c) Reduce support provision available to the graduate scheme and restricting number of future graduates taken on to the current limit of 2 per annum.
- d) Reduce social care training, including that provided to the private, voluntary and independent sector, by incorporating basic training such as induction and safety

### 3. Description of service area and proposal

into the provider requirement, rationalise the number of programmes on any one subject, developing improved digital learning activity and improved attendance at classroom based programmes.

- e) Realign the HR recharges to the schools for recruitment, occupational health, policy advice, HR systems. DBS clearance, trade union secondments and employee relations.
- f)

### 4. Impact and risks of proposal

#### Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:

The proposals will reduce the support on human resources matters to managers, as well as the Council's compliance with people management policy and objectives. The proposals will reduce the social care training support in the community which will be mitigated by increasing provider requirements on training.

#### Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

The proposals are a risk to effective employee relations and the Council's ability to act as a single employer

### 5. Financial information

Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
			2,100
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
a) Staff	20	200	220
b) Trade unions	40		40
c) Graduate support	40		40
d) Schools recharge	100		100
d) Adult social care training		100	100
<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>500</b>
<b>% of Net Budget</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>25%</b>
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	Yes	No	No
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:			

### 6. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
<b>10</b>		1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
<b>Negative</b>		

6. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
<b>Medium</b>		

7. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No specific impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:	Low	Pregnancy / Maternity:	Low
Gender:	Low	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	Low
Age:	Medium	Sexual orientation:	Low
Disability:	Low	Gender reassignment:	Low
Religion / Belief:	Low	Overall:	Low
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
The reduction will have an overall impact on most characteristics as HR policies and practice relate to all these characteristics. However as adult social care training is being reduced there will be a greater impact on older people.			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

9. Human Resources impact					
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					Yes
Workforce profile:					
Posts	Headcount in post	FTE in post	Establishment posts	Vacant	
				Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2	1				
Scale 3 – 5	2	1.5	3		
Sc 6 – SO2	10	10	11		1
PO1 – PO5	17	15.3	19	1	3
PO6 – PO8	3	3	2		
SMG 1 – 3	4	3.2	5		1
JNC	1	1	1		
Total	38		41		
Gender	Female	Male			
	30	8			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
	14	23		1	
Disability	Yes	No			
	3	32		3	

## 9. Human Resources impact

Sexual orientation	Known	Not known			

## 10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

--

## 11. Summary timetable

Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:

Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposals prepared ( <b>this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation</b> )
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Consultations ongoing
November 2015	Consultations ongoing and ( <b>full decision</b> ) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
December 2015	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 9 December
January 2016	Transition work ongoing
February 2016	Transition work ongoing and budget set 24 February
March 2016	Savings implemented

<b>1. Savings proposal</b>	
Proposal title:	IT
Reference:	I10
LFP work strand:	Corporate & Management Overheads
Directorate:	Customer services
Head of Service:	Duncan Dewhurst
Service/Team area:	Technology and Change
Cabinet portfolio:	Resources
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts

<b>2. Decision Route</b>			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
a) Revising infrastructure support arrangements	Yes	No	Yes
b) Contract, systems and supplies review	Yes	No	No
c) Committee Papers: move to digital access only	No	No	No

<b>3. Description of service area and proposal</b>
<b>Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:</b>
<p>The Technology and Change division provides IT services to the whole Council through a mixture of in-house provision and contracted services. The central IT budget is around £7m and across the Council expenditure on IT and related IT services accounts for a further £3m.</p>
<b>Saving proposal</b>
<p>The internal IT teams were restructured last year (to deliver savings £750k agreed in 14-15). As agreed by Mayor and Cabinet the Technology and Change division is currently in the process of implementing a major upgrade of Lewisham's IT infrastructure which will provide modern, stable and flexible IT. Building on this, as part of the IT strategy, the Head of Technology and Change has reviewed the potential to make savings in other parts of the Council's budget and is proposing to make further savings of £1m in 16-17 and a further £1m in 17-18.</p> <p><u>16-17 savings</u></p> <p>The savings in 16-17 will come from two areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Revising our arrangements for supporting our infrastructure (our current arrangements with Capita come to an end on April 1 2016); and</li> <li>- Reviewing contracts, systems and supplies to make best use of the new infrastructure.</li> </ul>

### 3. Description of service area and proposal

#### Revising infrastructure support arrangements

As agreed by Mayor and Cabinet we are currently investigating the feasibility of setting up a shared infrastructure support service with London Borough of Brent. No further decisions are required at this stage – a final decision on whether to proceed with the shared service will need to be taken by Mayor and Cabinet later in the autumn. Nevertheless indicative financial modelling suggests that savings in the region of £0.5m pa could be feasible.

#### Reviewing contracts, systems and supplies

Once the new IT infrastructure is in place there will be opportunities to deliver further savings from a combination of:

- Retendering existing contracts and better supplier management
- Reducing the amount of paper the Council uses, for example through making better use of mobile devices
- Reducing the cost of replacing our desktop estate through the use of 'thin clients'
- Reducing the use of bespoke systems

As part of the IT strategy the Head of Technology and Change is currently reviewing the options for making savings in these areas and will look to put in place a plan of action to coincide with the introduction of the new infrastructure. This plan will be in line with the Council's existing strategy of getting better value for money. Mayor and Cabinet may need to take further decisions on to realise these savings – for example where new contracts need to be awarded – which will be subject to the usual decision making process.

As a result of the changes being made it may be necessary to restructure staff posts in either 16-17 and / or 17-18, which would be subject to the usual consultation process.

#### 17-18 savings plans

17-18 savings plans are yet to be developed but it is expected that further savings could be made to contracts and through further sharing with other partners.

#### Electronic access to committee reports and ending of paper copies

Moving toward being a paperless council will provide the scope for significant reduction in paper and printing costs. Costs of committee papers alone could provide a reduction in printing costs of between £90,000 and £100,000. More detailed work will be undertaken to substantiate this for effecting a future saving.

### 4. Impact and risks of proposal

#### **Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:**

IT underpins every service that the Council delivers and is a critical function for all staff.



#### 4. Impact and risks of proposal

##### Electronic access to committee reports and ending of paper copies

Timing of delivery of this savings will have to be managed alongside the development of the new ICT arrangements. Therefore the risks relate to effective implementation of a stable system to support electronic access to relevant papers and for elected members access and the public access to committee papers.

##### Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

Risk: migrating to new infrastructure support arrangements may take longer than expected. Mitigation: taking a decision on the future of the infrastructure support arrangements as soon as possible.

Risk: changes in our infrastructure support arrangements could put at risk the stability of key systems. Mitigation: ensuring that our new infrastructure support arrangements can deal with both the new infrastructure and existing legacy infrastructure.

Risk: reducing budgets without a clear understanding of where savings are going to come from could put at risk the smooth running of key systems. Mitigation: ensuring that there is a clear plan for delivering savings from systems, supplies and contracts before proceeding

##### Electronic access to committee reports and ending of paper copies

Risks will be mitigated by forward planning for the roll out of the new arrangements

#### 5. Financial information

Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
	7,947	(1,177)	6,770
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
a)	500		500
	500		500
b) 17-18 savings		1,000	1,000
c) Paperless Cttees.	100		100
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,100</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>2,100</b>
<b>% of Net Budget</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>31%</b>
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	Yes	No	No
<b>If impact on DSG or HRA describe:</b>			

#### 6. Impact on Corporate priorities

Main priority	Second priority	Corporate priorities
<b>10</b>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Community leadership and empowerment</li> <li>2. Young people's achievement and involvement</li> <li>3. Clean, green and liveable</li> <li>4. Safety, security and a visible presence</li> <li>5. Strengthening the local economy</li> <li>6. Decent homes for all</li> <li>7. Protection of children</li> </ol>
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
<b>Positive</b>		
Level of impact on	Level of impact on	

6. Impact on Corporate priorities		
main priority – High / Medium / Low	second priority – High / Medium / Low	8. Caring for adults and the older people
<b>Medium</b>		9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity

7. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No specific impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:		Pregnancy / Maternity:	
Gender:		Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	
Age:		Sexual orientation:	
Disability:		Gender reassignment:	
Religion / Belief:		Overall:	
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

9. Human Resources impact					
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					Yes
Workforce profile:					
Posts	Headcount in post	FTE in post	Establishment posts	Vacant	
				Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2	3				
Scale 3 – 5	10				
Sc 6 – SO2	6				
PO1 – PO5	19				
PO6 – PO8	4				
SMG 1 – 3	2				
JNC	1				
Total	45				
Gender	Female	Male			
	25	19			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
	18	21	4		
Disability	Yes	No			
	40	3			
Sexual	Known	Not known			

**9. Human Resources impact**

orientation	20	23			
-------------	----	----	--	--	--

**10. Legal implications**

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

TBC

**11. Summary timetable**

Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:

Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposals prepared
September 2015	Overall proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Ongoing work to review contracts, systems and supplies
November 2015	Decision on shared IT infrastructure support service to go to Scrutiny and Mayor and Cabinet
December 2015	
January 2016	
February 2016	
March 2016	
April 2016	Implementation of new infrastructure support arrangements

