1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Redesign of Children's Joint Commissioning Service
Reference:	C-01
Directorate:	Children & Young People's Services
Director of Service:	Pinaki Ghoshal (Vacancy with substantive Director)
Service/Team area:	Joint Commissioning
Cabinet portfolio:	Children's Services and School Performance – Cllr Barnham
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Children and Young Peoples Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed:	Yes / No See para 16.2 of the Constitution https://lewisham.gov.uk/ mayorandcouncil/ aboutthecouncil/ how-council-is-run/ our-constitution	Public Consultation Yes / No and Statutory vs informal	Staff Consultation Yes / No and Statutory vs informal
Redesign of the Joint Commissioning service	No	No	Yes (staff consultation will be required)

### 3. Description of service area and proposal

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

Redesign of the Joint Commissioning Service and merger with the Safeguarding & Quality Assurance service in order to improve service delivery overall and reduce duplication

#### Cuts proposal\*

There is currently a vacancy for a Director for Joint Commissioning & Early Help. The intention is to recruit to a Director post but to redesign services reporting to it. The key change will be to bring together the Joint Commissioning Service and the Safeguarding and Quality Assurance Service (currently sitting within Children's social care) to build a directorate wide service focussed on commissioning, performance and quality assurance. Through the redesign process there is an opportunity to remove some duplication at the management level, but also to build more capacity around engagement and quality assurance.

### Mitigating Actions for 21/22

There are already a number of vacancies at present. As this is a significant re-design it will require a formal consultation with staff. Prior to the consultation phase there will be engagement with the managers and teams of the current services and their views will inform the final redesign proposal

### 4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

There should not be a negative impact on service users. The intention is to improve the service offer through improved engagement with young people and their families, together with an improved quality assurance function.

At present it is not possible to identify if any staff would be at risk of redundancy as the proposals have not yet been developed. This is however a risk.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions to be taken:

Engagement and consultation with the staff impacted by any proposed changes

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget:	Spend	Income	Net Budget	
General Fund (GF)	£'000	£'000	£'000	
	5499			
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	Total £'000
	£'000	£'000	£'000	
Redesign of the Joint	140			140
Commissioning				
Service and the				
Safeguarding & Quality				
Assurance service				
Total	140			140
% of Net Budget	2.5%	%	%	%
Does proposal impact	General	DSG	HRA	Health
on:	Fund			
Yes / No	Yes	No	No	Yes
If DSG, HRA, Health				The team is
impact describe:				also
				responsible
				for some
				CCG
				contracts

6. Impact on Corporate priorities: list in order of DECREASING impact					
1. Open Lewisham	Corporate priorities				
·	1. Open Lewisham				
3. Giving CYP the best start in life	2. Tackling the Housing Crisis				
	3. Giving Children and young				
8. Good governance and operational	people the best start in life				
effectiveness	4. Building an inclusive local				
4.	economy				
	5. Delivering and defending:				
5.	health, social care & support				
	6. Making Lewisham greener				
6.	7. Building safer communities				

6.	6. Impact on Corporate priorities: list in order of DECREASING impact				
7.					
		8.	Good governance and		
8.			operational effectiveness		
			•		

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

8. Service equalities impact					
Expected impact on service	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	N/A		
		Partnerships:			
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 corvice equality areas please explain why and what					

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

The changes proposed here relate to changes in the organisation of the service and not the provision that is available for clients. However through the changes being proposed there is the opportunity to target resources more clearly at groups of young people in Lewisham whose outcomes are poorer than they could be and so any impact has the potential to improve outcomes for such groups of young people, including from some BAME communities.

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

9. Human R	9. Human Resources impact					
Will this cuts	proposal hav	e an impact o	n employees:	Yes / No	Yes	
Workforce p	rofile:					
Posts	Headcount	FTE	Establishm	Vac	ant	
	in post	in post	ent posts	Agency /	Not	
				Interim	covered	
				cover		
Scale 1 – 2	5	5				
Scale 3 – 5	21	10.6		2		
Sc 6 – SO2	22	19.1		1		
PO1 – PO5	88	82.6		13		
PO6 – PO8	32	29.1		13		
SMG 1 – 3	12 /	11.11				
JNC	1	1				
Total	196	169.7		29		
Gender	Female	Male				
	163	33				
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known		
	80	92	1	23		
Disability	Yes	No				

9. Human Resources impact					
	12	73			
Sexual	Straight /	Gay /	Bisexual	Not	
orientation	Heterosex.	Lesbian		disclosed	
	115	5	1	10	

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			
September 2020	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation paper, equalities assessment and initial HR considerations)			
October 2020	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C			
November to December 2020	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing			
November to December 2020	Consultations undertaken and full decision reports (where required) prepared			
December 2020	Proposals to M&C, including Equality & HR assessments			
January 2021	Decision reports return to Scrutiny at the latest			
February 2021	Final decisions at M&C with the Budget			
March 2021	Cuts implemented			

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Day Service and Supported Learning integration
Reference:	C-02
Directorate:	Community Services
Director of Service:	Joan Hutton
Service/Team area:	Adult Social Care
Cabinet portfolio:	Health and Adult Social Care - Cllr Best
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Healthier Communities Select Committee and Children and
	Young Peoples Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed:	Key Decision*	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
	Yes / No	Yes / No and	Yes / No and
	See para 16.2 of the	Statutory vs	Statutory vs
	Constitution	informal	informal
	https://lewisham.gov.uk/		
	mayorandcouncil/		
	aboutthecouncil/		
	how-council-is-run/		
	our-constitution		
Integration of Day	Yes if leads to	Yes	Yes informal only
Services and	building closure?		
Supported Learning			

### 3. Description of service area and proposal

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

The Council delivers a wide range of adult learning courses through Adult Learning Lewisham. This includes a significant number of supported learners. The Council also commissions and directly provides day service places.

#### Cuts proposal\*

Move to an integrated model with services for adults with learning disabilities that would incorporate learning opportunities, promote independence, offer pathways to supported employment and provide a respite for carers.

#### 4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

The new provision would need to be designed in collaboration with service users and their carers to ensure that it meets their ongoing needs and aspirations. We believe this will offer better outcomes than some of the traditional day services and help move some people towards employment and volunteering as well as other elements of independent living. Closer working between the service areas should provide positive opportunities however, it is recognised that this group of service users may not respond well to change.

This should also be seen alongside the NCIL priority of supporting employment opportunities for people with disabilities.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions to be taken:

Service users can choose how to spend their personal budgets so any new provision would need to carefully match their needs and aspirations.

# 4. Impact and risks of proposal

Supported learning would need to continue to meet the requirements of the Adult Skills Budget funding from the GLA.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget:	Spend	Income	Net Budget	
General Fund (GF)	£'000	£'000	£'000	
	4,148	4,077	71	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	Total £'000
	£'000	£'000	£'000	
Integration of Day	50k	100k		150k
services and				
supported learning				
Total	50k	100k		150k
% of Net Budget	%	%	%	%
Does proposal impact	General	DSG	HRA	Health
on:	Fund			
Yes / No	yes			
If DSG, HRA, Health				
impact describe:				

6. Impact on Corporate priorities: list in orde	r of DECREASING impact
1. Delivering and defending health, social	Corporate priorities
care & support	1. Open Lewisham
2. Building and inclusive local economy	2. Tackling the Housing Crisis
	3. Giving Children and young
3. Good governance and operational	people the best start in life
effectiveness	4. Building an inclusive local
4.	economy
	5. Delivering and defending:
5.	health, social care & support
	6. Making Lewisham greener
6.	7. Building safer communities
7.	8. Good governance and
	operational effectiveness
8.	

7. Ward impact	
Geographical	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
impact by ward:	Borough wide
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?
	Residents from across the borough

### 8. Service equalities impact

Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A

8. Service equalities impact				
Ethnicity:		Pregnancy / Maternity:		
Gender:		Marriage & Civil		
		Partnerships:		
Age:		Sexual orientation:		
Disability:	High	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 Yes				

9. Human Resources impact					
Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No				tbc	
Workforce pi	rofile:				
Posts	Headcount	FTE	Establishm	Vac	ant
	in post	in post	ent posts	Agency /	Not
				Interim cover	covered
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5					
Sc 6 – SO2					
PO1 – PO5					
PO6 – PO8					
SMG 1 – 3					_
JNC					
Total					
Gender	Female	Male			
Ethnicity	ВМЕ	White	Other	Not Known	
Disability	Yes	No			
Sexual	Straight /	Gay /	Bisexual	Not	
orientation	Heterosex.	Lesbian		disclosed	

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

11. Summary timetable			
September 2020	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation paper, equalities assessment and initial HR considerations)		
October 2020	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C		
November to	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing		
December 2020			
November to	Consultations undertaken and full decision reports (where		
December 2020	required) prepared		
December 2020	Proposals to M&C, including Equality & HR assessments		
January 2021	Decision reports return to Scrutiny at the latest		
February 2021	Final decisions at M&C with the Budget		
March 2021	Cuts implemented		

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Housing – Service Reconfiguration in Housing Needs
Reference:	C-05
Directorate:	Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm
Director of Service:	Fenella Beckman
Service/Team area:	Housing Needs
Cabinet portfolio:	Housing and Planning – Cllr Bell
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Housing Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed:	Key Decision*  Yes / No See para 16.2 of the Constitution https://lewisham.gov.uk/ mayorandcouncil/ aboutthecouncil/ how-council-is-run/ our-constitution	Public Consultatio n Yes / No and Statutory vs informal	Staff Consultation Yes / No and Statutory vs informal
Service reconfiguration	No	No	No

### 3. Description of service area and proposal

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

A review of the housing needs and procurement services has been taking place following the move from a through the door service to a remote service. The review is due to be implemented in two phases. The first phase is to test the new structure which essentially brings together the two teams and curves them into 4 groupings that reflect the typical customer journey. This phase would see officers reporting lines change but not much more than this because we are currently anticipating an increase in demand for the service as the eviction ban has ended and furlough due to end soon. Savings would come from releasing vacant posts and not renewing some agency contracts. The second phase of this restructure takes place in financial year 2021/22 and this would then be when we will be looking for efficiencies from the new ways of working and the new IT systems.

### Cuts proposal\*

The savings from service reconfiguration realisation is being worked out and is likely to be realised in 22/23 and 23/24. We have however made in year savings for 20/21 and propose to extend these into 21/22. Potential savings totaling £126,793 have been identified from vacancies within the service.

### Mitigating Actions for 21/22

N/A

# 4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

There is no impact to service users as these roles have been vacant for the last year

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions to be taken:

N/A

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget:	Spend	Income	Net Budget	
General Fund (GF)	£'000	£'000	£'000	
	33,422	28,777	4,645	
HRA	?	?		
DSG	NA	NA		
Health	NA	NA		
Cuts proposed*:	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	Total £'000
	£'000	£'000	£'000	
Service reconfiguration –	127			127
initial savings				
Total	127			127
% of Net Budget	2.7%	%	%	2.7%
Does proposal impact	General	DSG	HRA	Health
on:	Fund			
Yes / No				
If DSG, HRA, Health				
impact describe:				

6. Impact on Corporate priorities: list in order	er of DECREASING impact
1. Good governance and operational	Corporate priorities
effectiveness	1. Open Lewisham
2. Tackling the Housing Crisis	2. Tackling the Housing Crisis
	3. Giving Children and young
3.	people the best start in life
	4. Building an inclusive local
4.	economy
	5. Delivering and defending:
5.	health, social care & support
	6. Making Lewisham greener
6.	7. Building safer communities
	8. Good governance and
7.	operational effectiveness
8.	

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

		for users – High / Medium / L	ow 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 se mitigations are propose		reas please explain why and	what
Is a full service equaliti	es impact asses	ssment required: Yes / No	No

9. Human Resources impact					
Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					
Workforce pi	rofile:				
Posts	Headcount	FTE	Establishm	Vac	ant
	in post	in post	ent posts	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	ВМЕ	White	Other	Not Known	
Disability	Yes	No			
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	

# 10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

No Implications at present as this is a realignment.

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			
September 2020	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers			
	- e.g. draft public consultation paper, equalities			
	assessment and initial HR considerations)			
October 2020	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C			
November to	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing			
December 2020				
November to	Consultations undertaken and full decision reports (where			
December 2020	required) prepared			
December 2020	Proposals to M&C, including Equality & HR assessments			
January 2021	Decision reports return to Scrutiny at the latest			
February 2021	Final decisions at M&C with the Budget			
March 2021	Cuts implemented			

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Review of Short Breaks delivery
Reference:	C-07
Directorate:	CYP
Director of Service:	Angela Scattergood
Service/Team area:	SEND- Short Breaks
Cabinet portfolio:	Children's Services and School Performance - Cllr Barnham
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Children and Young People Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed:	Yes / No See para 16.2 of the Constitution https://lewisham.gov.uk/ mayorandcouncil/ aboutthecouncil/ how-council-is-run/	Public Consultation Yes / No and Statutory vs informal	Staff Consultation Yes / No and Statutory vs informal
Short Breaks	No	No	No

### 3. Description of service area and proposal

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

The term 'short breaks' is used to describe services delivered to give respite activities and support for disabled children and young people receive and/or time off to their family and carers. These breaks come in different forms. Some families' access short breaks at centres and through commissioned service providers, others are part of schemes involving placements with families. Some receive direct payments to buy their own support.

The Council funds a range of short break support through a range of contracts with providers, including local special schools. Many of these arrangements have been in place for a number of years and a review is needed to ensure that those children with the greatest level of need are able to access appropriate short break and for their families respite support and also that the contracts deliver value for money. A review of the contracts will take place. In addition the balance of direct Council spend on short break provision will also be considered in relation to the spend directed to families through Direct Payments. Many families prefer to receive a direct payment so that they can choose the most appropriate provision for their children rather than this being determined by the Council. Nationally there has been a move towards increasing the level of personal budgets/direct payments for families, but any changes here will need to be discussed with families locally. Currently the Council spends in excess of £2M on short breaks so the savings identified are modest and should not have a negative impact on families.

Finally the directorate will review the internal mechanisms it uses to determine the level of need that a family has. At present a significant amount of this is done by qualified social workers, but it is hoped that more of the process can be managed by

### 3. Description of service area and proposal

other staff so that social work time is freed up to provide more direct support for families and children.

### Cuts proposal\*

- Review of targeted and specialist criteria and offer for short breaks.
- Unit costing exercise to assess VFM and impact of services.
- Review of contacts and commissioned services within the offer
- Consider distribution of assessment and monitoring roles across CWCN social work teams- identify activity which could be moved from social workers to family support workers

### Mitigating Actions for 21/22

Cost reduction measures will be prioritised

### 4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

Cost reduction measures with least impact on direct service delivery will be prioritised

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions to be taken:

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget:	Spend	Income	Net Budget	
General Fund (GF)	£'000	£'000	£'000	
	£2M			
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	Total £'000
	£'000	£'000	£'000	
	65	50	50	165
Total	65	50	50	165
% of Net Budget	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%	7%
Does proposal impact	General	DSG	HRA	Health
on:	Fund			
Yes / No	Yes			
If DSG, HRA, Health				
impact describe:				

6. Impact on Corporate priorities: list in order of DECREASING impact					
1. Giving Children and young people Corporate priorities					
the best start in life	1. Open Lewisham				
2. Building an inclusive local economy	2. Tackling the Housing Crisis				

6. Impact on Corporate priorities: list in order of DECREASING impact						
3. Delivering and defending: health, social	3. Giving Children and young					
care & support	people the best start in life					
4. Good governance and operational	4. Building an inclusive local					
effectiveness	economy					
5.	5. Delivering and defending:					
	health, social care & support					
6.	6. Making Lewisham greener					
	7. Building safer communities					
7.						
	8. Good governance and					
8.	operational effectiveness					

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

8. Service equalities i		u u a a u a llia la / Madiuma / L	ove or NI/A
		or users – High / Medium / L	
Ethnicity:	N/A	Pregnancy / Maternity:	N/A
Gender:	N/A	Marriage & Civil	N/A
		Partnerships:	
Age:	N/A	Sexual orientation:	N/A
Disability:	CYP with	Gender reassignment:	N/A
	complex		
	needs		
Religion / Belief:	N/A	Overall:	Low
For any High impact se	ervice equality are	eas please explain why and	what
mitigations are propos	sed:		
To be addressed as part	t of review		

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

9. Human Resources Impact							
Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					None		
Workforce p	Workforce profile:						
Posts	Posts Headcount FTE Establishm Vac				ant		
	in post	in post	ent posts	Agency / Interim cover	Not covered		
Scale 1 – 2							
Scale 3 – 5							
Sc 6 – SO2							
PO1 – PO5							
PO6 – PO8							
SMG 1 - 3							

Yes

9. Human Resources impact					
Gender	Female	Male			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
Disability	Yes	No			
Sexual	Straight /	Gay /	Bisexual	Not	
orientation	Heterosex.	Lesbian		disclosed	

### 10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

None at present

11	I. Sı	um	ma	ry t	im	eta	ble
----	-------	----	----	------	----	-----	-----

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:

decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc), implementation:				
Month	Activity			
September 2020	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers			
	<ul> <li>e.g. draft public consultation paper, equalities</li> </ul>			
	assessment and initial HR considerations)			
October 2020	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C			
November to	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing			
December 2020				
November to	Consultations undertaken and full decision reports (where			
December 2020	required) prepared			
December 2020	Proposals to M&C, including Equality & HR assessments			
January 2021	Decision reports return to Scrutiny at the latest			
February 2021	Final decisions at M&C with the Budget			
March 2021	Cuts implemented			

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Mobile Telephony
Reference:	C-08
Directorate:	Corporate Resources
Director of Service:	Kathy Freeman
Service/Team area:	IT
Cabinet portfolio:	Democracy, Refugees and Accountability - Cllr Bonavia
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed:	Key Decision*	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
	Yes / No	Yes / No and	Yes / No and
	See para 16.2 of the	Statutory vs	Statutory vs
	Constitution	informal	informal
	https://lewisham.gov.uk/ mayorandcouncil/		
	aboutthecouncil/		
	how-council-is-run/		
	our-constitution		
Reduce number of	N	N	N
SIM Cards in the			
estate			
Reduce number of	N	N	N
mobile devices and			
switch to Android			
Move to Intune	N	N	N
mobile device			
management			

### 3. Description of service area and proposal

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

The council currently has 1628 mobile phones and 1032 iPads in circulation. These are managed through the shared ICT service and the data charges are pooled across the 3 shared service partners of which Lewisham pays 25%. Calls are outside this apportionment and charged directly to Lewisham.

The original 20/21 budget allowed for £163k of charges associated with mobile telephony costs, based on last year's usage.

Around half of the council's mobile phone fleet has reached its end of life and no longer receives security updates.

The council has elected to use I-phones which carry a market premium over android phones. As well as pure cost implications, Android is increasingly becoming the platform of choice for corporate applications.

The council uses Mobile Iron security software which carries a subscription cost, however the council also has access to Microsoft Intune through our standard licensing agreements which provides similar functionality with no additional cost.

#### Cuts proposal\*

### 3. Description of service area and proposal

Rather than replacing these, as part of our in year 2021 savings it was agreed that these could be retired and the remaining phones be retrieved and redistributed to those whose jobs have a specific need for them to make calls whilst on the move, and/or to receive life and limb calls.

Where phones do need to be replaced this will be a direct charge to the service. There is currently no budget provision for the replacement of mobile phones.

All fully managed laptops come with the capability to make calls via 8\*8, and therefore it is proposed this becomes the main method of telephony for those working outside the office.

Furthermore it is proposed to retire the council's fleet of iPads once the roll-out of laptops is completed and reduce the allocation of SIM cards within the estate to one per person. The expectation is where an individual is issued with both a mobile phone and a laptop, that they use the hotspot facility on their phone if they need to connect their laptop via 4q.

### IT and Digital Services:

It is proposed to lock in the 20/21 in-year saving of £50k into 21/22. This was already an ambitious target as it represents around a third of the council's mobile spend.

Going forward an additional saving will be possible through a migration from Mobile Iron to Intune, but this will require some investment and it would not be expected to yield benefit before 2023/24.

#### **Cross Council:**

The provision of laptops equipped with a telephony function should significantly reduce the need for services to require mobile phones. We should be looking to reduce the overall numbers in the fleet in by at least 25% which equates to around 400 handsets

Based on a cost of £200 per handset his results in a cost avoidance of £80k.

Migrating to android should yield a saving of at least £25 per handset over the remaining handsets which equates to a total cost avoidance of £30k over the fleet lifecycle. Assuming a 3 year life expectancy, this yields an additional cost avoidance of £10k per annum, although the first year saving is likely to be negated by set up costs

Note – because of the lack of existing budget this is not true savings but rather cost avoidance.

### 4. Impact and risks of proposal

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

The main impact will be a change to the way that a large number of council staff communicate, as they use their laptop soft phones more, and get used to using mobile hotspots.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions to be taken:

There is a degree of risk around the SIM card reduction cost due to the way the data charges are pooled and apportioned. It is expected that due to organisational growth over the last few years, Lewisham's share of the apportionment will rise, and this could completely negate the saving.

The reduction in devices and sim cards may initially be seen by users as an inconvenience to the way they work. Careful messaging as to how alternatives can provide the support required and senior corporate buy-in are essential (the 20/21 in year saving has been taken to EMT)

# 4. Impact and risks of proposal

The redistribution will potentially be labour intensive – it may be necessary to fund a small project team to co-ordinate activities

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget:	Spend	Income	Net Budget	
General Fund (GF)	£'000	£'000	£'000	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2021/22 £'000	2022/23 £'000	2023/24 £'000	Total £'000
SIM card reduction (ITDS)	50			50
Device reduction	30			30
(Cross Council avoidance)				
Android migration		10	10	20
(Cross Council avoidance)				
Intune migration (ITDS)			?	
Total	80	10	10	100
% of Net Budget	%	%	%	%
Does proposal impact	General	DSG	HRA	Health
on:	Fund			
Yes / No				
If DSG, HRA, Health				
impact describe:				

6. Impact on Corporate priorities: list in orde	6. Impact on Corporate priorities: list in order of DECREASING impact			
1. Good governance and operational	Corporate priorities			
effectiveness	1. Open Lewisham			
2.	2. Tackling the Housing Crisis			
	3. Giving Children and young			
3.	people the best start in life			
	4. Building an inclusive local			
4.	economy			
	5. Delivering and defending:			
5.	health, social care & support			
	6. Making Lewisham greener			
6.	7. Building safer communities			
7.	8. Good governance and			
	operational effectiveness			
8.				

<b>7.</b>	Ward impact	
		No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more

7.	Ward impact	
		No specific impact
		If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

Ethnicity:	N/A	for users – High / Medium / Lo Pregnancy / Maternity:	N/A
Gender:	N/A	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	N/A
Age:	N/A	Sexual orientation:	N/A
Disability:	Low	Gender reassignment:	N/A
Religion / Belief:	N/A	Overall:	
For any High impact se mitigations are propose		reas please explain why and v	vhat

9. Human R	9. Human Resources impact				
Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No					
Workforce pi	rofile:				
Posts	Headcount	FTE	Establishm	Vac	ant
	in post	in post	ent posts	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	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	

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			
September 2020	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers			
	- e.g. draft public consultation paper, equalities			
	assessment and initial HR considerations)			
October 2020	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C			
November to	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing			
December 2020				
November to	Consultations undertaken and full decision reports (where			
December 2020	required) prepared			
December 2020	Proposals to M&C, including Equality & HR assessments			
January 2021	Decision reports return to Scrutiny at the latest			
February 2021	Final decisions at M&C with the Budget			
March 2021	Cuts implemented			