

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	Chief Executive			
Director	Helen Clarke			
Service area	Communications			
Cabinet Portfolio	Culture, Leisure and Communications- Cllr Walsh			
Reference	CEX1 - Lewisham Life Magazine			
Saving title				
	Lewisham Life			
Description of saving (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	Reduce frequency of Lewisham Life magazine from four times a year to two times a year.			
Division budget	Gross £k	1,919	Net £k	
Service area budget	Gross £k	1,219	Net £k	
Saving proposed	2023/24 £k	35	2024/25 £k	69
Risks:				
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N	No			
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	100%			
Impact of making the saving	<p>Lewisham Life is produced inhouse by the Council's Communications team and printed and distributed to 150,000 homes across the borough. A 2022 survey revealed it to be the most read and trusted publication in the borough. It is published four times a year, in line with Local Government Publicity Guidance.</p> <p>Rising costs in printing and labour mean the cost of printing and distribution are steadily increasing year-on-year, while advertising revenue for an infrequent, printed publication has decreased. Over time this trend is likely to continue.</p> <p>Lewisham Life is a source of Council news and information for many residents – particularly those who do not have access to digital channels, or chose not to engage with the Council via social media/digital communications.</p> <p>The local news market has reduced drastically over the last decade, with limited resources and no local newspaper delivered across the borough.</p> <p>As such, any reduction will increase the gap in the market for local news and information (including some of our statutory roles such as warning and informing and information about consultations/engagement). This could also lead to services needing to produce service-specific physical comms.</p>			
Possible risk mitigation	<p>A strategic content plan will allow to get the most out of our two issues a year and align with the Council's priorities. We will seek advertising and support from partners to either increase the size of the publication and/or resume quarterly publication.</p> <p>We are currently developing proposals to increase the reach of news and information from the Council and LSP members, both via digital and physical channels.</p>			
Other considerations:				
Member or Officer decision	Officer but members to be briefed.			

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Redundancies	Y/N	N	Number of staff	
Public consultation	Y/N	N	Audience(s)	
Investment required (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	N	Cost £k	
	In what:			
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work	Other services may need to fund alternatives to inform residents about services/changes/consultations etc.			
Specific legal or statutory considerations	N/A			

Equalities Screening Template

Impact & Outcomes
What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?
Service Users
<p>Lewisham Life is produced inhouse by the Council's Communications team and printed and distributed to 150,000 homes across the borough. A 2022 survey revealed it to be the most read and trusted publication in the borough. It is published four times a year, in line with the Code of Recommended Practice on Local Authority Publicity.</p> <p>Rising costs in printing and labour mean the cost of printing and distribution are steadily increasing year-on-year, while advertising revenue for an infrequent printed publication has decreased. Over time this trend is likely to continue.</p> <p>Lewisham Life is a source of Council news and information for many residents – particularly those who do not have access to digital channels, or chose not to engage with the Council via social media/digital communications.</p> <p>The local news market has reduced drastically over the last decade, with limited resources and no local newspaper delivered across the borough.</p> <p>As such, any reduction will increase the gap in the market for local news and information (including some of our statutory roles such as warning and informing and information about consultations/engagement). This could also lead to services needing to produce service-specific physical comms.</p> <p>We will try to gain sponsorship to enable us to resume quarterly publication in the near future, but in the meantime we will take steps to mitigate the potential impact of the change in service. A strategic content plan will allow to get the most out of our two issues a year and align with the Council's priorities.</p>

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<p>We are currently developing proposals to increase the reach of news and information from the Council and LSP members, both via digital and physical channels.</p> <p>It is worth noting that over 95% of Lewisham residents have access to the Internet, so we will also work to increase subscribers to our weekly e-newsletter.</p>				
Staff				
<p>No impact – Lewisham Life is produced inhouse by the Council's Communications Team. Staff capacity created by this change will be reallocated to other communications activity.</p>				
Other Council Services				
<p>Other services may need to fund alternative communications to inform residents about services/changes/consultations etc.</p>				
Partners				
<p>Partners frequently use Lewisham Life to promote events or campaigns. We will liaise with them to ensure we can find alternative ways to support their work, and engage them in trying to find sponsorship to enable us to increase the frequency of publication back up to four times a year.</p>				
<p>Are there any specific equalities implications? <u>Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.</u></p>				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age		Research shows that while over 95% of Lewisham residents have internet access, however those who do not tend to be older - this may limit their access to alternative sources of news and information.		
Disability				X
Ethnicity				X

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality		Research shows that residents in lower social and economic grades (C2DE) and/or social housing are <u>slightly less likely to have access</u> to the internet – this may limit their access to alternative sources of news and information.		
Is a full EAA required?			N	

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	Chief Executive			
Director	Helen Clarke			
Service area	Communications and Engagement (Executive Support)			
Cabinet Portfolio	Culture, Leisure and Communications- Cllr Walsh			
Reference	CEX2 - Executive Support Team Post Removals			
Saving title	Executive Support Structure			
Description of saving (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<p>The Executive Support Team will be reduced by two posts, achieved by not filling two vacancies which are currently held within the service.</p> <p>This will be a permanent saving, with the changes made to the base salary budget of the team.</p>			
Division budget	Gross £	1,919	Net £k	
Service area budget	Gross £	700	Net £k	£0
Saving proposed	2023/24 £k	35 (plus potential underspend of further £50k)	2024/25 £k	97
Risks:				
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N	No			
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	90%			
Impact of making the saving	The saving will reduce the level of administrative support which is provided to Directors within the Council, it will also increase the workload of the Executive Support service.			
Possible risk mitigation	<p>A more fluid provision of administrative support, with staff covering across multiple Directorates instead of providing support to one.</p> <p>An acknowledgement of the different levels of administrative support required by different Directors across the Council. This will allow the service to reduce support in areas where capacity is not being fully utilised, and increase the provision of support to areas where the service is being reduced, but the demand is still high.</p>			
Other considerations:				
Member or Officer decision	Officer			
Redundancies	Y/N	N	Number of staff	-
Public consultation	Y/N	N	Audience(s)	-
Investment required (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	N-	Cost £k	-
	In what:	-		
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work	No			

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Specific legal or statutory considerations	None
--	------

Equalities Screening Template

Impact & Outcomes
What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?
Service Users
<p>This change relates to a reduction of two vacant posts which are currently held within the Council's Executive Support Team.</p> <p>This change will have a minimal impact on service users. The team that is affected does not provide a service that regularly interacts with Lewisham residents, and therefore changes to it likely will not be felt by residents.</p> <p>The team does provide a small casework function, but this is carried out primarily by the team's managers, and the proposed change will impact the capacity of officers. It is therefore felt that there will be no impact on service users from implementation.</p>
Staff
<p>This change will impact staff within the Executive Support Team, as well as the Council's Directors. The Executive Support team primarily provides an administrative function to the Council's senior officers, and therefore a reduction in its capacity will reduce the work that they are able to complete. It is possible that some of the burden that has previously been carried by this team will now need to be covered from within services, rather than being provided corporately by the Council.</p> <p>Additionally, Officers within the Executive Support Team will now need to provide administrative support to an increased number of directors relative to their size as a team. This will increase the workload of both officers and managers within the team. Although it is felt that the team do have capacity to absorb an increased workload, this change will be closely monitored to ensure that it does not have a significant negative impact on workload.</p>
Other Council Services
<p>This change will have a minimal impact on the other Council services. As has been referenced above, it is possible that a reduced corporate administrative function will mean that some services find an increased administrative workload is placed on them. However, it is felt that this will not be significant and more efficient ways of working, including utilising technology designed to support administrative work, will help to minimise this impact.</p>
Partners
<p>This change will not impact the Council's partners.</p>

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X
Disability				X
Ethnicity				X
Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality				X
This proposed change focuses only of roles which have been held vacant for an extended period of time. As no significant impact has been felt for the duration that the roles have already been vacant, it is assumed that formalising the change will not have a significant impact on the Council or on service users.				
Is a full EAA required?			N	

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	Chief Executive's			
Director	Sherene Russell-Alexander			
Service area	People and Organisation Development			
Cabinet Portfolio	Finance and Strategy - Cllr de Ryk			
Reference	CEX10 – People & Org Development Vacant Posts			
Saving title				
People and Organisation Development Savings Proposal				
Description of saving (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	All savings proposed are ongoing and achieved by holding vacant positions.			
	General Fund For Financial Year 2023/24 People and OD is projected to be underspent by £200,000 which represents a 7% saving on the Net Budget . This is achieved mostly by holding vacancies while making some small savings in other areas.			
Division budget	Gross £k	£2,925 (General Fund)	Net £k	£2,719 (General Fund)
Service area budget	Gross £k	N/A	Net £k	N/A
Saving proposed	2023/24 £k	£200k (General Fund 7%)	2024/25 £k	Target Savings: 6% of General Fund = £169k
Risks:				
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N		No		
Likelihood of making cut in full - %		100%		
Impact of making the saving	Higher workload for the team. Service activities to be prioritised carefully to ensure we have capacity to match delivery. As it stands there is a continually demand, with little regard for actual ability to deliver.			
Possible risk mitigation	Careful consideration of what is added (negotiated to be removed) to the workplan - clear mapping of capacity and resources			
Other considerations:				
Member or Officer decision	Officer			
Redundancies	Y/N	Y	Number of staff	Potential 2 (2024/25)
Public consultation	Y/N	N	Audience(s)	
Investment required (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	N	Cost £k	
	In what:			
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work	No			
Specific legal or statutory considerations	Compliance with employment legislation for redundancy and consultation with trade unions.			

Equalities Screening Template

For each of the nine protected characteristics, identify whether the proposal has a high, medium, low or neutral impact on service users and whether this is a positive or negative impact.

Identify whether the proposal has a high, medium, low or neutral impact on socio-economic inequality (e.g. low income, fuel poverty, food insecurity, digital inclusion etc) and whether this is a positive or negative impact.

Identify whether a full service equalities analysis assessment is required for this proposal based on this Equalities Analysis Toolkit. For advice on whether an EAA is required and how to assess service equalities impact please contact policy@lewisham.gov.uk

Impact & Outcomes				
What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?				
Service Users				
No impact on service users for both 2023/24 and 2024/25				
Staff				
No impact on staff for 2023/24 as savings achieved by holding vacancies open.				
For 2024/25 a small restructure within People and OD is envisaged to achieve savings target. However, the details are yet to be determined. Once we are clear on the exact nature of the changes and the impact on individual posts and people, a full EAA for that people change will be undertaken.				
Other Council Services				
No impact envisaged for both 2023/24 and 2024/25				
Partners				
No impact envisaged for both 2023/24 and 2024/25				
Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X
Disability				X
Ethnicity				X
Gender				X

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality				X
Is a full EAA required?	No. Not required at this stage as referenced above. Once the details of the changes are known, we will undertake a further screening exercise			

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

	Chief Executive's			
	Jeremy Chambers			
	Electoral Services			
	Finance and Strategy - Cllr de Ryk			
	CEX03 – Electoral Services Election Equipment Expenditure			
	Election equipment expenditure move from Electoral Registration budget to Election budget			
	One-off We received approval from EMT earlier this year to purchase some vital new election equipment – 10 scanners for postal vote verification. The cost of the equipment, scanning software and licenses will come to around £8k. Currently this expenditure sits in our Electoral Registration budget (E44117), but it would be more appropriate to move it to the Election budget (E44118), which comes out of the corporate fund. Not an actual saving for the council, but it will represent a reduction and correction for the Electoral Registration budget.			
	Gross £k		Net £k	
	Gross £	468	Net £k	460
	2023/24 £k	8	2024/25 £k	0
Risks:				
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N		Yes – to the Election budget. E44118		
Likelihood of making cut in full - %		100%		
	This will provide a correct position for the Electoral Registration budget. But it will simply pass on the cost to the Election budget, which pulls from the corporate fund (I am told). The election budget also covers any unscheduled polls, such as the Deptford by-election which is coming on 9 November.			
	NA			
Other considerations:				
	Officer			
	Y/N	N	Number of staff	NA
	Y/N	N	Audience(s)	NA
	Y/N	N	Cost £k	NA
	In what:			

Equalities Analysis Assessment

Electoral Services Savings Proposals

1. Election equipment expenditure move from Electoral Registration budget to Election budget.

Summary of the proposal

This is a one off saving. In effect it is simply a movement of expenditure from a regular service budget to the corporate fund.

Election equipment has been purchased from the electoral registration budget for approximately £8k. We are required to make 10% savings on this budget. The election budget works differently to the electoral services budget, with election expenses being unpredictable (especially for unscheduled polls). This proposals simply moves the cost for election equipment from the electoral services budget to the election budget. In addition, for each parliamentary or GLA election we are able to reclaim 10% of the cost of this equipment, which will be recorded within the election budget.

Equalities Screening Template

Impact & Outcomes				
What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?				
Service Users				
There is no impact on service users.				
Staff				
There is no impact on staff.				
Other Council Services				
The 2 budgets for electoral services will be more accurate.				
Partners				
There is no impact on Council partners.				
Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X
Disability				X
Ethnicity				X
Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Pregnancy and maternity				x
Religion and belief				x
Sexual orientation				x
Socio-economic inequality				x
Is a full EAA required?			No (with Corporate Policy input)	

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	Chief Executive's			
Director	Jeremy Chambers			
Service area	Electoral Services			
Cabinet Portfolio	Finance and Strategy - Cllr de Ryk			
Reference	CEX04 – Electoral Services Annual Canvass			
Saving title	Annual Canvass – remove non-statutory freepost reply envelope and scanning service			
Description of saving (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<p>From 2024-25 onwards</p> <p>The law requires us to send a canvass form with pre-paid response envelope to every 'route 2' property at least once. We have to send reminder forms to non-responding properties, but the requirement for a pre-paid reply envelope no longer applies. The first part of this proposal is to remove the pre-paid reply envelope from the reminder forms. Saving of £1k</p> <p>The second part of the proposal involves the scanning of the returned forms. Currently the forms are returned to a contractor who opens, scans and destroys the forms for us. This costs around £1k (including VAT). We propose scanning the forms ourselves instead. This work will be absorbed in normal officer work time. Saving of £1k</p>			
Division budget	Gross £k		Net £k	
Service area budget	Gross £	468	Net £k	466
Saving proposed	2023/24 £k	0	2024/25 £k	2
Risks:				
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N	N			
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	80%			
Impact of making the saving	<p>The initial form must still carry a reply envelope. Most of the postal responses we receive come from that first form, so for most residents there will be no change to the service.</p> <p>There is an impact on the residents that receive the reminder forms. 90% of responses come from our online response service, which is cheaper than the postage cost, so this will likely mean more people using that method.</p> <p>There may be an impact on those who are unable to use the internet, and who do not receive, or lose/ignore the initial form with the reply envelope.</p>			
Possible risk mitigation	Those residents who are affected and unable to respond to the forms posted to them will receive a visit from a canvasser. This is a legal requirement and work we already carry out. So there is adequate mitigation already built in to the service, and already accounted for in our budget.			
Other considerations:				
Member or Officer decision	Officer			
Redundancies	Y/N	N	Number of staff	NA
Public consultation	Y/N	N	Audience(s)	NA
Investment required (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	N	Cost £k	NA
	In what:			
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work				

Specific legal or statutory considerations	Statutory requirement for the resident to receive at least 1 canvass form with a reply envelope.
--	--

Equalities Analysis Assessment

Electoral Services Savings Proposals

2. Annual Canvass – remove non-statutory freepost reply envelope and scanning service

Summary of the proposal

From 2024-25 onwards

The law requires us to send a canvass form with pre-paid response envelope to every 'route 2' property at least once. We have to send reminder forms to non-responding properties, but the requirement for a pre-paid reply envelope no longer applies. The first part of this proposal is to remove the pre-paid reply envelope from the reminder forms.

Saving of £1k

The second part of the proposal involves the scanning of the returned forms.

Currently the forms are returned to a contractor who opens, scans and destroys the forms for us. This costs around £1k (including VAT). We propose scanning the forms ourselves instead. This work will be absorbed in normal officer work time.

Saving of £1k

Impact & Outcomes
What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?
Service Users
<p>The absence of a reply envelope for reminder forms could have a negative impact on a small number of people who prefer to respond by post, rather than the other methods (phone, online, by hand).</p> <p>Note that all properties will still receive a reply envelope with the initial canvass form delivered to them. In the last 2 years, 60% of forms received by post have been returned using the reply envelope in the initial form. However, of the 25,000 responses we receive each year, only 3,000 (12%) are returned by post. The vast majority are completed online.</p> <p>The online response service has improved and the number of online responses has increased every year. Lewisham now receives a higher percentage of online responses than any other London authority, and we believe we can raise that even higher by increasing awareness of the speed and ease of the digital route.</p> <p>The change to the scanning of the forms will have zero impact on service users.</p>
Staff
<p>The removal of the envelope will have a minimal impact on staff. It's possible it may lead to a small increase in enquiries from residents who are not able to use the online or telephone response methods.</p>

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

The change to the scanning will have a bigger impact. Staff will have to increase the amount of time they spend scanning the forms.
However, we know that scanning the forms internally will improve the speed and quality of our service. We will be able to scan the forms each morning, rather than waiting for the contractor to scan and upload them each afternoon. This will help the staff with the planning of their day, and give us a greater ability to audit the effectiveness of our scanning (by checking batches to identify any missed items).

Other Council Services

The postroom will see a large increase in the number of items to process during the canvass period. However, it is not considered this will be beyond their capacity, as the number of items will not be as great as they were in 2019, and the staffing has remained the same.

Partners

Our print supplier will not need to print so many reply envelopes, nor insert envelopes for our additional runs. This will save time.

The reduction in envelope printing will help with our environmental policy.

Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.

Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age			X	
Disability			X	
Ethnicity			X	X
Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality			X	
Is a full EAA required?			Yes (with Corporate Policy input)	

1. Equalities Analysis Assessment Template

Author	Jamie Baker	Directorate	Chief Execs
--------	-------------	-------------	-------------

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Date	11/1/24	Service	Electoral Services	
<p>1. The activity or decision that this assessment is being undertaken for</p>				
<p><i>Annual Canvass – remove non-statutory freepost reply envelope and scanning service</i> From 2024-25 onwards The law requires us to send a canvass form with pre-paid response envelope to every 'route 2' property at least once. We have to send reminder forms to non-responding properties, but the requirement for a pre-paid reply envelope no longer applies. The first part of this proposal is to remove the pre-paid reply envelope from the reminder forms. Saving of £1k The second part of the proposal involves the scanning of the returned forms. Currently the forms are returned to a contractor who opens, scans and destroys the forms for us. This costs around £1k (including VAT). We propose scanning the forms ourselves instead. This work will be absorbed in normal officer work time. Saving of £1k</p>				
<p>2. The protected characteristics or other equalities factors potentially impacted by this decision</p>				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Age	<input type="checkbox"/> Ethnicity/ Race	<input type="checkbox"/> Religion or belief	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Language spoken	<input type="checkbox"/> Other, please define:
<input type="checkbox"/> Gender/Sex	<input type="checkbox"/> Gender identity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Household type	
<input type="checkbox"/> Income	<input type="checkbox"/> Carer status	<input type="checkbox"/> Sexual orientation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Socio Economic status	
<input type="checkbox"/> Marriage and Civil Partnership	<input type="checkbox"/> Pregnancy and Maternity	<input type="checkbox"/> Refugee/ Migrant/ Asylum seeker	<input type="checkbox"/> Health & Social Care	
<input type="checkbox"/> Nationality	<input type="checkbox"/> Employment	<input type="checkbox"/> Armed forces		

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

3. The evidence to support the analysis

Annual canvass response statistics for the last 3 years

The statistics from previous canvasses show us the number of responses to the canvass from the initial form and reminder forms.

ONS data

This gives us information on the number and types of people living in Lewisham. We cannot match the 2 datasets to determine exactly which categories of people are more likely to use reply envelopes, but we can make reasonable assumptions on the likelihood of some people having a preference for responding by post.

4. The analysis

The canvass response rate has increased every year. The number of responses by post, using the free reply envelope, has decreased every year, with the number of online responses increasing significantly.

The total response rate for canvass route 2 properties is 65%. 40% of properties respond to the initial canvass form. We send a further 2 reminders and send canvassers who make at least 2 visits to each non-responding household. The total response rate from the 2 reminder forms and the door-knocking accounts for the remaining 15% of the properties to respond.

This evidence tells us:

- The introduction of the online response service has improved the response rate, reduced cost, and improved accessibility
- The reply envelope results in a decent number of responses with the initial canvass form, but suffers from diminishing returns in the subsequent reminder forms
- There are many reasons why residents do not respond to the canvass, the presence of a reply form has not made an impact on reducing the number of non-responders
- Although we cannot match non-responding properties against ONS data, we can make reasonable assumptions on the categories of people less likely to respond to the canvass
- We can also make some reasonable assumptions on the categories of people who are more likely to prefer to respond by post, using a freepost reply envelope

Scanning

For the scanning element of the proposal, the evidence shows that there will be approximately 4,000 canvass forms to scan each year. This represents a total of around 15 hours work. This is spread across a 4 month period, and can be spread across 4 members of staff. Therefore, we consider the impact on staff to be minimal, with the extra work easily absorbed into current working schedules.

5. Impact summary

Age

Potential for positive and negative impacts

Older people

Older people have traditionally been less likely to use digital solutions for public services, such as responding to the annual canvass. The absence of a freepost reply envelope may impact this group negatively due to their preference to complete and return the physical form.

However, recent studies show that the 70+ age group are now far more digitally proficient and confident, and in some spending more time online than other age groups. We also know that this group are more likely to respond to the initial canvass form which will carry a reply envelope.

Finally, we also know that older people move home less often, so are more likely to fall under route 1 of the canvass and be automatically verified, with no requirement to respond.

Younger people

Younger people are less likely to register to vote, and less likely to respond to the annual canvass form. The presence of a reply envelope is not thought to be a significant factor in their ability or propensity to complete the form or register to vote. Instead, it is the language on the form and awareness of the requirement to register that represent bigger barriers, in addition to an increased likelihood to feel disengaged from politics and therefore disinclined to be involved.

Language Spoken

Potential for negative impacts

People who have low levels of English, or cannot read English will struggle to complete and return the canvass form. The form itself is easier to understand and complete for someone in this category compared to the online form. The presence of existing names with nationality and layout of the form make it more obvious what the resident needs to do. Because of this, the reply form is more useful for this group as they are more likely to want to respond by post.

Disability

Both positive and negative impacts

This group is quite varied and the ability to respond with a freepost envelope will affect disabled people differently.

Many disabled people with mobility impairments will prefer to respond online as there is no requirement for them to travel to a postbox.

Some disabled people will struggle to complete the form themselves – paper or online versions – and will require someone to help them, such as a carer. Carers will usually prefer to complete the paper form and return it via post, rather than the online system which would require them to log on to the website with their personal device at their clients home.

Household type

Negative impact

People living in flat shares and HMOs are less likely to want to complete the canvass form for the entire property. That is because they often don't know their housemates well, and are not willing to take responsibility for the household. In

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

these cases the paper form is often the best way for them to respond – each member of the household adding their own details, with the final person returning the form. However, the response rate from these properties has been low for a number of years, and we are trying other methods to contact these households to gather the list of residents.

Socio-Economic status

Potential for negative impact

The poorest residents in Lewisham may not have access to online services at home, and therefore are more likely to require the freepost reply envelope.

Impact on Council's 5 equality objectives:

- **To ensure equal opportunities for marginalised and seldom heard communities.**

Minor impact. The absence of a reply envelope from reminder forms will slightly reduce the likelihood of some residents to complete and return the form

- **To reduce the number of vulnerable people in the borough by tackling socio-economic inequality.**

No impact.

- **To improve the quality of life of residents by tackling preventable illnesses and diseases.**

No impact.

- **To ensure that services are designed and delivered to meet the needs of Lewisham's diverse population.**

Positive impact. The absence of the reply envelope with the reminder forms will encourage more people to return their form online. More online responses will improve the efficiency of the service and reduce the cost for residents

- **To increase the number of people we support to become active citizens**

Positive impact

Completing their registration online will give them access to more information that can encourage electoral participation.

6. Mitigation

Our mitigations already exist and can be built upon further.

- The initial canvass form will still have a freepost reply envelope
- Residents are able to call us directly and complete the form over the phone
- Forms can also be returned by an additional recorded message phoneline, online, via email, and via text message
- Forms are sent to 75% of registered voters via email, with a significant response each year
- 40 canvassers visit all non-responding households to help them complete the form
- HMOs and student properties are dealt with separately, with data being requested, and often supplied, by a responsible person (HOM licence holder, landlord, university and wardens). This removes the requirement for some households to respond
- Improved data matching processes to identify where people are still resident (found on other council databases) removing their requirement to return the form

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

- Translation services information appearing on the forms enabling people who do not understand English to contact us and get help to complete the form
- Anybody that asks for a reply envelope, or a canvass form, will receive one in the post (forms we post out directly will always contain a reply envelope)

7. Service user journey that this decision or project impacts

Service users will be able to contact the council to complain or get more information about the canvass. The best point of contact will be electoral services – phone, email or visiting our office.

The main impact of this policy is to further encourage responses using the online response service, saving the council money which can be better spent on other important council services.

Signature of Director

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	Chief Executive's			
Director	Jeremy Chambers			
Service area	Electoral Services			
Cabinet Portfolio	Finance and Strategy - Cllr de Ryk			
Reference	CEX05 – Electoral Services Voter ID Letters			
Saving title	Voter ID letters – send via email only, scrap the direct letters to households			
Description of saving (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<p>One-off</p> <p>We have received a DLUHC grant to fund the new burdens introduced by the Elections Act. Part of the grant is for “elector engagement”, though they have not provided a breakdown, nor a requirement for us to provide any detailed accounts.</p> <p>Our current proposal is to spend £25k on letters to properties where there are no people registered to vote who we are able to contact via email – roughly 50k properties. Our revised proposal is to continue with the email communications only, with no letters going in the post.</p> <p>The grant will instead be used to cover other Elections Act new burdens costs, including the staffing cost for processing Voter ID applications, training polling staff, purchasing accessibility equipment, processing online postal vote applications and overseas voter applications etc.</p>			
Division budget	Gross £k		Net £k	
Service area budget	Gross £	468	Net £k	441
Saving proposed	2023/24 £k	25	2024/25 £k	0
Risks:				
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N	N			
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	90%			
Impact of making the saving	<p>Some residents will not receive any direct or indirect communication about Voter ID to their household until poll cards are sent for the election. This may mean:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some residents are unaware of the requirement to provide photo ID in polling stations • Voters turned away at polling stations due to not having ID • Reputational damage for Lewisham if we have an above average number of people turned away from polling stations due to a lack of suitable ID 			
Possible risk mitigation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large scale comms campaign by the electoral commission, GLA, and political parties. Previous campaigns by these groups in the 2023 local elections have proven to be very effective • Large scale Lewisham comms campaign. We already propose to spend £5k on posters at key locations, and on various ads, plus a lot of social media activity. There is a lot of best practise we can follow to make this cost effective • 66% of voters have an email address and will receive multiple reminders about the requirement for ID • All electoral correspondence already includes notices about Voter ID • Poll cards will be in envelopes with info about Voter ID in large font on the front and back, and with more information on the poll card itself, with a full list of the ID, plus a leaflet with even more information. This type of communication is thought to be most effective as it will be a timely call to action, rather than an advanced warning of something for people to think about (which they tend to mostly ignore or forget) 			
Other considerations:				

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Member or Officer decision	Officer			
Redundancies	Y/N	N	Number of staff	NA
Public consultation	Y/N	N	Audience(s)	NA
Investment required (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	N	Cost £k	NA
	In what:			
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work				
Specific legal or statutory considerations	The only legal requirement to notify voters about Voter ID is via the poll card. Everything else is not statutory.			

Equalities Analysis Assessment

Electoral Services Savings Proposals

3. Voter ID letters – send via email only, scrap the direct letters to households

Summary of the proposal

One-off

We have received a DLUHC grant to fund the new burdens introduced by the Elections Act. Part of the grant is for “elector engagement”, though they have not provided a breakdown, nor a requirement for us to provide any detailed accounts. Our current proposal is to spend £25k on letters to properties where there are no people registered to vote who we are able to contact via email – roughly 50k properties. Our revised proposal is to continue with the email communications only, with no letters going in the post.

The grant will instead be used to cover other Elections Act new burdens costs, including the staffing cost for processing Voter ID applications, training polling staff, purchasing accessibility equipment, processing online postal vote applications and overseas voter applications etc.

Impact & Outcomes

What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?

Service Users

Residents will no longer receive a letter solely about voter ID.

But the rest of the changes in the Elections Act will continue, properly funded, on schedule, and to the highest quality. This includes processing of the new VAC, postal, proxy and overseas applications via the new portal, and improved accessibility equipment in polling stations.

It is believed this change of approach will have a minimal impact on Lewisham resident’s awareness of the requirement and ability to vote. This is because our other activities will have significant reach and will ensure that the majority of people

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

who wish to vote will be aware of the requirement in good time before the election, and there will be support to people who attend polling stations on polling day without the correct ID.				
Staff				
No impact				
Other Council Services				
No impact				
Partners				
No impact				
Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age			X	
Disability			X	
Ethnicity			X	X
Gender				X
Gender reassignment			X	
Marriage and civil partnerships			X	
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality			X	
Is a full EAA required?			Yes (with Corporate Policy input)	

1. Equalities Analysis Assessment Template

Author	Jamie Baker	Directorate	Chief Execs
Date	11/1/24	Service	Electoral Services

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<p>1. The activity or decision that this assessment is being undertaken for</p> <p><i>Voter ID letters – send via email only, scrap the direct letters to households</i></p> <p><i>We have received a DLUHC grant to fund the new burdens introduced by the Elections Act. Part of the grant is for “elector engagement”, though they have not provided a breakdown, nor a requirement for us to provide any detailed accounts. Our current proposal is to spend £25k on letters to properties where there are no people registered to vote who we are able to contact via email – roughly 50k properties. Our revised proposal is to continue with the email communications only, with no letters going in the post.</i></p> <p><i>The grant will instead be used to cover other Elections Act new burdens costs, including the staffing cost for processing Voter ID applications, training polling staff, purchasing accessibility equipment, processing online postal vote applications and overseas voter applications etc.</i></p>				
<p>2. The protected characteristics or other equalities factors potentially impacted by this decision</p>				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Age	<input type="checkbox"/> Ethnicity/ Race	<input type="checkbox"/> Religion or belief	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Language spoken	<input type="checkbox"/> Other, please define:
<input type="checkbox"/> Gender/Sex	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gender identity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Household type	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Income	<input type="checkbox"/> Carer status	<input type="checkbox"/> Sexual orientation	<input type="checkbox"/> Socio Economic status	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marriage and Civil Partnership	<input type="checkbox"/> Pregnancy and Maternity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Refugee/ Migrant/ Asylum seeker	<input type="checkbox"/> Health & Social Care	
<input type="checkbox"/> Nationality	<input type="checkbox"/> Employment	<input type="checkbox"/> Armed forces		
<p>3. The evidence to support the analysis</p> <p>The government’s DPIA and survey which was conducted before tabling the Elections Act 2022 which introduced Voter ID. Subsequent research since the first elections with Voter ID which occurred in May 2023.</p>				

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

The GLA report into voter ID in London which provides data on awareness of the requirement for ID, and the number of people who claim not to have an acceptable form of ID.

ONS data

This gives us information on the number and types of people living in Lewisham.

GLA analysis has highlighted the following groups to be most impacted by the requirement to show ID in polling stations:

Young Londoners (18–25-year-olds)

Black, Asian, Minority Ethnic and migrant Londoners, including EU Londoners

Deaf and disabled Londoners

Older Londoners (60+ years)

LGBTQ+ Londoners, with a focus on trans and non-binary Londoners

Low-income Londoners

Social and private renting Londoners

Electoral Commission and the Electoral Reform Society completed a review of the May 2023 elections. They have found no evidence that direct letters to residents to raise awareness of ID had a significant impact. The number of voters who failed to present ID, and the turnout, did not vary significantly between authorities that sent out direct letters and those that didn't. Other communications activity had a greater potential impact, mostly posters, social media activity, and the electoral commission's own advertising campaign.

Other data sets, such as the government's own survey, has given an indication of the categories of people who are less likely to hold an acceptable form of ID, and those who are less likely to want to vote because of the requirement (regardless of whether they have an acceptable form of ID)

4. Impact summary

For the most part there is a small negative impact for the following groups. A direct letter could benefit these people as they are less likely to be aware of the requirement to show ID, and/or less likely to have an acceptable form of ID.

However, we are confident the mitigations listed in item 5 present a more effective way of communicating to these groups, and would present better value for money.

Age

18-25 year olds are less likely than average to be aware of the requirement to show ID. However, they are more likely than average to have an acceptable form of ID.

Language Spoken

People who do not speak English are less likely to be aware of the requirement for ID. They are less likely to be reached by the more indirect methods of communication via social media, and national media.

Gender Identity

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

People who have changed gender are less likely to have an acceptable form of ID with a photo that matches their current appearance. Various campaigns are being aimed at this group to improve awareness.

Disability

Certain disabled groups are less likely to be aware of the requirement and less likely to have an acceptable form of ID. Deaf people in particular. Communication campaigns led by the GLA have been ongoing for some time to reach this group.

Household type

Direct letters to residents in shared homes, hostels, student halls of residence and HMOs can be ineffective – with mail often not reaching the intended target. People living in private rented accommodation are less likely to be registered to vote.

Income

Low income residents are less likely to be aware of the requirement to show ID. Those out of work and who do not travel abroad are less likely to have an acceptable form of ID

Marriage and Civil Partnership

Many of these people, particularly women, will have ID with a name that does not match their name on the register. These people will need to amend the register, amend their ID, or provide alternative evidence when voting at the polling station. Information on the poll card and emails from electoral services provides more detail for what these people should do, as does the various communication campaigns.

Refugee/migrant/asylum seeker

This group are amongst the least likely to register to vote, and least likely to have an acceptable form of ID. The GLA have led a campaign to target this group via various charities and community groups.

Impact on Council's 5 equality objectives:

- **To ensure equal opportunities for marginalised and seldom heard communities.**

Minor impact. Our other proactive measures to encourage Voter ID awareness should minimise the number of people who are unaware by polling day. But there will be a small group of people where a direct letter may be the best approach.

- **To reduce the number of vulnerable people in the borough by tackling socio-economic inequality.**

No impact.

- **To improve the quality of life of residents by tackling preventable illnesses and diseases.**

No impact.

- **To ensure that services are designed and delivered to meet the needs of Lewisham's diverse population.**

Positive impact. The ability to spend the grant elsewhere, and sign other sources to encourage awareness, will provide value for money for our residents.

- **To increase the number of people we support to become active citizens**

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

No impact.

5. Mitigation

Residents will receive communications and information about Voter ID through many sources. Research from the May 2023 elections has shown the following activities that Lewisham will be taking will have a strong and positive impact.

- New A4 poll card in a reply envelope, with the statutory wording about Voter ID displayed prominently on the front and reverse of the poll card
- Outer envelope which the poll card will be in will carry messaging about Voter ID on the front and back
- Note that most voters will receive at least 3 poll cards this year for the different elections. All poll cards will use the same template envelope, with repeated messages helping to improve recognition and awareness
- Poll cards are also sent by email to all polling station voters twice during each election. 75% of voters have an email address and will receive the email version of the poll card with prominent Voter ID information
- Poll cards via the post and the email versions are sent at least 1 month before polling day which gives these voters all the info they need in good time before the election, enabling them to take action if they do not have an acceptable form of ID
- Voter ID messaging on all standard letters sent to electors, and in responses to all emails
- Large scale poster campaign for each election. Evidence shows these are incredibly effective
- Direct communication to community groups via our engagement team
- Messages in the annual council tax statement, bulletins and Lewisham Life
- Social media campaign

In addition, communications about Voter ID will come from many external sources. Research has shown these can be very effective for certain target groups

- National and local media coverage
- Political party campaigning – leaflets, canvassing, media
- GLA's campaign. With a focus on direct activity at target groups
- Electoral Commission campaign – on TV, radio and social media

The Voter Authority Certificate (VAC)

This is an important part of the mitigation strategy. All voters are able to apply for a VAC. It is completely free. They can apply using a paper form, the online portal, or in person at the electoral services office. The deadline to apply is 6 days before polling day. This gives the ability and opportunity to obtain a valid form of photo ID completely free. Our communications will encourage awareness of the VAC so that anybody who wants/needs one will know how to do so and the deadline.

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Polling day

There will be posters outside and inside every polling station to remind people of the requirement to show ID. Any voter who doesn't have an acceptable form of ID will receive a leaflet providing all the relevant information and encouraged to return to the station with an acceptable form of ID before the close of poll (10pm). Voters will be encouraged to speak to the electoral services officer by phone, email or in person to request advice on what they can do.

6. Service user journey that this decision or project impacts

Service users will be able to contact the council to complain or get more information about Voter ID. The best point of contact will be electoral services – phone, email or visiting our office.

The main impact of this policy is that some residents will not receive a direct communication about Voter ID until they receive the poll card around 1 month before polling day. The government's new burdens grant will be spent covering the additional costs of introducing Voter ID, along with the other changes within the Elections Act 2022.

Signature of Director

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	Chief Executive's			
Director	Jeremy Chambers			
Service area	Electoral Services			
Cabinet Portfolio	Finance and Strategy - Cllr de Ryk			
Reference				
Saving title	Bringing answering of electoral phone line back in-house			
Description of saving (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<p>One-off and Ongoing</p> <p>Lewisham's Corporate Customer Relations team (CCR) took over the handling of calls to electoral services back in 2018. In return the service receives a journal of the cost of a scale 5 officer with on-costs, from the electoral registration budget. In 2023-24 the total cost is projected to be £40,796.</p> <p>However, we believe this is no longer value for money, and the phone line should revert to the electoral services team, which should be possible without creating any extra cost, and without reducing the level of service received by residents.</p> <p>The contract with the CCR is a rolling annual contract, but can be cancelled with 28 days notice.</p> <p>This proposal is for cancelling the contract on 31/12/23, which would bring about savings of: £10,199.01 for the 23-24 financial year (one-off saving) £40,796.04 for the 24-25 financial year (ongoing saving)</p>			
Division budget	Gross £k		Net £k	
Service area budget	Gross £	468	Net £k	468
Saving proposed	2023/24 £k	10	2024/25 £k	41
Risks:				
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N	Not really. But it would create a dent in the budget for the CCR, but with a corresponding reduction in workload.			
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	90%			
Impact of making the saving	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electoral services already take <u>all</u> electoral calls during an election period • The CCR only take calls during months where there is no election • The impact will be on residents making electoral registration enquiries • For the vast majority of the time, the call volume will be easily manageable for the electoral services team of 4 officers • The impact on those 4 officers may mean less time to spend on other tasks • At certain times the residents may find it harder to reach us on the phone • But the speed, accuracy and quality of the response will be improved due to the expertise of the electoral officers compared to the CCR who are not electoral specialists 			

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is likely that enquiries will be 'pushed' to online routes, which may not be accessible for all, though the phone lines will not be cut and will still be available for those who need them Potential for a negative impact on the CCR service, who will have a reduced income of £10k in 23-24 and £41k in 24-25 and thereafter This may mean the service needs to reduce their workforce, but could also allow for developments in other areas of the service due to freeing up officer time 			
Possible risk mitigation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 'Push' residents to online routes for resolving their queries Remove the phone number from the largest mailouts, retaining it on forms only when there is a more likely requirement for the resident to contact us (eg. No phone number on addition or removal notices, but definitely keep the phone number on poll cards) Encourage email and postal responses Add forms to the website for the most common queries to enable self-service and a quick and convenient way for residents to reach us In the past, the electoral team is expanded at election time to manage our calls. We can begin this earlier if the call volumes necessitates and if the demands on officer time becomes too great 			
Other considerations:				
Member or Officer decision	Officer			
Redundancies	Y/N	N	Number of staff	NA
Public consultation	Y/N	N	Audience(s)	NA
Investment required (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	N	Cost £k	NA
	In what:			
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work				
Specific legal or statutory considerations	A phone number is a requirement for many of the prescribed electoral registration and election forms. We do not propose removing the phone number from any of these forms. We will review the legislation and submit a proposal to EMT, with an EIA, before removing the phone number from any communications, or introducing any other 'push' methods.			

Equalities Analysis Assessment

Electoral Services Savings Proposals

4. Bringing answering of electoral phone line back in-house

Summary of the proposal

One-off and Ongoing

Lewisham's Corporate Customer Relations team (CCR) took over the handling of calls to electoral services back in 2018. In return the service receives a journal of the cost of a scale 5 officer with on-costs, from the electoral registration budget. In 2023-24 the total cost is projected to be £40,796.

However, we believe this is no longer value for money, and the phone line should revert to the electoral services team, which should be possible without creating any extra cost, and without reducing the level of service received by residents.

The contract with the CCR is a rolling annual contract, but can be cancelled with 28 days notice.

This proposal is for cancelling the contract on 31/12/23, which would bring about savings of:

£10,199.01 for the 23-24 financial year (one-off saving)

£40,796.04 for the 24-25 financial year (ongoing saving)

Impact & Outcomes					
What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?					
Service Users					
When contacting electoral services by phone, residents will now speak directly to the electoral services staff, rather than staff in the Customer Services Centre. There are 2 impacts, 1 positive and 1 negative: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive – service users will speak directly to expert electoral officers and will receive an excellent and improved response • Negative – on very rare occasions it is possible that service users will have to wait longer for their call to be answered 					
Staff					
Electoral Services staff will now have to answer telephone calls more often. This can disrupt the flow of their work, and can lead to an increase in work. On the other hand, speaking directly to residents on a regular basis will improve the team's knowledge of our service users, and our ability to respond to their needs.					
Other Council Services					
No impact					
Partners					
No impact					
Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.					
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral	

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Age				X
Disability				X
Ethnicity				X
Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality				X
Is a full EAA required?			No (with Corporate Policy input)	

1. Equalities Analysis Assessment Template

Author	Jamie Baker	Directorate	Chief Execs
Date	11/1/24	Service	Electoral Services
<p>One-off and Ongoing</p> <p>Lewisham's Corporate Customer Relations team (CCR) took over the handling of calls to electoral services back in 2018. In return the service receives a journal of the cost of a scale 5 officer with on-costs, from the electoral registration budget. In 2023-24 the total cost is projected to be £40,796.</p> <p>However, we believe this is no longer value for money, and the phone line should revert to the electoral services team, which should be possible without creating any extra cost, and without reducing the level of service received by residents.</p> <p>The contract with the CCR is a rolling annual contract, but can be cancelled with 28 days notice.</p> <p>This proposal is for cancelling the contract on 31/12/23, which would bring about savings of:</p> <p>£10,199.01 for the 23-24 financial year (one-off saving)</p> <p>£40,796.04 for the 24-25 financial year (ongoing saving)</p>			
<p>1. The protected characteristics or other equalities factors potentially impacted by this decision</p>			

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<input type="checkbox"/> Age	<input type="checkbox"/> Ethnicity/ Race	<input type="checkbox"/> Religion or belief	<input type="checkbox"/> Language spoken	<input type="checkbox"/> Other, please define:
<input type="checkbox"/> Gender/Sex	<input type="checkbox"/> Gender identity	<input type="checkbox"/> Disability	<input type="checkbox"/> Household type	
<input type="checkbox"/> Income	<input type="checkbox"/> Carer status	<input type="checkbox"/> Sexual orientation	<input type="checkbox"/> Socio Economic status	
<input type="checkbox"/> Marriage and Civil Partnership	<input type="checkbox"/> Pregnancy and Maternity	<input type="checkbox"/> Refugee/ Migrant/ Asylum seeker	<input type="checkbox"/> Health & Social Care	
<input type="checkbox"/> Nationality	<input type="checkbox"/> Employment	<input type="checkbox"/> Armed forces		

2. The evidence to support the analysis

We have data to show the number of calls received by the CSC for electoral services over the past 5 years. The data shows that the electoral services team should be able to handle the number of calls with a similar or higher response rate (i.e. with fewer calls going unanswered).

The CSC call handlers have in the past been trained by the electoral services team. The electoral services team have more knowledge, experience and qualifications concerning our service area, and will naturally be more able to respond to enquiries. With the addition of some customer response training, the electoral services team should be well prepared to answer calls from all kinds of residents.

Note that the electoral services telephone lines are transferred back to the electoral services team during election periods, which is when the highest volume of calls are received. The CSC does not answer electoral calls during this period. The reason for this was to improve the speed and quality of response to residents contacting the service at the most important period (election time!).

3. Impact summary

This change is not considered to cause a negative impact on any category of resident or service user. The movement of the phone lines back to the electoral services team will ensure that resident phone calls are answered by the staff with the most expertise, knowledge and electoral register access. Enquiries will be answered correctly and promptly, with appropriate follow-up questions asked to provide further benefit.

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

There is the potential for an impact on the electoral services staff, which will reduce over time as the staff develop procedures and undertake training to be better able to continue their regular work with the occasional interruption of a phone call.

Impact on Council's 5 equality objectives:

- **To ensure equal opportunities for marginalised and seldom heard communities.**

No impact.

- **To reduce the number of vulnerable people in the borough by tackling socio-economic inequality.**

No impact.

- **To improve the quality of life of residents by tackling preventable illnesses and diseases.**

No impact.

- **To ensure that services are designed and delivered to meet the needs of Lewisham's diverse population.**

Positive impact. The improved knowledge and electoral register access for people answering the phones will improve the quality of the service the residents receive.

- **To increase the number of people we support to become active citizens**

No impact.

4. Mitigation

Electoral Services staff will receive the following training:

- Call handling
- Difficult conversations
- Complaints
- Equality and diversity
- The operating system – especially in transferring calls to other services, and how to operate the language line service
- Prioritising work and juggling tasks

More staff will be added to the service at peak times, namely for elections and the canvass. And we can operate a rota system to improve our response times and ability to undertake other tasks (such as meeting residents in person who report to reception).

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

5. Service user journey that this decision or project impacts

The service user journey will improve as they will speak directly with the electoral services staff rather than a customer engagement officer. The impact on electoral services itself could be challenging at times but we have sufficient mitigations and opportunities to lead to an improvement in the service.

**Signature of
Director**

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	Chief Executive's			
Director	Jeremy Chambers			
Service area	Electoral Services			
Cabinet Portfolio	Finance and Strategy - Cllr de Ryk			
Reference	CEX06 – Electoral Services Electoral Phones In-House			
Saving title	Bringing answering of electoral phone line back in-house			
Description of saving (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<p>One-off and Ongoing</p> <p>Lewisham's Corporate Customer Relations team (CCR) took over the handling of calls to electoral services back in 2018. In return the service receives a journal of the cost of a scale 5 officer with on-costs, from the electoral registration budget. In 2023-24 the total cost is projected to be £40,796.</p> <p>However, we believe this is no longer value for money, and the phone line should revert to the electoral services team, which should be possible without creating any extra cost, and without reducing the level of service received by residents.</p> <p>The contract with the CCR is a rolling annual contract, but can be cancelled with 28 days notice.</p> <p>This proposal is for cancelling the contract on 31/12/23, which would bring about savings of: £10,199.01 for the 23-24 financial year (one-off saving) £40,796.04 for the 24-25 financial year (ongoing saving)</p>			
Division budget	Gross £k		Net £k	
Service area budget	Gross £	468411	Net £k	468411
Saving proposed	2023/24 £k	10	2024/25 £k	41
Risks:				
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N	Not really. But it would create a dent in the budget for the CCR, but with a corresponding reduction in workload.			
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	90%			
Impact of making the saving	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Electoral services already take <u>all</u> electoral calls during an election period The CCR only take calls during months where there is no election The impact will be on residents making electoral registration enquiries For the vast majority of the time, the call volume will be easily manageable for the electoral services team of 4 officers The impact on those 4 officers may mean less time to spend on other tasks At certain times the residents may find it harder to reach us on the phone But the speed, accuracy and quality of the response will be improved due to the expertise of the electoral officers compared to the CCR who are not electoral specialists It is likely that enquiries will be 'pushed' to online routes, which may not be accessible for all, though the phone lines will not be cut and will still be available for those who need them 			

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential for a negative impact on the CCR service, who will have a reduced income of £10k in 23-24 and £41k in 24-25 and thereafter This may mean the service needs to reduce their workforce, but could also allow for developments in other areas of the service due to freeing up officer time 			
Possible risk mitigation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 'Push' residents to online routes for resolving their queries Remove the phone number from the largest mailouts, retaining it on forms only when there is a more likely requirement for the resident to contact us (eg. No phone number on addition or removal notices, but definitely keep the phone number on poll cards) Encourage email and postal responses Add forms to the website for the most common queries to enable self-service and a quick and convenient way for residents to reach us In the past, the electoral team is expanded at election time to manage our calls. We can begin this earlier if the call volumes necessitates and if the demands on officer time becomes too great 			
Other considerations:				
Member or Officer decision	Officer			
Redundancies	Y/N	N	Number of staff	NA
Public consultation	Y/N	N	Audience(s)	NA
Investment required (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	N	Cost £k	NA
	In what:			
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work				
Specific legal or statutory considerations	A phone number is a requirement for many of the prescribed electoral registration and election forms. We do not propose removing the phone number from any of these forms. We will review the legislation and submit a proposal to EMT, with an EIA, before removing the phone number from any communications, or introducing any other 'push' methods.			

Equalities Analysis Assessment

Electoral Services Savings Proposals

4. Bringing answering of electoral phone line back in-house

Summary of the proposal

One-off and Ongoing

Lewisham's Corporate Customer Relations team (CCR) took over the handling of calls to electoral services back in 2018. In return the service receives a journal of the cost of a scale 5 officer with on-costs, from the electoral registration budget. In 2023-24 the total cost is projected to be £40,796.

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

However, we believe this is no longer value for money, and the phone line should revert to the electoral services team, which should be possible without creating any extra cost, and without reducing the level of service received by residents.

The contract with the CCR is a rolling annual contract, but can be cancelled with 28 days notice.

This proposal is for cancelling the contract on 31/12/23, which would bring about savings of:

£10,199.01 for the 23-24 financial year (one-off saving)

£40,796.04 for the 24-25 financial year (ongoing saving)

Impact & Outcomes				
What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?				
Service Users				
When contacting electoral services by phone, residents will now speak directly to the electoral services staff, rather than staff in the Customer Services Centre. There are 2 impacts, 1 positive and 1 negative: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive – service users will speak directly to expert electoral officers and will receive an excellent and improved response • Negative – on very rare occasions it is possible that service users will have to wait longer for their call to be answered 				
Staff				
Electoral Services staff will now have to answer telephone calls more often. This can disrupt the flow of their work, and can lead to an increase in work. On the other hand, speaking directly to residents on a regular basis will improve the team's knowledge of our service users, and our ability to respond to their needs.				
Other Council Services				
No impact				
Partners				
No impact				
Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X
Disability				X
Ethnicity				X
Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality				X
Is a full EAA required?			No (with Corporate Policy input)	

1. Equalities Analysis Assessment Template

Author	Jamie Baker	Directorate	Chief Execs	
Date	11/1/24	Service	Electoral Services	
<p>One-off and Ongoing</p> <p>Lewisham's Corporate Customer Relations team (CCR) took over the handling of calls to electoral services back in 2018. In return the service receives a journal of the cost of a scale 5 officer with on-costs, from the electoral registration budget. In 2023-24 the total cost is projected to be £40,796.</p> <p>However, we believe this is no longer value for money, and the phone line should revert to the electoral services team, which should be possible without creating any extra cost, and without reducing the level of service received by residents. The contract with the CCR is a rolling annual contract, but can be cancelled with 28 days notice.</p> <p>This proposal is for cancelling the contract on 31/12/23, which would bring about savings of:</p> <p>£10,199.01 for the 23-24 financial year (one-off saving)</p> <p>£40,796.04 for the 24-25 financial year (ongoing saving)</p>				
<p>1. The protected characteristics or other equalities factors potentially impacted by this decision</p>				
<input type="checkbox"/> Age	<input type="checkbox"/> Ethnicity/ Race	<input type="checkbox"/> Religion or belief	<input type="checkbox"/> Language spoken	<input type="checkbox"/> Other, please define:
<input type="checkbox"/> Gender/Sex	<input type="checkbox"/> Gender identity	<input type="checkbox"/> Disability	<input type="checkbox"/> Household type	
<input type="checkbox"/> Income	<input type="checkbox"/> Carer status	<input type="checkbox"/> Sexual orientation	<input type="checkbox"/> Socio Economic status	
<input type="checkbox"/> Marriage and Civil Partnership	<input type="checkbox"/> Pregnancy and Maternity	<input type="checkbox"/> Refugee/ Migrant/ Asylum seeker	<input type="checkbox"/> Health & Social Care	

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<input type="checkbox"/> Nationality	<input type="checkbox"/> Employment	<input type="checkbox"/> Armed forces	
2. The evidence to support the analysis			
<p>We have data to show the number of calls received by the CSC for electoral services over the past 5 years. The data shows that the electoral services team should be able to handle the number of calls with a similar or higher response rate (i.e. with fewer calls going unanswered).</p> <p>The CSC call handlers have in the past been trained by the electoral services team. The electoral services team have more knowledge, experience and qualifications concerning our service area, and will naturally be more able to respond to enquiries. With the addition of some customer response training, the electoral services team should be well prepared to answer calls from all kinds of residents. Note that the electoral services telephone lines are transferred back to the electoral services team during election periods, which is when the highest volume of calls are received. The CSC does not answer electoral calls during this period. The reason for this was to improve the speed and quality of response to residents contacting the service at the most important period (election time!).</p>			
3. Impact summary			
<p>This change is not considered to cause a negative impact on any category of resident or service user. The movement of the phone lines back to the electoral services team will ensure that resident phone calls are answered by the staff with the most expertise, knowledge and electoral register access. Enquiries will be answered correctly and promptly, with appropriate follow-up questions asked to provide further benefit.</p> <p>There is the potential for an impact on the electoral services staff, which will reduce over time as the staff develop procedures and undertake training to be better able to continue their regular work with the occasional interruption of a phone call.</p> <p>Impact on Council's 5 equality objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• To ensure equal opportunities for marginalised and seldom heard communities. <p>No impact.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• To reduce the number of vulnerable people in the borough by tackling socio-economic inequality. <p>No impact.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• To improve the quality of life of residents by tackling preventable illnesses and diseases. <p>No impact.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• To ensure that services are designed and delivered to meet the needs of Lewisham's diverse population. <p>Positive impact. The improved knowledge and electoral register access for people answering the phones will improve the quality of the service the residents receive.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• To increase the number of people we support to become active citizens <p>No impact.</p>			

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

4. Mitigation

Electoral Services staff will receive the following training:

- Call handling
- Difficult conversations
- Complaints
- Equality and diversity
- The operating system – especially in transferring calls to other services, and how to operate the language line service
- Prioritising work and juggling tasks

More staff will be added to the service at peak times, namely for elections and the canvass. And we can operate a rota system to improve our response times and ability to undertake other tasks (such as meeting residents in person who report to reception).

5. Service user journey that this decision or project impacts

The service user journey will improve as they will speak directly with the electoral services staff rather than a customer engagement officer. The impact on electoral services itself could be challenging at times but we have sufficient mitigations and opportunities to lead to an improvement in the service.

Signature of Director

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	Chief Executive			
Director	Jeremy Chambers			
Service area	Information Security and Governance			
Cabinet Portfolio	Finance and Strategy - Cllr de Ryk			
Reference	CEX07 – Information Security and Governance (GF)			
Saving title	Information Security and Governance GF Savings			
Description of saving (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<p>NB: For all savings please confirm whether one-off or ongoing? All 2024/25 savings should be ongoing, and any 2023/24 once off savings must have a permanent replacement in 2024/25.</p> <p>2023 / 2024 GF Savings: None</p> <p>2024/2025 GF Savings: Savings of £36000 by reducing the supplies and services budget by £30000 and the Comms and Computing budget by £6000. This will be ongoing.</p> <p>NB: These GF savings are made against the current service budget and do not take into account the budget for the Access to Records team which is transferring from CYP.</p>			
Division budget	Gross £k		Net £k	
Service area budget	Gross £k	744	Net £k	594
Saving proposed	2023/24 £k	0	2024/25 £k	36
Risks:				
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N	If 'yes' identify the service impacted.			
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	100%			
Impact of making the saving	GF: Savings have come from non-salary budget and should not see impact to service delivery.			
Possible risk mitigation	The DPO function transferring from Lewisham Homes will transfer to the Council's DPO. Non-salary savings were made based on comparative spend of previous years.			
Other considerations:				
Member or Officer decision	Officer decision			
Redundancies	Y/N	N	Number of staff	0
Public consultation	Y/N	N	Audience(s)	N/A
Investment required (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	N	Cost £k	-
	In what:	N/A		
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work	N/A			

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Specific legal or statutory considerations	The DPO function of Lewisham Homes transferring to the Council will be absorbed by the Council's DPO.
---	---

Impact & Outcomes				
What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?				
Service Users				
Include evidence to support anticipated impacts, both positive and negative. There will be no impact to service users.				
Staff				
Include evidence to support anticipated impacts, both positive and negative. There will be no impact to staff.				
Other Council Services				
Include evidence to support anticipated impacts, both positive and negative. There will be no impact to Council services.				
Partners				
Include evidence to support anticipated impacts, both positive and negative. There will be no impact to partners.				
Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X
Disability				X
Ethnicity				X
Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality				X
Is a full EAA required?			N	

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	Chief Executive			
Director	Jeremy Chambers			
Service area	Mayor's Office			
Cabinet Portfolio	Mayor			
Reference	CEX08 – Mayor's Office Salary & Non-Salary			
Saving title	Mayor's Office			
Description of saving (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	The office will achieve underspend of c.£12k from salaries in 23/24 and is proposing cut of 6% in its 24/25 non-salary expenditure for 24/25 (£870).			
Division budget	Gross £k		Net £k	
Service area budget	Gross £k		Net £k	
Saving proposed	2023/24 £k	12	2024/25 £k	1
Risks:				
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N	No			
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	100%			
Impact of making the saving	Minor impact on office expenditure but this can be managed			
Possible risk mitigation	Look to hold any vacancies as unfilled for short periods of time (where capacity allows) in order to create additional headroom in the budget.			
Other considerations:				
Member or Officer decision	Officer			
Redundancies	Y/N	N	Number of staff	NA
Public consultation	Y/N	N	Audience(s)	NA
Investment required (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	N	Cost £k	NA
	In what:	NA		
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work	NA			
Specific legal or statutory considerations	NA			

Impact & Outcomes

What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?

Service Users

None.

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Staff				
None.				
Other Council Services				
None.				
Partners				
None.				
Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				No impact.
Disability				No impact.
Ethnicity				No impact.
Gender				No impact.
Gender reassignment				No impact.
Marriage and civil partnerships				No impact.
Pregnancy and maternity				No impact.
Religion and belief				No impact.
Sexual orientation				No impact.
Socio-economic inequality				No impact.
Is a full EAA required?			No.	

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	Chief Executive's (Legal and Corporate Governance)
Director	Jeremy Chambers
Service area	Scrutiny and Policy
Cabinet Portfolio	Finance and Strategy - Cllr de Ryk
Reference	CEX09 – Corporate Policy Team Staffing Reduction
Saving title	Staffing reduction – Corporate Policy
Description of saving (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<p>Deletion of one Senior Policy and Strategy Officer (SPSO) P06 role from 2023/24 onwards.</p> <p>This will require the reshaping of the policy team (part of the wider scrutiny and policy team), with a move away from direct support to directorates and a re-focusing on core, central workstreams. The policy team is currently configured to 'shadow' directorates. The proposed reduction in the number of posts in the team combined with an additional directorate (Housing) being created means this is no longer feasible. Instead, it is proposed that the two remaining P06 posts focus on a core suite of corporate policy functions.</p> <p>Currently, equalities work and consultation & engagement work forms a large part of the team's workload, which will need to change.</p> <p>Equalities – the saving proposal relies upon equalities work being carried out by a new equalities advisor. This has been agreed and is in train.</p> <p>Consultation and engagement – some citizen space work will need to be moved to another team. Completely transferring responsibility for day-to-day consultation and engagement activity to another team would assist in the streamlining and reshaping of the team to take on a central co-ordinating role. Such a transfer may also result in responsibility for the function and responsibility for everyday activity sitting in the same team, which would be desirable.</p> <p>Key elements of a re-shaped policy team:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SPSOs will no longer be assigned to specific directorates. Directorates will continue to get dedicated policy support from assigned Executive Support Officers (ESOs). A recent policy mapping exercise showed that, in addition to this, some directorate level policy resource also exists. Specialist support in relation to equalities will be provided by the proposed equalities advisor post. • If required, the two SPSOs will continue to support consultation and engagement, although this will impact on their ability to deliver the key products listed below. • The two SPSOs will deliver a range of "key products" for the council including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall policy co-ordination – Regularly meeting with, and linking up, directorate policy leads, the ESOs, performance officers, the specialist equalities post, consultation and engagement officers (if responsibility is transferred) to ensure policy alignment and consistency across the council. • Corporate Strategy – Assisting in the production of service level delivery plans in relation to key service plan outcomes and KPIs; and tracking delivery of the corporate strategy, in partnership with the Performance team, with an annual report to EMT.

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oversight of the corporate portfolio of policies and strategies – Keeping track of policy and strategy delivery across the council and working with directorates and the equalities advisor, to ensure all EAA requirements and consultation/engagement requirements are met; and making connections so that policies and strategies don't happen in directorate silos (and cross-directorate input is sought where appropriate). • Develop and maintain strategy / policy / action plan templates and guidance – Providing guidance and ensuring that policies and strategies look and feel similar; and are aligned with each other and the corporate strategy. • EMT Horizon scanning / Policy briefings - Analysing national, regional and/or local policy; making connections between regional and national developments, and Lewisham; and presenting this to Directors via the EMT horizon scan and other briefings as required. • Network management – Representing the council on the Cooperative Council Innovation Network; the London Policy network; and other related networks and forums. • Policy projects – Participating in policy style projects such as support in writing bids, subject to capacity. • Back Up resource to specialist posts -Maintaining a working knowledge of equalities and consultation & engagement including citizen space (if responsibility for consultation and engagement transfers to another service) to cover for the specialist posts as required and avoid single person dependency. • Mentoring – Helping to embed policy skills and capabilities within the ESO function to allow them to take on additional policy and strategy related work, via mentoring. 			
Division budget	Gross £	571	Net £k	571
Service area budget	Gross £	6,297	Net £k	5,831
Saving proposed	2023/24 £k	72	2024/25 £k	72
Risks:				
Cost shunt to other service? Y		All directorates to absorb a degree of policy work		
Likelihood of making cut in full - %		100%		
Impact of making the saving	<p>There will be some reduction in direct, generalist policy support for Directorates. This will need to be partly absorbed by the directorates and partly absorbed by ESOs.</p> <p>Strategic responsibility for consultation and engagement currently lies with the Director of Communications and Engagement, but a large amount of day to day support is provided by the policy team who advise on consultation and engagement and load surveys onto the council's survey platform: citizen space. This includes statutory surveys. Although a streamlined policy team of two posts could continue to carry out this activity, it would limit the core central activity they can carry out and, at times, would mean they have little capacity to carry out work other than consultation and engagement.</p>			
Possible risk mitigation	<p><i>Equalities</i> - Directorates will have access to a new Equalities Advisor once recruited.</p> <p><i>Consultation and engagement</i> - Although a streamlined policy team of two posts could continue to carry out this activity, if this was transferred, it would mean that strategic responsibility and operational delivery for</p>			

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

	<p>consultation and engagement could be brought together and the policy team could have a clearer new focus.</p> <p><i>Other Policy support</i> -The council has a range of specialist and generalist posts, across different teams and directorates, which contribute to, and support, policy. Whilst it is proposed that 'pure policy' support is provided by the two remaining SPSOs, generalist support will continue to be provided by ESOs and cabinet support officers; and service transformation support by business analysts. Specialist support will be provided by the performance team, partnership officers, directorate specific policy officers and the new equalities post.</p> <p>Work has already taken place to embed policy skills and capabilities within the ESO function to allow them to take on additional policy and strategy related work.</p>			
Other considerations:				
Member or Officer decision	Officer			
Redundancies	Y/N	N	Number of staff	
Public consultation	Y/N	N	Audience(s)	
Investment required (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	N	Cost £k	
	In what:			
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work	The proposal relies on the new Equalities Advisor post being filled and ideally, consultation and engagement being transferred out of the service.			
Specific legal or statutory considerations	The council has statutory responsibilities in relation to equalities and consultation.			

Equalities Screening Assessment

Impact & Outcomes

What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?

Service Users

The users of this service are internal. There will be some reduction in direct, generalist policy support for Directorates. This will need to be partly absorbed by the directorates and partly absorbed by ESOs. A new specialist equalities advisor post has been agreed and this post will absorb the majority of the equalities work being carried out by the team.

Staff

The post being deleted is vacant. The service provided by the remaining officers will be re-shaped to avoid an impact on workload. The appointment of a specialist equalities post will have a positive impact of the equalities policy support that directorates receive.

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Other Council Services				
As above. There will be some reduction in direct, generalist policy support for Directorates. This will be partly absorbed by the directorates, ESO and specialist equalities advisor post (which will absorb the majority of the equalities work being carried out by the team).				
Partners				
The Policy team will continue to work with council partners, representing the council on the Cooperative Council Innovation Network; the London Policy network; and other related networks and forums.				
Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age			X Positive	
Disability			X Positive	
Ethnicity			X Positive	
Gender			X Positive	
Gender reassignment			X Positive	
Marriage and civil partnerships			X Positive	
Pregnancy and maternity			X Positive	
Religion and belief			X Positive	
Sexual orientation			X Positive	
Socio-economic inequality			X Positive	
(The transfer of most equalities support from a generalist central policy team to a specialist equalities advisor post will have an overall positive impact on equalities – the appointment of a specialist equalities advisor was a recommendation of the recent independent review of the Council's approach to equalities)				
Is a full EAA required?			N	

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	Community Services			
Director	Joan Hutton/ Kenneth Gregory			
Service area	Adult Social Care/ Joint Commissioning			
Cabinet Portfolio	Health and Adult Social Care- Cllr Bell			
Reference	COM01 – Homecare Efficiencies ASC01_24_25			
Saving title	Homecare Efficiencies			
Description of saving (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<p>The new Maximising wellbeing at home (MWAH) contract that went live on 1st September 23, has a yearly efficiency factor built into the contract specification that will achieve the 400K savings proposed</p> <p>This is based on efficiencies submitted by successful bidders and as part of MWAH contract. These efficiencies will form of capitated budget for the relevant /target years.</p>			
Division budget	Gross £k	125,513	Net £k	62,921
Service area budget	Gross £k	21,095	Net £k	20,680
Saving proposed	2023/24 £k		2024/25 £k	400,000
Risks:				
No	No			
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	80%			
Impact of making the saving	Confirmation that Contract specification has been applied and reduced spend on homecare for same amount of hours. Doing more with less with each pound spent. Only increases will be demographic based and other work around front door eg Newton enablement should keep this within reasonable control			
Possible risk mitigation	Continual monitoring of the contracts and data provided by the providers regarding detail of service hours delivered.			
Other considerations:				
Member or Officer decision	Officer decision			
Redundancies	Y/N	N	Number of staff	
Public consultation	Y/N	N	Audience(s)	
Investment required (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	N	Cost £k	
	In what:	N/A		
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work	No			
Specific legal or statutory considerations	No			

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	Community Services			
Director	Joan Hutton			
Service area	Adult Social Care			
Cabinet Portfolio	Health and Adult Social Care- Cllr Bell			
Reference	COM02 – ASC Transitions ASC02_24_25			
Saving title	Transitions			
Description of saving (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<p>The analysis of costs associated with young people with SEND who transition to ASC indicates an increase of both demand and cost per care and support plan. It is forecast that the demand in 24-25 is now 32 young people who are going to become 18 during the year. Of the 32 young adults identified, it is unlikely that all of them will need ASC, but from the information we have been given appears at least 26 will need Adult Social Care Services.</p> <p>Initially based on earlier CYP data, we understood the Transition numbers to be 16, this informed the corporate growth funding of 1.5m in total including the transition of 0.8m. The latest data suggests that there is now 800k gap from the initial estimate.</p> <p>This proposal is in anticipation of increase share of social care grant in 24-25 either from existing pot or from any increases from government funding received by LBL. The total expected funding from the grant should be in the region of 1.4m in order to be able to deliver the savings below. Hence this requires agreement with EMT/Corporate colleagues</p>			
Division budget	Gross £k	125,513	Net £k	62,921
Service area budget	Gross £k	30,893 <i>*This is LD Budget (Transitions cuts across various care types)</i>	Net £k	29,750 <i>*Adjusted for CHC only. (Other income is not allocated per service area) 46,502 Res and Nursing only</i>
Saving proposed	2023/24 £k	0	2024/25 £k	600,000
Risks:				
No	None			
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	80%			
Impact of making the saving	This will reduce the underlying £4-6m pressure in the ASC budgets that is forecast for 24-25			
Possible risk mitigation	<p>This risk is also being managed via improving the Transition system by greater joined up working with CYP so that Transition cases are identified early to allow proactive work in sourcing more suitable and affordable packages in line with ASC client portfolio. The current reality is that upon transfer the average weekly costs of CYP cases are much higher than typical ASC package</p> <p>Also ASC will ensure that those young persons with more complex needs are assessed early for CHC eligibility. This will reduce the cost to the Council</p>			
Other considerations:				
Member or Officer decision	Officer decision			

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Redundancies	Y/N	N	Number of staff	
Public consultation	Y/N	N	Audience(s)	
Investment required (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	N	Cost £k	
	In what:			
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work	This saving proposal is contingent on corporate agreement on ASC share of social care grant in 24-25.			
Specific legal or statutory considerations				

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	Community Services			
Director	Joan Hutton			
Service area	Adult Social Care			
Cabinet Portfolio	Health and Adult Social Care- Cllr Bell			
Reference	COM03 – ASC Care Home Reviews ASC03_24_25			
Saving title	Care Home Reviews			
Description of saving (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<p>ASC aims to support residents of the borough with care and support needs to remain at home living as independently as possible. For citizens who have more complex needs, a care home setting is often the safest and appropriate way to meet their needs. Nationally there has been an increase in the complexity of people who require this type of support, particularly for people with advanced dementia and other complex presentations.</p> <p>Adult social care has a duty to review all services users annually who have care and support plans in place.</p> <p>There is a total of 25 Residential and Nursing home placements that have 1:1 and 2:1 support.</p> <p>The review process will work closely with the placement providers to ensure residents are well supported and that their needs continue to be met. There will be an opportunity to manage some of the presentations that have required the additional support by adding capacity to the specialist clinical care home support team.</p> <p>This saving will require collaborative multi-disciplinary work arrangements that support providers to manage more complex residents effectively and safely and may result in an increase in requests for full CHC or joint funding with health.</p> <p>The implications of the recent Fair Cost of Care exercise that took place in 2022 and the significant rise in costs in providing care has been considered within the data informing this proposal inflation.</p>			
Division budget	Gross £k	125,513	Net £k	62,921
Service area budget	Gross £k	46,502 Res and Nursing only	Net £k	30,984 *CHC and Client contributions
Saving proposed	2024/25 £k			300,000
Risks:				
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N		No		
Likelihood of making cut in full - %		65%		
Impact of making the saving	The result of implementing this support to providers should be a positive experience for the residence in terms of how their care and support is delivered. There may be an increase to Health budgets, it could mean that more costs are transferred to Health as more cases reach criteria for CHC full funded, or Health Joint funding.			
Possible risk mitigation	Joint Commissioning will ensure that inflation increases are negotiated and remain within budget. They are also working with local providers to block purchase some beds rather than be totally reliant on a spot purchasing model.			

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

	There will be additional training and support to Care home staff from specialist clinicians that will allow the reduction to 1-1 Support.			
Other considerations:				
Member or Officer decision	Officer			
Redundancies	Y/N	N	Number of staff	
Public consultation	Y/N	N	Audience(s)	
Investment required (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	Y	Cost £k	70k
	In what:	To increase capacity within the Care home support team with a focus on support for people with complex dementia and behavioural presentations that require specialist support.		
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work	None			
Specific legal or statutory considerations	Care Act and CHC Fund policy			

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	Community Services			
Director	Joan Hutton			
Service area	Adult Social Care			
Cabinet Portfolio	Health and Adult Social Care- Cllr Bell			
Reference	COM06 – ASC Staffing Reorganisation			
Saving title	Staffing reorganisation across Adult Social Care			
Description of saving (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<p>A reorganisation proposal of staffing across Adult Social Care assessment teams is in Draft form.</p> <p>The intention of this proposal is to strengthen our approach to the management of demand, multi-disciplinary working and to further embed the Principles of the Empowering Lewisham programme of improvement.</p> <p>A planned recruitment campaign will also reduce reliance on agency staff, conclude secondments and Acting up arrangements that are currently in place. Agency staff will be replaced with permanent staff, and some posts now covered by agency will be deleted.</p> <p>This will also strengthen our position regarding staff retention in preparation for our forthcoming CQC inspection.</p>			
Division budget	Gross £k	125,513	Net £k	62,921
Service area budget	Gross £k	21,095	Net £k	20,680 *S75 recharge adjusted
Saving proposed	2023/24 £k		2024/25 £k	350,000
Risks:				
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N	No			
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	100%			
Impact of making the saving	This will have a Positive impact on service delivery as the reorganisation will further embed the EL programme of work.			
Possible risk mitigation	<p>Consultation with staff will facilitate an opportunity to manage this change in accordance with the Councils HR procedures.</p> <p>There remains a risk that recruitment process may not be successful in filling posts and that this will mean continuing reliance on agency cover. Experienced Social care workers are in high demand across London</p>			
Other considerations:				
Member or Officer decision	Officer			
Redundancies	Y/N	N	Number of staff	
Public consultation	Y/N	N	Audience(s)	
	Y/N	N	Cost £k	

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Investment required (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	In what:	
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work	No	
Specific legal or statutory considerations	No	

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	Community Services			
Director	Joan Hutton			
Service area	Adult Social Care			
Cabinet Portfolio	Health and Adult Social Care- Cllr Bell			
Reference	COM06 – ASC Arranging Care Fees & Charges ASC07_24_29			
Saving title	Fees and Charges increases			
Description of saving (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<p>This proposal is in accordance with Care Act 2014 legislation and the National Fairer Charging policy that allows LA's to Charge a fee for arranging care and support to those residents assessed to pay full costs for their care.</p> <p>The saving will be achieved by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An annual increase in charging based on inflation increases. 2. By introducing an annual fee from April 24 to all full cost paying Services users in receipt of ASC services where we have arranged and commissioned their care. 			
Division budget	Gross £k	125,513	Net £k	62,921
Service area budget	Gross £k	11,498	Net £k	11,498
		*client contributions		
Saving proposed	2023/24 £k		2024/25 £k	150,000
Risks:				
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N	No			
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	85%			
Impact of making the saving	Increased costs to Service Users. Full cost payers may choose to organise their own care; therefore, we will not get the full income for charging for this function.			
Possible risk mitigation	<p>Ensuring all new Service Users have a financial assessment as soon as they become Care Act eligible.</p> <p>The fees paid to providers via the LA are often more cost effective than those privately sourced.</p> <p>The quality of care is monitored as part of contract monitoring by Joint commissioning.</p>			
Other considerations:				
Member or Officer decision	Officer, this has already had Members decision.			
Redundancies	Y/N	N	Number of staff	
Public consultation	Y/N	N	Audience(s)	
Investment required (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	N	Cost £k	
	In what:			
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work	May impact the workload of the Financial and Money Management Team.			

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Specific legal or statutory considerations	Care Act and Fairer Charging Guidance
---	---------------------------------------

ASC Equalities Screening Template

Change : Home care efficiencies

The new Maximising wellbeing at home (MWAH) contract that went live on 1st September 23, has a yearly efficiency factor built into the contract specification that will achieve the £400K savings proposed

Impact & Outcomes				
What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?				
Service Users				
None anticipated				
Staff				
None anticipated				
Other Council Services				
None anticipated				
Partners				
Partners have agreed to an efficiency factor from year 2 of their contract onwards as part of the procurement exercise and with the understanding that they are getting the full fair cost of care upfront.				
Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X
Disability				X
Ethnicity				X
Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality				X
Is a full EAA required?			No (with Corporate Policy input)	

Equalities Screening Template

Change : Transitions

This proposal is in anticipation of increase share of social care grant in 24-25 either from existing pot or from any increases from government funding received by LBL. The total expected funding from the grant should be in the region of 1.4m in order to be able to deliver the savings below. Hence this requires agreement with EMT/Corporate colleagues. THIS IS RELIANT ON THE SERVICE GETTING ADDITIONAL FUNDING OVER AND ABOVE CURRENT MTFS ASSUMPTIONS

Impact & Outcomes				
What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?				
Service Users				
None anticipated				
Staff				
None anticipated				
Other Council Services				
Funding is expected to come from additional sources				
Partners				
None anticipated				
Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X
Disability				X
Ethnicity				X
Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality				X
Is a full EAA required?			No (with Corporate Policy input)	

Equalities Screening Template

Change : Care Home Reviews

This saving will require collaborative multi-disciplinary work arrangements that support providers to manage more complex residents effectively and safely and may result in an increase in requests for full CHC or joint funding with health.

Impact & Outcomes				
What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?				
Service Users				
More complex service users across all protected characteristics will be supported in their care homes				
Staff				
None anticipated				
Other Council Services				
Partners				
MDT Working				
Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X
Disability		positive		
Ethnicity				X
Gender				X

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality				X
Is a full EAA required?			No (with Corporate Policy input)	

Equalities Screening Template

Change :

Section 117 recharge to ICB	This saving will be achieved by ensuring 50% of all Section 117 aftercare is recharge to the ICB in accordance with the Section 75 Agreement.
-----------------------------	---

Impact & Outcomes				
What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?				
Service Users				
None anticipated				
Staff				
None anticipated				
Other Council Services				
None anticipated				
Partners				
Recharged to ICB in accordance with the S75 agreement				
Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X
Disability				X
Ethnicity				X

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality				X
Is a full EAA required?			No (with Corporate Policy input)	

Equalities Screening Template

Change :

Staffing reorganisation across Adult Social Care	The intention of this proposal is to strengthen our approach to the management of demand, multi-disciplinary working and to further embed the Principles of the Empowering Lewisham programme of improvement.
--	---

Impact & Outcomes				
What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?				
Service Users				
None anticipated				
Staff				
Staff restructure focusing on agency and temporary staff				
Other Council Services				
None anticipated				
Partners				
None anticipated				
Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X
Disability				X
Ethnicity				X
Gender				X

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality				X
Is a full EAA required?			No (with Corporate Policy input)	

Equalities Screening Template

Change :

Fees and Charges increases	This proposal is in accordance with Care Act 2014 legislation and the National Fairer Charging policy that allows LA's to Charge a fee for arranging care and support to those residents assessed to pay full costs for their care.
----------------------------	---

Impact & Outcomes				
What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?				
Service Users				
Those who are assessed to pay full cost for their care will be charged a brokerage fee, in line with the National Fairer Charging Policy. Clients will therefore be selected regardless of equalities but based on their level of income/savings.				
Staff				
None anticipated				
Other Council Services				
None anticipated				
Partners				
None anticipated				
Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X
Disability				X

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Ethnicity				X
Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality				X
Is a full EAA required?			No (with Corporate Policy input)	

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	Community Service			
Director	James Lee			
Service area	Leisure Services			
Cabinet Portfolio	Culture, Leisure and Communications- Cllr Walsh			
Reference	COM08 – Leisure Service Savings			
Saving title	Leisure Services Savings			
Description of saving (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> £100K –will be available from revenue generated when the Leisure Contract share of surplus mechanism kicks in 24/25 forward £20k – removal of professional consultancy fees, 23/24 forward £10k – work R&M contingency at Downham Leisure Centre 23/24 forward 			
Division budget	Gross £k	29,249	Net £k	14,144
Service area budget	Gross £k		Net £k	Leisure currently supported by provisions
Saving proposed	2023/24 £k	£30	2024/25 £k	£130
Risks:				
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N	No			
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	100%			
Impact of making the saving	<p>The loss of the budget for the London Youth Games, mini marathon and sports talent bursaries will adversely affect young people in the borough depriving them of the opportunity to represent their borough and excel in their chosen sport perhaps effecting their long-term life chances.</p> <p>The revenue generated via the share of surplus could have been directed to cover other potential emerging pressure in the Leisure Service such as the outcome of the Downham PFI benchmarking process that is currently underway.</p>			
Possible risk mitigation	<p>The level of consultancy support has reduced since placing the Leisure Contract on a sound footing.</p> <p>LYG reputational risk of being the first London Borough to pull out of the games counter to the objectives set out within the recently adopted Physical Activity Strategy. There is a possibility that the local sports clubs and schools will step into entre the LYG AND Mini Marathon if the council removes it support. Advice could be offered to talented athletes on where they can find bursaries and sponsorship to support their development.</p> <p>PFI contractor at Downham Leisure Centre has a contractual responsibility to undertake R&M on the site robust contract monitoring procedures ensure that these works are being completed removing the necessity to spend the contingency.</p>			
Other considerations:				
Member or Officer decision	Officer			
Redundancies	Y/N	N	Number of staff	
Public consultation	Y/N	N	Audience(s)	
Investment required (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	N	Cost £k	
	In what:			

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work	N/A
Specific legal or statutory considerations	N/A

EAA Screening

Impact & Outcomes				
What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?				
Service Users				
No direct impact on service users				
Staff				
No direct impact on staff				
Other Council Services				
No direct impact on other services				
Partners				
No direct Impact on Partners				
Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				x
Disability				x
Ethnicity				x
Gender				x
Gender reassignment				x
Marriage and civil partnerships				x
Pregnancy and maternity				x
Religion and belief				x
Sexual orientation				x
Socio-economic inequality				x
Is a full EAA required?			No	

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	Community Partnerships and Leisure – Community Services			
Director	James Lee			
Service area	Community Education and Cultural Assets			
Cabinet Portfolio	Culture, Leisure and Communications- Cllr Walsh			
Reference	COM07 – ALL GF Subsidy Reduction			
Saving title	Adult Learning Lewisham reduction in general fund subsidy for salary enhancements			
Description of saving (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	One off Savings of £100K for 2023/24 and 2024/25 from the core budget contribution to the uplift on Salaries at ALL			
Division budget	Gross £k	29,249	Net £k	14,144
Service area budget	Gross £k	£3,943	Net £k	£231
Saving proposed	2023/24 £k	£100	2024/25 £k	£100
Risks:				
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N	If 'yes' identify the service impacted. N			
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	100%			
Impact of making the saving	The service has an increase of funding from GLA in 23/24 of £65K due to over performance against the GLA AEB budget allocation and the service in predicting an overall underspend. The London factor uplift has been increased, which means there is more funding allocated per learner, with learner enrolments increasing and class numbers growing this means that courses will draw down more funding and therefore we can increase the cost efficiency of course delivery.			
Possible risk mitigation	<p>There is the potential with the London factor uplift that the service will continue to over perform within the 3% tolerance, which represents up to an additional £100K per academic year.</p> <p>The service also has a reserve from the ring-fenced funding allocation which could mitigate against the risks of underperformance or the impact of salary uplifts in 2023/24 and 2024/25.</p>			
Other considerations:				
Member or Officer decision	Officer			
Redundancies	Y/N	N	Number of staff	
Public consultation	Y/N	N	Audience(s)	
Investment required (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	N	Cost £k	
	In what:	N		
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work				
Specific legal or statutory considerations	The GLA AEB funding is ring fenced for the delivery of adult education only. This means that we are only able to make cuts from the general fund			

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

	subsidy to salary increases for 23/24 and 24/25 to support the savings programme which will align with the contractual funding agreement
--	--

Directorate	Community Service		
Director	James Lee		
Service area	Parks and Open Spaces		
Cabinet Portfolio	Culture, Leisure and Communications- Cllr Walsh		
Reference	COM09 – Parks Infrastructure Investment		
Saving title	Infrastructure Investment		
Description of saving (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	Reduce by 30k revenue budget for parks infrastructure improvements allocated to supplement Greening Fund 2 & NCIL (GF2 & NCIL) projects and other small-scale improvements at locations that have no GF2 & NCIL projects planned.		
Saving proposed	2023/24 £k	£30,000	2024/25 £k
Risks:			
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N	If 'yes' identify the service impacted.		
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	100%		
Impact of making the saving	The main impact will be less resources to invest in parks infrastructure to compliment other GF2 & NCIL works taking place across the borough as well as a loss of budget for small scale improvements at location where no GF2 & NCIL projects planned.		
Possible risk mitigation	Risks a missed opportunity for additional parks investment. Mitigation will be to work within secured GF2 & NCIL allocations		
Other considerations:			
Member or Officer decision	Officer		
Redundancies	Y/N	N	Number of staff
Public consultation	Y/N	N	Audience(s)
Investment required (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	N	Cost £k
	In what:		
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work	N/A		
Specific legal or statutory considerations	N/A		

Impact & Outcomes

What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?

Service Users

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

No direct impact on service users				
Staff				
No direct impact on staff				
Other Council Services				
No direct impact on other services				
Partners				
No direct Impact on Partners				
Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				x
Disability				x
Ethnicity				x
Gender				x
Gender reassignment				x
Marriage and civil partnerships				x
Pregnancy and maternity				x
Religion and belief				x
Sexual orientation				x
Socio-economic inequality				x
Is a full EAA required?			No	

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	Community Service			
Director	Catherine Mbema			
Service area	Public Health			
Cabinet Portfolio	Businesses, Jobs and Skills- Cllr Powell			
Reference	COM10 - Public Health NCDP			
Saving title	Neighbourhood Community Development Partnerships (NCDP) saving (PH grant substitution).			
Description of saving (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> £90k currently allocated to public health area-based programmes, which has been used to support our Neighbourhood Community Development Partnerships. Neighbourhood Community Development Partnerships (NCDPs) bring together relevant partners in each Neighbourhood in Lewisham to identify resources within communities to maximise their potential while also highlighting gaps in service provision and working with the local voluntary sector to develop services to meet local needs. 			
Division budget	Gross £k	29,914	Net £k	£Nil
Service area budget	Gross £k	90	Net £k	90
Saving proposed	2023/24 £k		2024/25 £k	£90,000
Risks:				
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N	No			
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	100%			
Impact of making the saving	<p>Since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic the funding for Neighbourhood Community Development Partnerships (NCDPs) has been repurposed to support emergency food provision/food justice work in the borough owing to the inability of the Partnerships to run during the pandemic. This financial year some of this funding has also been repurposed to support the development of Health Equity Teams in the borough for each Primary Care Network (PCN) in Lewisham, which are a more recent form of area/neighbourhood work that public health is supporting. Since the NCDPs have now not run for a number of years the impact of them not restarting will be mild, however there will be a risk to the ongoing support that can be provided to work on food justice and Health Equity Teams by making this public health (PH) grant substitution/saving.</p>			
Possible risk mitigation	<p>There is South-East London Integrated Care Board (SEL ICB) work underway to develop integrated neighbourhood teams that may provide some degree of mitigation to not having NCDPs in place. If sustained the In terms of food justice work, fixed-term funding from other areas of PH grant will provide short term mitigation for no longer being able to repurpose NCDP funding to support this work.</p>			
Other considerations:				
Member or Officer decision	Officer			
Redundancies	Y/N	N	Number of staff	
Public consultation	Y/N	N	Audience(s)	
Investment required (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	N	Cost £k	
	In what:			

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work	N/A
Specific legal or statutory considerations	N/A

Equalities Screening Template

Impact & Outcomes				
What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?				
Service Users				
The service users that would have been attendees of the NCDP funded projects for the 2019/2020 period include younger residents, residents over 60 years and residents from Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic communities. Residents that would benefit from NCDP funded projects may therefore be impacted by the proposed changes with potential mitigations for these impacts outlined in the savings proforma attached.				
Staff				
There are no direct equalities implications for Lewisham Council staff as a result of these changes.				
Other Council Services				
There are no direct equalities implications for Lewisham Council staff as a result of these changes.				
Partners				
NCDPs were supported by Community Connections Lewisham so there may be some impact for this partnership initiative by the proposed changes.				
Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Negative)	Neutral
Age			x	
Disability			x	
Ethnicity			x	
Gender			x	
Gender reassignment				x
Marriage and civil partnerships				x
Pregnancy and maternity			x	

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Religion and belief			x	
Sexual orientation				x
Socio-economic inequality			x	
Is a full EAA required?				Y/N (with Corporate Policy input)

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	Corporate Resources			
Director	Rich Clarke			
Service area	Assurance (Cross Service)			
Cabinet Portfolio	Finance and Strategy - Cllr de Ryk			
Reference	COR01 – Assurance Budget Adjustments			
Saving title	Various Assurance Budget Adjustments			
Description of saving (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<p>Various budget adjustments within Assurance to bring budgets in line with expected expenditure and remove historical anomalies (including some growth items). Individual recurring changes >£10k</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • +£33k, cease practice of recharging audit to schools • +£29k, additional A-FACT apprentice (2yr scheme) • £25k, re-tender Lewisham Homes inherited internal audit support (currently total GF/LH budget is c.£70k, anticipate new contract to be awarded at c.£45k. Estimated split of that contract would be £10k GF, £35k HRA resulting in £10k GF saving and £15k HRA saving but this is an estimate subject to recharge arrangements tbc on workload split). • £25k, relinquishing contingency held in H&S budget for restructure • £20k, expected re-tender of combined building inspection contract • £15k, achieved saving following H&S software re-procurement 			
Division budget	Gross £k	5,744	Net £k	2,775
Service area budget	Gross £k	5,744	Net £k	2,775
Saving proposed	2023/24 £k		2024/25 £k	35
Risks:				
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N	No			
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	90%			
Impact of making the saving	Various impacts, but all regarded as manageable.			
Possible risk mitigation	Various mitigations, but all regarded as achievable.			
Other considerations:				
Member or Officer decision	Officer.			
Redundancies	Y/N	No	Number of staff	n/a
Public consultation	Y/N	No	Audience(s)	n/a
Investment required (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	No	Cost £k	£0
	In what:			
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work	None.			
Specific legal or statutory considerations	None.			

Equalities Screening Template: Assurance – Cross Service

Impact & Outcomes				
What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?				
Service Users				
None. Services are not public facing.				
Staff				
None. Changes are not staff related save A-FACT apprentice recruitment.				
Other Council Services				
Minimal. Largely arising through releasing contingency or effective procurement.				
Partners				
None.				
Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X
Disability				X
Ethnicity				X
Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality				X
Is a full EAA required?			No	

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	Corporate Resources			
Director	Rich Clarke			
Service area	Insurance & Risk			
Cabinet Portfolio	Finance and Strategy - Cllr de Ryk			
Reference	COR02 – Assurance Insurance Contracts			
Saving title	Insurance Contract			
Description of saving (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	We recently awarded new contracts for the Council's insurances as part of a scheduled recruitment. These contracts will commence 1/12/23 and run for five years.			
Division budget	Gross £k	5,744	Net £k	2,775
Service area budget	Gross £k	4,454	Net £k	1,566
Saving proposed	2023/24 £k	68	2024/25 £k	203
Risks:				
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N	No			
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	95%			
Impact of making the saving	None. Providing sufficient coverage was a qualifying requirement for suppliers. Therefore we retain expected coverage levels. Note that c.25% of the saving will be charged to HRA as the insurance covers Council residential properties.			
Possible risk mitigation	N/A			
Other considerations:				
Member or Officer decision	Delegated officer decision to be made by David Austin.			
Redundancies	Y/N	No	Number of staff	n/a
Public consultation	Y/N	No	Audience(s)	n/a
Investment required (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	No	Cost £k	£0
	In what:			
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work	Contract award decision pending			
Specific legal or statutory considerations	Small inherent risk that award may be challenged by unsuccessful suppliers, but no challenge expected. Process completed alongside Council procurement team from start to finish and so confident on compliance.			

Equalities Screening Template: Assurance – Insurance Contracts

Impact & Outcomes
What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?
Service Users

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

None. New contracts materially retain level of extent of insurance coverage held on pre 1/12/23 contracts.				
Staff				
None. New contracts materially retain level of extent of insurance coverage held on pre 1/12/23 contracts.				
Other Council Services				
None. New contracts materially retain level of extent of insurance coverage held on pre 1/12/23 contracts.				
Partners				
None. New contracts materially retain level of extent of insurance coverage held on pre 1/12/23 contracts.				
Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X
Disability				X
Ethnicity				X
Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality				X
Is a full EAA required?			No	

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	Corporate Resources			
Director	Rich Clarke			
Service area	Internal Audit			
Cabinet Portfolio	Finance and Strategy - Cllr de Ryk			
Reference	COR03 – Internal Audit Restructure			
Saving title	Internal Audit Restructure			
Description of saving (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	Current vacant post. Propose not replacing at all in 2023/24 and instead spreading work among existing staff (current saving proposed). For 2024/25 look to replace the post with a more junior post focussed on maintaining risk information.			
Division budget	Gross £k	5,744	Net £k	2,775
Service area budget	Gross £k	454	Net £k	421
Saving proposed	2023/24 £k	17	2024/25 £k	15
Risks:				
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N	No			
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	70%			
Impact of making the saving	Reduced internal audit capacity.			
Possible risk mitigation	Hope to manage the impact via better targeted audit derived from improved risk information.			
Other considerations:				
Member or Officer decision	Officer (Head of Assurance, with appropriate permissions for amended post).			
Redundancies	Y/N	No	Number of staff	n/a
Public consultation	Y/N	No	Audience(s)	n/a
Investment required (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	No	Cost £k	£0
	In what:			
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work	Spend rest of 23/24 determining demand for risk information. Working expectation is as per this form; need for a more junior employee to help manage risk register. However, it is possible with more self-service across the Council the post may not be needed at all (in which case saving c.£50k).			
Specific legal or statutory considerations	None.			

Equalities Screening Template: Assurance – Internal Audit

Impact & Outcomes
What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?
Service Users
None. IA is not a public facing service.

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Staff				
Minimal. All changes proposed relate to vacant posts. Replacement post is more junior and presents opportunity to recruit early-career individual.				
Other Council Services				
None.				
Partners				
None.				
Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X
Disability				X
Ethnicity				X
Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality				X
Is a full EAA required?			No	

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	Corporate Resources			
Director	Katharine Nidd			
Service area	Finance			
Cabinet Portfolio	Finance and Strategy – Cllr De Ryk			
Reference	COR04 – Finance Structure Revisions			
Saving title	Finance Savings			
Description of saving (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	As at P4 Finance were reporting an underspend and therefore all savings will take effect from 1 April 2024. The saving is a mixture of re-structuring historically hard to fill vacant posts (including a full review of the payroll service) and minor revisions to structures to drive efficiencies out.			
Division budget	Gross £k	8,491	Net £k	6,100
Service area budget	Gross £k	8,491	Net £k	6,100
Saving proposed	2023/24 £k	0	2024/25 £k	250
Risks:				
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N	No			
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	100%			
Impact of making the saving	This will slightly reduce resilience within the finance function, and remove any capacity for making significant change or improvement without additional resource in the future.			
Possible risk mitigation	We are undertaking a review of recharges for those services paid by others (schools, HRA, GF), this may offset risk in Finance but may result in cost shunt.			
Other considerations:				
Member or Officer decision	Officer			
Redundancies	Y/N	N	Number of staff	N/A
Public consultation	Y/N	N	Audience(s)	N/A
Investment required (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	N	Cost £k	N/A
	In what:	N/A		
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work	None initially, as part of budget setting the review of recharges may involve discussion with other services.			
Specific legal or statutory considerations	None			

1. Equalities Screening Template

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

For each of the nine protected characteristics, identify whether the proposal has a high, medium, low or neutral impact on service users and whether this is a positive or negative impact.

Identify whether the proposal has a high, medium, low or neutral impact on socio-economic inequality (e.g. low income, fuel poverty, food insecurity, digital inclusion etc) and whether this is a positive or negative impact.

Identify whether a full service equalities analysis assessment is required for this proposal based on this Equalities Analysis Toolkit. For advice on whether an EAA is required and how to assess service equalities impact please contact policy@lewisham.gov.uk

Impact & Outcomes				
What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?				
Service Users				
There should be very little impact on service users, the changes mostly relate to vacant posts which are being delivered in other ways, therefore there should be minimal noticeable change for service users within the Council.				
Staff				
There is a planned restructure of the Payroll service which staff have been made aware of as this has already been planned. There are a number of hard to fill vacant posts across finance which will either be deleted or reviewed/changed and which will not affect any staff directly, and there is a deletion of a single post which will impact on a staff member, however they will be assimilated into an existing equivalent role.				
Other Council Services				
There is not expected to be any impact on other Council Services, however, in making savings this slightly reduces resilience within the finance function, and removes any capacity for making significant change or improvement without additional resource in the future.				
Partners				
None				
Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X
Disability				X
Ethnicity				X

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality				X
Is a full EAA required?			N	

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	Resident and Business Services			
Director	Maxine Gordon			
Service area	Facilities Management			
Cabinet Portfolio	Finance and Strategy - Cllr de Ryk			
Reference	COR10 – FM Printing & Stationery			
Saving title	FM Other Costs			
Description of saving (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	FM Printing FM Stationery			
Division budget	Gross £	5,008,288	Net £k	
Service area budget	Gross £	177,767	Net £k	
Saving proposed	2023/24 £k	60	2024/25 £k	
Risks:				
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N	If 'yes' identify the service impacted.			
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	80%			
Impact of making the saving	Invu Printing Costs finished during Covid and annual stationery costs are static and lower than budget.			
Possible risk mitigation				
Other considerations:				
Member or Officer decision	Officer			
Redundancies	Y/N	N	Number of staff	
Public consultation	Y/N	N	Audience(s)	
Investment required (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	N	Cost £k	
	In what:			
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work				
Specific legal or statutory considerations				

EIA

Impact & Outcomes

What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?

Service Users

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

There is no impact to service users because this printing hasn't been used since 2020. Stationery costs have also been below budget this year hence the proposed saving.				
Staff				
No anticipated impact to staff.				
Other Council Services				
No anticipated impact to council services.				
Partners				
No anticipated impact to partners.				
Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X
Disability				X
Ethnicity				X
Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality				X
Is a full EAA required?			N	

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	Resident and Business Services			
Director	Maxine Gordon			
Service area	Facilities Management			
Cabinet Portfolio	Finance and Strategy - Cllr de Ryk			
Reference	COR05 – FM Energy Post Removal			
Saving title				
FM Energy				
Description of saving (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	Reduction of one admin post			
Division budget	Gross £	1,124,309	Net £k	
Service area budget	Gross £	265,775	Net £k	
Saving proposed	2023/24 £k	25	2024/25 £k	
Risks:				
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N	If 'yes' identify the service impacted.			
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	80%			
Impact of making the saving	Technical solution to be implemented which will process school utility invoices. The member of staff is a CYP officer and we make a £25k contribution to their salary.			
Possible risk mitigation				
Other considerations:				
Member or Officer decision	officer			
Redundancies	Y/N	N	Number of staff	1
Public consultation	Y/N	N	Audience(s)	
Investment required (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	N	Cost £k	
	In what:			
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work				
Specific legal or statutory considerations				

EIA

Impact & Outcomes
What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?
Service Users
Invoice validation will be a positive change for service users because it will better improve our management of energy payments.

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Staff				
One person is affected but this person is employed by the schools and is currently 0.7 (2 days a week).				
Other Council Services				
Schools will have the option of providing her with more work or making her role redundant.				
Partners				
There are no partners involved in this proposed change.				
Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age		x		
Disability			x	
Ethnicity		x		
Gender		x		
Gender reassignment				x
Marriage and civil partnerships				x
Pregnancy and maternity				x
Religion and belief				x
Sexual orientation				x
Socio-economic inequality				x
Is a full EAA required?			N	

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	Resident and Business Services			
Director	Maxine Gordon			
Service area	Facilities Management			
Cabinet Portfolio	Finance and Strategy - Cllr de Ryk			
Reference	COR11 – FM Receptionist Posts			
Saving title				
FM Soft Services				
Description of saving (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	2 x Receptionist roles.			
Division budget	Gross £	922,701	Net £k	
Service area budget	Gross £	841,434	Net £k	
Saving proposed	2023/24 £k	40	2024/25 £k	
Risks:				
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N	No			
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	80%			
Impact of making the saving	We are in October and these roles have not been recruited to as yet for 23/24. We will be recruiting to these roles in 24/25.			
Possible risk mitigation				
Other considerations:				
Member or Officer decision				
Redundancies	Y/N	N	Number of staff	0
Public consultation	Y/N	N	Audience(s)	
Investment required (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	N	Cost £k	
	In what:			
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work				
Specific legal or statutory considerations				

EIA – FOH Receptionists

Impact & Outcomes
What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?
Service Users
These posts have been vacant for over a year with no impact on service users. Cover has been arranged and the team are supported by security staff who

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

signpost enquiries in the first instance. The majority of visitors come in relation to housing and they currently have their own staff in the reception area				
Staff				
There are currently no negative impacts identified. Before the end of 23/24 a new Operations Manager will join the team and they will be able to better manage resources.				
Other Council Services				
There is no negative impact on any other services.				
Partners				
There is no negative impact on any partners.				
Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				x
Disability				x
Ethnicity				x
Gender				x
Gender reassignment				x
Marriage and civil partnerships				x
Pregnancy and maternity				x
Religion and belief				x
Sexual orientation				x
Socio-economic inequality				x
Is a full EAA required?			N	

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	Resources			
Director	IT & Digital			
Service area	Shared Technology Services (STS)			
Cabinet Portfolio	Finance and Strategy - Cllr de Ryk			
Reference	COR06 – IT & Digital STS			
Saving title				
Shared Technology Services (STS) savings				
Description of saving (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	JUMPSEC Limited	Cyber Security Review	Jumpsec Ltd for Cyber Security Review – This is the company that the London Borough of Lewisham use to scan and report on potential cyber threats to the council's IT network.	£33,000
	Computacenter (UK) Ltd	Mobile Iron Renewal	London Borough of Brent & London Borough of Lewisham to renew the contract for MobileIron which is the software used to secure corporate devices such as mobile phones.	£38,509
	One off		Relocation of Lewisham Homes Equipment from Greenwich to Brent Datacentre	£7,467
	One off		Relocation of Equipment from Maidstone to the Croydon Datacentre	£7,486
	Plus £88,000 proposed reduction from move to new O2 annual contract from Vodafone All 2024/25 savings should be ongoing reduction to the Shared Technology Services (STS) budget.			
Division budget	Gross £k	11,112,891	Net £k	
Service area budget	Gross £k	4,210,956	Net £k	
Saving proposed	2023/24 £k	0	2024/25 £k	174
Risks:				
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N	No			
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	100%			
Impact of making the saving	A reduced cost to Lewisham Council for services and contracts provided by Shared Technology Services (STS).			
Possible risk mitigation	Not applicable			
Other considerations:				
Member or Officer decision	Officer decision			
Redundancies	Y/N	N	Number of staff	
Public consultation	Y/N	N	Audience(s)	
Investment required	Y/N	N	Cost £k	
(value of saving)	In what:			

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

shown above should be net of this investment)		
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work	None	
Specific legal or statutory considerations	None	

1. Equalities Screening Template

For each of the nine protected characteristics, identify whether the proposal has a high, medium, low or neutral impact on service users and whether this is a positive or negative impact.

Identify whether the proposal has a high, medium, low or neutral impact on socio-economic inequality (e.g. low income, fuel poverty, food insecurity, digital inclusion etc) and whether this is a positive or negative impact.

Identify whether a full service equalities analysis assessment is required for this proposal based on this Equalities Analysis Toolkit. For advice on whether an EAA is required and how to assess service equalities impact please contact policy@lewisham.gov.uk

Impact & Outcomes
What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?
Service Users
There will be no impact on service users as these savings are mainly gained from contractual cost reductions and equipment relocations within the data centres. This would all occur "behind the scenes". Service will continue seamlessly.
Staff
The only impact on staff will be those who use devices with council SIM cards (mobile phones, tablets, laptops etc.) who will need to change the sim cards to the new O2 ones. This is being co-ordinated, managed and communicated in a way that will cause minimum disruption to staff.
Other Council Services
There is not expected to be any impact on other Council Services.
Partners
None

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X
Disability				X
Ethnicity				X
Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality				X
Is a full EAA required?			N	

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	Resources		
Director	IT & Digital		
Service area	ICT		
Cabinet Portfolio	Finance and Strategy - Cllr de Ryk		
Reference	COR08 – IT & Digital Vacant Posts		
Saving title			
Description of saving (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	Staffing ‘In year’ saving by not recruiting to a number posts within the IT and Digital solution, plans are in place to recruit next year to bolster the service to meet demand		
Division budget	Gross £k		Net £k
Service area budget	Gross £k	1118	Net £k
Saving proposed	2023/24 £k	357	2024/25 £k 0
Risks:			
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N	No.		
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	30%		
Impact of making the saving	Posts remain vacant so delays in some work around transformation, data, IT design, and Cyber Security we remain reliant on Shared Technology Services (STS) and Director of IT & Digital.		
Possible risk mitigation	Cyber Security we remain reliant on Shared Technology Services (STS) and Director of IT & Digital.		
Other considerations:			
Member or Officer decision	Officer decision		
Redundancies	Y/N	N	Number of staff
Public consultation	Y/N	N	Audience(s)
Investment required (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	N	Cost £k
	In what:		
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work	none		

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Specific legal or statutory considerations	none
--	------

1. Equalities Screening Template

For each of the nine protected characteristics, identify whether the proposal has a high, medium, low or neutral impact on service users and whether this is a positive or negative impact.

Identify whether the proposal has a high, medium, low or neutral impact on socio-economic inequality (e.g. low income, fuel poverty, food insecurity, digital inclusion etc) and whether this is a positive or negative impact.

Identify whether a full service equalities analysis assessment is required for this proposal based on this Equalities Analysis Toolkit. For advice on whether an EAA is required and how to assess service equalities impact please contact policy@lewisham.gov.uk

Impact & Outcomes				
What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?				
Service Users				
Whilst these changes may delay some work around IT Design and Cyber Security, we remain supported by Shared Technology Services (STS) who are currently supporting the bulk of these activities.				
Staff				
No perceived impact on staff as the posts have always been vacant so for staff, the status quo remains.				
Other Council Services				
There is not expected to be any impact on other Council Services.				
Partners				
We are reliant more on STS until these posts are filled.				
Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X
Disability				X
Ethnicity				X
Gender				X

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality				X
Is a full EAA required?				N

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	Resources			
Director	IT & Digital			
Service area	Programme Management Office (PMO)			
Cabinet Portfolio	Finance and Strategy - Cllr de Ryk			
Reference	COR09 – IT & Digital PMO			
Saving title	Programme Management Office (PMO) savings			
Description of saving (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	The Programme Management Office (PMO) will not recruit to a vacant Business Analyst and Project Officer role, making a saving of £60,820.			
Division budget	Gross £k	11,112	Net £k	
Service area budget	Gross £k	665	Net £k	
Saving proposed	2023/24 £k	61	2024/25 £k	0
Risks:				
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N	No			
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	100%			
Impact of making the saving	The Programme Management Office (PMO) will only have one Business Analyst role in the team. This will limit the ability to work with numerous service areas across the council and support other service improvements and savings proposals.			
Possible risk mitigation	To recruit temporary agency staff via Matrix, the council's agreed agency worker provider.			
Other considerations:				
Member or Officer decision	Officer decision			
Redundancies	Y/N	N	Number of staff	
Public consultation	Y/N	N	Audience(s)	
Investment required (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	N	Cost £k	
	In what:	N/A		
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work	None			
Specific legal or statutory considerations	None			

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

1. Equalities Screening Template

For each of the nine protected characteristics, identify whether the proposal has a high, medium, low or neutral impact on service users and whether this is a positive or negative impact.

Identify whether the proposal has a high, medium, low or neutral impact on socio-economic inequality (e.g. low income, fuel poverty, food insecurity, digital inclusion etc) and whether this is a positive or negative impact.

Identify whether a full service equalities analysis assessment is required for this proposal based on this Equalities Analysis Toolkit. For advice on whether an EAA is required and how to assess service equalities impact please contact policy@lewisham.gov.uk

Impact & Outcomes				
What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?				
Service Users				
There will be a slight impact on service users whereby the Programme Management Office (PMO) will have less capacity for Business Analysis which will limit it's ability to work with numerous service areas across the council and support other service improvements and savings proposals.				
Staff				
There may be an impact on other staff in the Programme Management Office (PMO) with the need to share some of the Business Analyst function amongst the other team members.				
Other Council Services				
There is not expected to be any impact on other Council Services.				
Partners				
None				
Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X
Disability				X
Ethnicity				X
Gender				X

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality				X
Is a full EAA required?				N

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	Resources			
Director	IT & Digital			
Service area	Digital Services			
Cabinet Portfolio	Finance and Strategy - Cllr de Ryk			
Reference	COR07 – IT & Digital Applications			
Saving title	Digital savings			
Description of saving (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<p>Support for the Microsoft Dynamics Customer Relationship Management (CRM) application which supports various services and new Housing Management system transfer from Xpedition Ltd to the in-house team, a saving of 24,835. As we have built up the capability and size of the Digital team, these capabilities can be managed in house. To be achieved from 24/25.</p> <p>Lewisham will cease to use East Peninsular Trading for recruitment and talent acquisition, a saving of 20,000. To be achieved from 23/24.</p>			
Division budget	Gross £k	11,112,891	Net £k	
Service area budget	Gross £k	148,509	Net £k	
Saving proposed	2023/24 £k	20	2024/25 £k	45
Risks:				
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N	No			
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	100%			
Impact of making the saving	Will no longer use talent acquisition so it may be more difficult to recruit.			
Possible risk mitigation	To fill vacant posts with permanent staff where possible or to use Matrix, the council's approved agency worker provider if necessary.			
Other considerations:				
Member or Officer decision	Officer decision			
Redundancies	Y/N	N	Number of staff	
Public consultation	Y/N	N	Audience(s)	
Investment required (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	N	Cost £k	
	In what:			
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work	None			
Specific legal or statutory considerations	None			

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

1. Equalities Screening Template

For each of the nine protected characteristics, identify whether the proposal has a high, medium, low or neutral impact on service users and whether this is a positive or negative impact.

Identify whether the proposal has a high, medium, low or neutral impact on socio-economic inequality (e.g. low income, fuel poverty, food insecurity, digital inclusion etc) and whether this is a positive or negative impact.

Identify whether a full service equalities analysis assessment is required for this proposal based on this Equalities Analysis Toolkit. For advice on whether an EAA is required and how to assess service equalities impact please contact policy@lewisham.gov.uk

Impact & Outcomes				
What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?				
Service Users				
No impact on service users as there should be a seamless transition from the support for MS Dynamics provided by Xpedition Ltd to the in-house team.				
Staff				
No impact on staff as they will still go through the same contact team.				
Other Council Services				
There is no envisaged impact on any other council services.				
Partners				
None				
Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X
Disability				X
Ethnicity				X
Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality				X
Is a full EAA required?				N

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	CYPS - CSC				
Director	Pinaki Ghoshal				
Service area	Children's Social Care				
Cabinet Portfolio	Children & Young People- Cllr Barnham				
Reference	CYP1 – CSC Housing Benefit Claims CYP2 – CSC Placement Payments Efficiency CYP3 – CSC Building Residential Homes CYP4 – CSC S17 & Placements				
Cut title	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Placements: Housing Benefit claims for all Staying Put 2. Placements: Payments efficiency for placement providers 3. Placements: Building Lewisham children's residential homes 4. S17 & Placements: Reduced spot purchasing of youth support 				
Description of cut (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	Saving	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	Total
		£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
	CSC 1	0	80	0	80
	CSC 2	20	180	0	200
	CSC 3	0	390	1,170	1,560
	CSC 4	200	500	500	1,200
TOTAL	220	1,150	1,670	3,040	
Division budget	Gross £k	57,222		Net £k	53,619
Service area budget	Gross £k	57,222		Net £k	53,619
Cut proposed	2023/24 £k	£220k		2024/25 £k 2025/26 £k	£1.150m £1.670m
Risks:					
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N	No				
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	80%				
Impact of making the cut	<p><u>CSC2</u>: Positive impact – fewer overpayments and interest charges on late payments</p> <p><u>CSC3</u>: Positive impact - less reliance on placement market, more cost control</p> <p><u>CSC4</u>: Negative impact moderate - Could risk more young people entering care, if an alternative is not in place.</p>				
Possible risk mitigation	<u>CSC4</u> : Development of adolescent service to provide alternative 'in house' service				
Other considerations:					
Member or Officer decision	officer				
Redundancies	Y/N	N	Number of staff		
Public consultation	Y/N	N	Audience(s)		
Investment required (value of cut shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	Y	Cost £k		TBC
In what:	S3: Capital investment for repurposing identified buildings S4: Expansion of 'in house' service as alternative to commissioned resource				

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work	S2: Requires changes to processes across CYP Services and Finance Payments Service S3: Business Case to be developed.
Specific legal or statutory considerations	

Equalities Screening Template

For each of the nine protected characteristics, identify whether the proposal has a high, medium, low or neutral impact on service users and whether this is a positive or negative impact.

Identify whether the proposal has a high, medium, low or neutral impact on socio-economic inequality (e.g. low income, fuel poverty, food insecurity, digital inclusion etc) and whether this is a positive or negative impact.

Identify whether a full service equalities analysis assessment is required for this proposal based on this Equalities Analysis Toolkit. For advice on whether an EAA is required and how to assess service equalities impact please contact policy@lewisham.gov.uk

Impact & Outcomes
What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?
Service Users
CYP Directorate CSC Division Savings Proposals. Saving: 1,2,4. – No impact Saving 3 impact: Placing of children in care in an in-house Lewisham controlled provision as an alternative to commissioning placements, is likely to have a positive impact for those service users placed in the proposed units. Primarily, the provision will be local/in Borough and closer to the child's support network, family, school and community. Secondly as Lewisham will be in control of the provision, we will not be served short notice on placements (as frequently currently experienced). Both factors are likely to result in greater stability and continuity of care for some of our most vulnerable young people in care.
Staff
Saving: 1,2,4. – No impact Saving 3 impact : Developing in house children's home provision will require staffing, depending on the model implemented and whether staffing will be permanent employees or a sub-contracted, internal staff may be suitable for an attracted to new posts, which may have an impact on existing staffing levels in the Children's Directorate.
Other Council Services
Saving: 1,2,4. – No impact

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Saving 3 – too early at this stage to establish. As part of the Business Case and Programme Management of this proposal a fuller EAA will be completed where this will be explored in detail.				
Partners				
Saving: 1,2,4. – No impact Saving 3 – too early at this stage to establish. As part of the Business Case and Programme Management of this proposal a fuller EAA will be completed where this will be explored in detail.				
Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X No specific impact
Disability				X No specific impact
Ethnicity		X For some CYP in care being able to remain in their community, not placed elsewhere in the country that have less cultural/racial diversity.		
Gender				X No specific impact
Gender reassignment				X No specific impact
Marriage and civil partnerships				X No specific impact
Pregnancy and maternity				X No specific impact
Religion and belief				X No specific impact
Sexual orientation				X No specific impact
Socio-economic inequality				X No specific impact
Is a full EAA required?			Y (See notes above)	

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	CYP																															
Director	Angela Scattergood																															
Service area	Education – Access, Inclusion and Participation																															
Cabinet Portfolio	Cllr Barnham																															
Reference	CYP5 – Primary Phase Commissioning Costs – Management Action CY6 – Participation Team – Management Action																															
Cut title	<p>Edu 4. Primary phase Alternative Provision Commissioning costs – Management action</p> <p>Edu 5. Contribution from the Participation Team – Management action</p> <p>Edu 12. Lewisham Challenge – Management action</p> <p>Edu 14a. Outreach Inclusion Service – Management action</p>																															
Description of cut (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Saving</th> <th>2023/24</th> <th>2024/25</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th>£'000</th> <th>£'000</th> <th>£'000</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Edu 4</td> <td>70</td> <td>30</td> <td>100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Edu 5</td> <td>10</td> <td>0</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Edu 12</td> <td>0</td> <td>40</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Edu 14A</td> <td>70</td> <td>0</td> <td>70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>150</td> <td>70</td> <td>220</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Edu 4. Primary phase Alternative Provision Commissioning costs – Management action We intend to commission fewer Primary Alternative Provision places from September 2023. This reduction will be five places at £20K so in an academic year £100K saving to the HNB. An in year saving of £70,000 in the 2022-23 budget and a total of £100K in 2024-25. This saving can be achieved as we have not seen the number of commissioned places go above 20 for some time, so there is no reduction in the offer to children.</p> <p>Edu 5. Contribution from the Participation Team – Management action We can offer a £10K from the Participation Team as an in-year saving from for European Social Fund (ESF) grant for post-16 tracking work.</p> <p>Edu 12. Lewisham Challenge – Management action Is a programme to raise aspirations amongst young people across all of the Lewisham sixth forms and colleges and to inform their decisions about HE and career opportunities. This is a programme unique to Lewisham but a non-statutory function. The target group is 16-18 and is well supported by external organisations (Higher Education, practitioners and employers). The programme is long standing in Lewisham and is coordinated by an external consultant.</p> <p>The proposal is to remove Council this funding for this coordination which is currently through the General Fund and for the Lewisham post-16 providers (sixth forms and colleges) to fund the programme moving forward. Recent legislation, including the Skills Post-16 Education Act 2022 and the Education (Careers Guidance in Schools) Act 2022 has placed further responsibility for careers guidance with schools and providers (rather than the LA). This has already been discussed with the providers who are confident in the programme and want to ensure its continuity; schools,</p>				Saving	2023/24	2024/25	Total		£'000	£'000	£'000	Edu 4	70	30	100	Edu 5	10	0	10	Edu 12	0	40	40	Edu 14A	70	0	70	TOTAL	150	70	220
Saving	2023/24	2024/25	Total																													
	£'000	£'000	£'000																													
Edu 4	70	30	100																													
Edu 5	10	0	10																													
Edu 12	0	40	40																													
Edu 14A	70	0	70																													
TOTAL	150	70	220																													

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

	Higher Education providers and Goldsmiths University have committed to funding.			
	<p>Edu 14a. Outreach Inclusion Service – Management action</p> <p>There are three elements to this overall savings proposal of £70k.</p> <p>a. We no longer base the Outreach Inclusion Service at New Woodlands School and staff are not based at Laurence House and work remotely. The rental of £18K is no longer required as an expenditure from the budget.</p> <p>b. Finance support has previously brokered with the New Woodlands School at an annual cost of £6K. This ceased from 31st July 2023. The Outreach Manager and internal Business Support are managing the finances and will continue to do so moving forward.</p> <p>With changes to the management of the offer a vacant post is now being deleted from the establishment.</p>			
Division budget	Gross £k	£170,538	Net £k	£15,176
Service area budget	Gross £k	£8,563	Net £k	£197
Cut proposed	2023/24 £k	£150k	2024/25 £k	£70k
Risks:				
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N	No			
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	All- 100%			
Impact of making the cut	Need to continue to monitor demand for alternative provision places.			
Possible risk mitigation	Review in September 2024 when management of the provision will move to Grinling Gibbons School.			
Other considerations:				
Member or Officer decision	Officer			
Redundancies	N		Number of staff	
Public consultation	N		Audience(s)	
Investment required	N		Cost £k	
(value of cut shown above should be net of this investment)	In what:			
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work	n/a			
Specific legal or statutory considerations	n/a			
What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?				
Service Users				
<p>Primary phase Alternative Provision Commissioning costs – Management Action</p> <p>No impact on services users. Based on three years of analysis less places are required to need. This will be sufficient to support the primary aged children in Lewisham schools.</p>				
<p>Contribution from the Participation Team</p> <p>N/A as it is external / additional funding we can contribute. However this is a one-off saving contribution.</p>				
Lewisham Challenge				

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

If we are unable to maintain external funding from key stakeholders we would need to consider the future of the programme.

Outreach Inclusion Service

With one less member of staff supporting children in schools it may have an impact on reducing exclusions for Lewisham CYP. However, this work is part of the overall inclusion strategy and initiatives such as Mental Health Support Teams in Schools are being rolled out to more schools across the borough which is likely to offset any impact.

Staff

Primary phase Alternative Provision Commissioning costs – Management Action

N/A no impact on staffing.

Contribution from the Participation Team

N/A no impact on staffing.

Lewisham Challenge

N/A no impact on staffing.

4. Outreach Inclusion Service

N/A no impact on staffing

Other Council Services

Primary phase Alternative Provision Commissioning costs – Management Action

N/A no impact on other Council services.

Contribution from the Participation Team

N/A no impact on other Council services.

Lewisham Challenge

N/A no impact on other Council services.

Outreach Inclusion Service

No impact on other Council services

Partners

Primary phase Alternative Provision Commissioning costs – Management Action

N/A

Contribution from the Participation Team

N/A

Lewisham Challenge

N/A

Outreach Inclusion Service

New Woodlands School were notified of these changes in Spring 2023, which were implemented in Summer 2023.

Are there any specific equalities implications?

Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X
Disability				X
Ethnicity				X
Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality				X
Is a full EAA required?				N

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	CYP		
Director	Angela Scattergood (Pinaki Ghoshal – Executive Director)		
Service area	Education Services - Integrated SEND Services for Children & Young People		
Cabinet Portfolio	Cllr Barnham		
Reference	CYP17 – SEND Travel Assistance CYP18 – Integrated SEND Service		
Cut title	Edu 8 Savings DBV Programme Implementation Grant Edu14 SEN Transport Mitigation work		
Description of cut (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	Integrated SEND Service (£100k) – Grant Maximisation (one off) SEN Travel Assistance £150k		
Division budget	Gross £k	£170,538	Net £k
Service area budget	Gross £k	£86,435	Net £k
Savings proposed	2023/24 £k		250k
Risks:			
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N	No		
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	80%		
Impact of making the cut	<p>Edu 8. DBV Programme -Grant Implementation-Mitigation work The LA is currently in wave 3 of the Delivering Better Value (DBV) programme and is highly likely to succeed with its bid/grant application for £1million to support continued mitigation work in reducing special educational needs and disabilities SEND spend from April 2024 onwards. The grant application is currently going through the assurer process from Newton Europe and Department for Education (DfE) and feedback so far has been positive.</p> <p>The LA has already demonstrated a strong track record in delivering mitigations such as creating additional local SEND places in special schools and resource bases as well as working with partners, such as local colleges on moderating high needs funding levels for individual learners with Education Health Care Plans (EHCPs).</p> <p>This work related to the DBV programme has required and continues to require protected project management and leadership time as well as capacity in the wider statutory SEND Service to undertake and deliver the ongoing mitigation work.</p> <p>We suggest therefore that 8-10%, e.g. £80k-£100k of the grant when successful, is used in supporting the internal continued staffing cost for wider project management related to high needs mitigation work. Additionally, £32k has already been awarded by the DBV programme for data collection work; this could be added to the overall substitution. We would propose a £132k substitution to the posts funded by the general fund, including Head of Service for SEND post, SEND Data Monitoring Officer, CYP Finance Strategic Lead as a one-off saving.</p> <p>Edu14. SEN Travel Assistance for eligible learners: increase of personal travel assistance budgets by 5-8%.</p>		

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

	<p>Currently we have 1,038 children and young people (CYP) who are eligible to be receiving SEND travel assistance, but only 62 of these CYP are accepting/receiving/are provided with a Direct Payment or Personal Travel Assistance Budget to meet their travel assistance needs to school/college and back home. The average unit cost of a Personal Travel Assistance Budget (PTAB) is £2,326.06 per learner per annum, compared to an average unit cost of £9,500 for a learner provided with SEN transport. A cost difference of £7,173.94 per learner per annum.</p> <p>A PTAB Offer or Direct Payments offer can be completely flexible and does not need to be only for a set mileage and a set mileage cost. A PTAB offer would also give families more choice and control. In order to encourage more families to take up the offer of a PTAB, we want to ensure we can make a generous offer to individual families, who are eligible to receive SEND travel assistance for their child, which encourages and enables more choice and control for the family whilst also saving the Council significant amounts of money longer term (as a PTAB is always more cost efficient than providing direct 'transport'). Additionally, it would encourage a long overdue culture change related to expectations of a 'door to door' service and a more comprehensive approach to supporting independence for CYP where this is an appropriate and desirable outcome. A PTAB would be significantly cheaper than the Council needing to commission direct travel assistance in form of taxi or LPS. The parents/carers could commission their own support, may this be a neighbour or retired grandparent taking the eligible child to school, a family booking an Uber for the child and siblings, a family paying for breakfast and/or after school club which allows a parent to also manage multiple school runs better for all siblings.</p> <p>We are proposing that a PTAB can be offered of up to 50% of the value of the average unit cost and this could provide a saving of at least £4,750 per learner accepting this offer. 5% of learners would be 51 C&YP x£4,750= £242,250 pa 8% of learners would be 83 C&YP x£4,750= £394,250 pa</p> <p>We have identified particular groups of learners whom we would want to approach in the first instance, such as our post 16 learners in local provisions in and out of borough. We also want to focus on young people going through a statutory phase transfer, moving on to secondary school.</p>			
Possible risk mitigation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Capacity in the Integrated SEND Service- to be monitored 2. Limited acceptance of families taking up the offer of a PTABs/Direct Payment options- Comms plan, support for individual families 			
Other considerations:				
Member or Officer decision	Officer			
Redundancies	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%; text-align: center;">Y/N</td> <td style="width: 33%; text-align: center;">N</td> <td style="width: 33%; text-align: center;">Number of staff</td> </tr> </table>	Y/N	N	Number of staff
Y/N	N	Number of staff		

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Public consultation	Y/N	N	Audience(s)	
Investment required (value of cut shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	N	Cost £k	
	In what:			
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work	N			
Specific legal or statutory considerations	N			
What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?				
Service Users				
Lewisham C&YP with SEND and their families will be provided with more choice and control. Families not wishing to take up the PTAB will be entitled to their standard transport offer. This PTAB does not impact on eligibility criteria.				
Staff				
Increase in administrative work to ensure PTABS are set up and paid regularly.				
Other Council Services				
Reduction in need for Lewisham Passenger Services will need to be monitored.				
Partners				
Are there any specific equalities implications?				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	
Age				
Disability				
Ethnicity				
Gender				
Gender reassignment				
Marriage and civil partnerships				
Pregnancy and maternity				
Religion and belief				
Sexual orientation				
Socio-economic inequality		A positive impact could be that more families have more choice and control and the funds to make their own travel arrangements for their children.		

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	Children & Young People																																							
Director	Angela Scattergood																																							
Service area	Education services																																							
Cabinet Portfolio	Cllr Barnham																																							
Reference	Edu 6,7,10,11 CYP18 – Grant Funding to Support Lewisham Learning CYP19 – Early Years Block Grant Maximisation CYP20 – Lewisham Virtual School Efficiencies (Edu 11- DUPLICATE)																																							
Cut title	Edu6 - Use of grant funding to provide administrative support within Lewisham Learning. Edu7 – Early Years Funding Block -Grant Maximisation Edu10- Efficiency savings across Lewisham Virtual School Edu11 - Overspend reduction measure – Time off for trade union activities (TOFTUA) and Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) charges																																							
Description of cut (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Saving</th> <th>2023/24</th> <th>2024/25</th> <th>2025/26</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th>£'000</th> <th>£'000</th> <th>£'000</th> <th>£'000</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Edu 6</td> <td>15</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Edu 7</td> <td>0</td> <td>35</td> <td>100</td> <td>135</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Edu 10</td> <td>61</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>61</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Edu 11</td> <td>15</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>91</td> <td>35</td> <td>100</td> <td>226</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Edu 6 - Use of grant funding to provide administrative support within Lewisham Learning. Saving relates to cost reduction £15k Since the beginning of the academic year the Lewisham Learning Project Manager post has been vacant. In parallel with this Lewisham has been successful in securing a grant from the Violence Reduction Unit for work supporting primary schools. This funding includes an allocation to provide administrative support for the project. The intention is therefore to recruit to a full-time post, but however part fund this through the grant allocation. It is estimated that this will save £15k within the current financial year.</p> <p>Edu 7. Early Years Funding Block -Grant Maximisation The Early Years Block enables LA to holdback 5% of the total 3 and 4 year old funding. This proposal suggests that a total of £135k is put forward as a grant maximisation saving. This would be phased £35k in 2024/25 and further £100k in 2025/26.</p> <p>The Government has agreed to an extension of the Early Years entitlement offer including free childcare for children from the age of 9 months. The implementation of the new offer will take time to embed, for this reason the saving is phased in as stated. To support this extension additional grant funding has also been made available to the LA. As the</p>					Saving	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	Total		£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	Edu 6	15	0	0	15	Edu 7	0	35	100	135	Edu 10	61	0	0	61	Edu 11	15	0	0	15	TOTAL	91	35	100	226
Saving	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	Total																																				
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000																																				
Edu 6	15	0	0	15																																				
Edu 7	0	35	100	135																																				
Edu 10	61	0	0	61																																				
Edu 11	15	0	0	15																																				
TOTAL	91	35	100	226																																				

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<p>number of children attending pre-school provision increase as more families access free provision, the income the LA will also increase.</p> <p>Edu 10. Efficiency savings across Lewisham Virtual School This saving relates to review and of contracts and service level agreements across the activities of the Virtual School to ensure best use of funding. There will be no reduction to direct statutory support for children which is mainly funded through ring-fenced Pupil Premium funding. The Pupil Premium has specific grant conditions which we cannot deviate from. The service funding of £2,043k for 23/24:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>DSG - High Needs</td> <td style="text-align: right;">948,119</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pupil Premium - CLA</td> <td style="text-align: right;">867,790</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">100,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Virtual School Extended Duties</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Extension of the Role of Virtual School Heads</td> <td style="text-align: right;">47,972</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pupil Premium Plus (PP+) post-16</td> <td style="text-align: right;">78,200</td> </tr> </table> <p>Edu 11 - Overspend reduction measure, TOFTUA and DBS) Saving relates to cost reduction £15k. This saving relates to a Lewisham schools forum decision (October 2023, as part of its de-delegation arrangements) to a full reimbursement model for schools for trade union cover, ensuring that there is equity across schools in funding this activity and in reimbursement for those schools who have elected local union representatives, for their actual costs. Under the current arrangements, the Local Authority and specific schools (i.e. those with elected reps.) and are subsidising TOFTUA arrangements across the borough. It based on a historic formula, rather than activity and the full cost of covering these members of staff. Lewisham Council and schools forum remains committed to supporting the role that local trade unions play in maintaining good employee relations, communication and representing individual employees. This proposal does not make any changes to level of activity. The budget in question relates mainly to the teacher trade unions, including NEU, which also welcomes all school-based staff. Facilities time for the main recognised support staff unions (UNISON, GMB, UNITE) is funded by the corporate Council. In addition, future charging to schools to use the DBS service will include the reimbursement of administrative the costs.</p>					DSG - High Needs	948,119	Pupil Premium - CLA	867,790		100,000	Virtual School Extended Duties		Extension of the Role of Virtual School Heads	47,972	Pupil Premium Plus (PP+) post-16	78,200
DSG - High Needs	948,119															
Pupil Premium - CLA	867,790															
	100,000															
Virtual School Extended Duties																
Extension of the Role of Virtual School Heads	47,972															
Pupil Premium Plus (PP+) post-16	78,200															
Division budget	Gross £k	£170,538k	Net £k	£15,176k												
Service area budget	Gross £k	£4,319k	Net £k	£197k												
Savings proposed	2023/24 £k	£91k	2024/25 £k 2025/26 £k	£35k £100k												
Risks:																
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N	No															
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	6 - 100% 7 - 70% 10 - 95% 11- 100%															
Impact of making the cut	6 - No impact given the additional grant funding															

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

	7 - One key risk is that as the new entitlement offer is being rolled out, there is a possibility that the 5% holdback that LA's are allowed to centrally managed could be reduced to 3%- DfE communication will be monitored 10 – The Virtual School service is demand led and a statutory requirement on LA's 11 – Education service will no longer subsidise shortfall in costs.		
Possible risk mitigation	6 - N/A 7 - It is unclear exactly what the government's intentions are here. A reduction in the percentage funding that we hold back may however be offset by a large increase in the number of children receiving free early years childcare. 10 - There will be no reduction in direct statutory support to children 11 – N/A		
Other considerations:			
Member or Officer decision	Officer Schools Forum where relevant		
Redundancies	Y/N	N	Number of staff
Public consultation	Y/N	N	Audience(s)
Investment required (value of cut shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	N	Cost £k N
	In what:		
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work	N		
Specific legal or statutory considerations	6 – N 7 – Grant conditions will be met. 10 - LA are required to provide Virtual School services as part of their statutory requirements. Grant conditions will be met. 11 - N		
Impact & Outcomes			
What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?			
Service Users			
<p>Use of grant funding to provide administrative support within Lewisham Learning. There is no anticipated impact on service users. The support to schools and delivery of services will not be affected.</p> <p>Early Years Funding Block -Grant Maximisation There will be no impact on service users.</p> <p>Efficiency savings across Lewisham Virtual School There will be no reduction in direct statutory support to children</p> <p>Overspend reduction measure – TOFTUA and DBS charges None</p>			
Staff			
Use of grant funding to provide administrative support within Lewisham Learning.			

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

There is no anticipated impact on staff. The recruitment process will be in line with Lewisham guidance and the post will be advertised externally.

Early Years Funding Block -Grant Maximisation

There will be no impact on staff.

Efficiency savings across Lewisham Virtual School

None envisaged

Overspend reduction measure – TOFTUA and DBS charges

None

Other Council Services

Use of grant funding to provide administrative support within Lewisham Learning.

There is no anticipated impact on other council services.

Early Years Funding Block -Grant Maximisation

There is no impact on other council services.

Efficiency savings across Lewisham Virtual School

None envisaged

Overspend reduction measure – TOFTUA and DBS charges

None

Partners

Use of grant funding to provide administrative support within Lewisham Learning.

There is no anticipated impact on partners.

Early Years Funding Block -Grant Maximisation

There is no impact on partners.

Efficiency savings across Lewisham Virtual School

None envisaged

Overspend reduction measure – TOFTUA and DBS charges

Arrangements for school funding of the activity has been agreed by schools forum

Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.

Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				x
Disability				x
Ethnicity				x
Gender				x
Gender reassignment				x

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Marriage and civil partnerships				x
Pregnancy and maternity				x
Religion and belief				x
Sexual orientation				x
Socio-economic inequality				x
Is a full EAA required?				NO

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	CYPS – Education
Director	Angela Scattergood (Pinaki Ghoshal – Executive Director)
Service area	Education
Cabinet Portfolio	Children & Young People- Cllr Barnham
Reference	
Cut title	1. <u>Overspend reduction measure – TOFTUA and DBS charges</u>
Description of cut (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<p>Saving relates to cost reduction £15k</p> <p>Lewisham Council strongly supports the principle of collective bargaining and recognises the role that local trade unions can play in maintaining good employee relations, assisting communication between the authority and its workforce, as well as representing individual employees.</p> <p>Schools Forum has supported the process of ‘de-delegation’ for a number of years now in relation to Lewisham maintained schools. The Forum has recognised the value of having a consistent group of experienced trade union representatives to work with on a borough wide basis. The budget in question relates mainly to the teacher trade unions. However, the inception of the National Education Union (NEU) means that this large union welcomes members from all school based staff. Facilities time for the main recognised support staff unions (UNISON, GMB, UNITE) is funded by the corporate Council. Previously the TOFTUA support was allocated on the basis of an historic formula.</p> <p>The unions elect their representatives democratically. This can present a challenge for schools when they find a member of their staff has been elected and may be required to have time off for a regular day/days per week. In addition the current reimbursement arrangements within the policy do not cover the full cost of absent members of staff.</p> <p>The consequences, although unintended are that specific schools and the Local Authority were subsidising TOFTUA arrangements.</p> <p>At its meeting on the 19th October 2023, Schools forum supported the full reimbursement model for trade union cover as part of its de-delegation arrangements.</p> <p>This means, that the previous shortfall in funding is no longer the case. Relative to 2022/23, the Education service will no longer subsidise this cost.</p> <p>The service also provides a DBS service. future costs will include the reimbursement of Administrative costs.</p>

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Division budget	Gross £k		Net £k	
Service area budget	Gross £k		Net £k	
Savings proposed	2023/24 £k	15	2024/25 £k 2025/26 £k	
Risks:				
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N	No			
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	100%			
Impact of making the cut				
Possible risk mitigation				
Other considerations:				
Member or Officer decision				
Redundancies	Y/N	N	Number of staff	
Public consultation	Y/N	N	Audience(s)	
Investment required (value of cut shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	Y	Cost £k	N
	In what:			
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work				
Specific legal or statutory considerations				

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	Children & Young People			
Director	Angela Scattergood			
Service area	Education Services			
Cabinet Portfolio	Cllr Barnham			
Reference	CYP9 – Short Breaks Review			
Cut title	Edu 9. Savings from Short Breaks Review- Targeted & Specialist Short Breaks including CHC cases.			
Description of cut (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<p>Targeted Short Breaks: We are currently reviewing the criteria for targeted short breaks as they currently focus on diagnosis and Disability Living Allowance which give a generic need but does not factor elements such as severity of need and other support available to the child.</p> <p>Specialist Short Breaks: Over time the spot purchasing of support has increased, especially related to carer support and domiciliary care. We are proposing to review commissioning arrangements, reduce the level of support spot-purchased (which is typically more expensive than using an agreed contract) and will also explore the opportunity of increasing our in-house offer if we can evidence better value for money.</p> <p>Contributions to Continuing Health Care (CHC awarded by Health) Packages: We are currently contributing over £1million per annum for children who are eligible to receive continuing health care packages via the ICB. We are proposing a review of these historical agreements as well as a policy review as we are of the view that it should not be that social care has to subsidise care packages for children with often acute nursing needs.</p> <p>The estimate of the savings achieved is £150k. This may increase once further work has been done in this area.</p>			
Division budget	Gross £k	£170,538	Net £k	£15,176
Service area budget	Gross £k	£86,435	Net £k	£14,172
Savings proposed	2023/24 £k	0	2024/25 £k 2025/26 £k	£150k £0
Risks:				
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N	No			
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	70%			
Impact of making the cut	<p>Reluctance of ICB/CHC to cover costs of care packages for health reasons.</p> <p>Changes to Targeted Short Breaks may lead to some children receiving increased packages of support and others receiving less. Families in the latter group are unlikely to welcome such a reduction.</p>			
Possible risk mitigation	In relation to changes in criteria for targeted support we will need to communicate openly with families about the changes proposed and why. Some initial exploration has identified discrepancies in the levels			

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

	of support that children receive. We will ensure effective consultation and communication with families. In relation to the ICB health contribution this will need to involve on-going negotiation with our Health partners			
Other considerations:				
Member or Officer decision	Officer			
Redundancies	Y/N	N	Number of staff	
Public consultation	Y/N	N	Audience(s)	
Investment required (value of cut shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	Y	Cost £k	N
	In what:	Not known at present – development of increased in-house provision is likely to involve some investment if this is deemed to be the best way forward. This would be met through reduced spend on contracted provision.		
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work	N			
Specific legal or statutory considerations	N			
What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?				
Service Users				
Some CYP and their families may receive a reduced level of service, whilst others may receive more and/or additional children and young people may become eligible for targeted short breaks. A full assessment of impact will be carried out as part of the review.				
Staff				
No impact on staff.				
Other Council Services				
No impact				
Partners				
ICB- negotiations at senior level to agree way forward				
Are there any specific equalities implications?				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X
Disability		Potential negative or positive impact on some C&YP with SEND in service level changes- will be assessed as part of EAA of the review		
Ethnicity				X
Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality			Potential negative or positive impact on some C&YP with SEND in service level changes- will be assessed as part of EAA of the review	
Is a full EAA required?			Y (will be undertaken as part of review)	

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

	Children & Young People										
	Sara Rahman										
	Families, Quality & Commissioning										
	Cllr Barnham										
	CYP11 - FQC Reduction in Business Support CYP12 – FQC Grant Maximisation CYP13 – FQC Sale of Capital Asset CYP14 – FQC Children’s Centre Revenue CYP15 – FQC Staffing Costs Reduction										
	<p>1. <u>Reduction in Business Support to FQC.</u> Following changes in responsibilities across both Children’s Social Care and Families Quality & Commissioning changes in business support (still largely delivered by staff within CSC are required. It is expected that this can lead to efficiencies given changes in ways of working and staffing restructures more widely within FQC. In addition grant funding will be used for some of the administrative support where appropriate).</p> <p>2. <u>Grant maximisation (inc Family Hubs).</u> Increasingly FQC have been in receipt of a range of different grants, including the Family Hub grants and Enhance grant from the DfE. Other smaller grants from the VRU have also been gained. Some use of grant funding for some activity previously funded through the General Fund is possible.</p> <p>3. <u>Sale of a capital asset.</u> The directorate has continued responsibility for a building in Honor Oak (Honor Oak Depot), which historically was used to support Children’s Centre delivery. This site has not been delivery a Children’s Centre offer for some time and is currently used for accommodating a small service which could be delivered elsewhere. The building is within the Honor Oak estate (and Opposite the Honor Oak Youth Centre which is about to become a Family Hub, supported by additional capital investment. The site is valued at £850k and is no longer required. Given its location it would be suitable to be redeveloped for social housing (HRA funding) or temporary accommodation. Further discussions will be required with colleagues across the Council to consider how the site might best be used to support residents. No decision about this has yet been made.</p> <p>4. <u>Children’s Centre Revenue saving.</u> With the changes to service delivery (from Children’s Centres to Family Hubs) and improved multi-agency working, there is expected to be a permanent saving to Children’s Centre running costs. As the Family Hubs programme develops there will be some overlaps with the current Children’s Centre delivery with opportunities for efficiencies. In the longer term, new Family Hubs in sites that are not previously Children’s Centres (2 or 3 depending on a final decision for Kaleidoscope) will provide an opportunity to ensure more integrated service delivery in hubs, supported by a lower level of support in spokes leading to less activity in Children’s Centres that are not Family Hubs.</p> <p>5. <u>Reduction in staffing costs</u> The division has already been managing with a number of vacant posts following previous restructures. It is projected that this will deliver an additional saving of £350k over and above previous projections.</p>										
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Saving</th> <th>2023/24</th> <th>2024/25</th> <th>2025/26</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Saving	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	Total					
Saving	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	Total							

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

	FQC 1	0	100	0	£100
	FQC 2	150	0	0	£150
	FQC 3*	0	850	0	£850
	FQC 4	0	50	0	£50
	FQC 5*	350	0	0	£350
	TOTAL	500	1000	0	£1500
	*Denotes one off savings				
	Gross £k		15,141	Net £k	8,328
	Gross £k		15,141	Net £k	8,328
	2023/24 £k		£500k	2024/25 £k	£1m
				2025/26 £k	£0
Risks:					
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N		No			
Likelihood of making cut in full - %		70%			
	<p>FQC 1: Potential impact on business support capacity – low risk</p> <p>FQC 3: This assumes the sale of a capital asset as a one off cost saving to the General Fund. As noted above this will require further work to support delivery of the saving.</p> <p>FQC 2 & 4: Careful management is required here as we move away from the previous Children's Centre delivery model to the new Family Hub model. This is intended to improve outcome for children and families as it involves greater multi-agency working and a 'one stop shop' for families seeking support.</p>				
	See above				
Other considerations:					
	Most are Officer BUT Member decision re capital assets				
	Y/N	N		Number of staff	
	Y/N	N		Audience(s)	
	Y/N	Y		Cost £k	N
	In what:	Investment already identified to support the Family Hub programme – approximately £4.5M over three years, grant funded			

Equalities Screening Template

For each of the nine protected characteristics, identify whether the proposal has a high, medium, low or neutral impact on service users and whether this is a positive or negative impact.

Identify whether the proposal has a high, medium, low or neutral impact on socio-economic inequality (e.g. low income, fuel poverty, food insecurity, digital inclusion etc) and whether this is a positive or negative impact.

Identify whether a full service equalities analysis assessment is required for this proposal based on this Equalities Analysis Toolkit. For advice on whether an EAA is

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

required and how to assess service equalities impact please contact policy@lewisham.gov.uk

Impact & Outcomes
What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?
Service Users
<p>Include evidence to support anticipated impacts, both positive and negative.</p> <p><u>Savings proposal 1 (FQC1):</u> Positive Impact– Changes in business support responsibilities across Children’s Social Care and Families, Quality and Commissioning are ongoing, which will ensure a consistent level of business support across the division. Saving efficiencies within FQC due to changes to ways of working will not impact service users negatively.</p> <p><u>Savings proposal 2 (FQC 2):</u> Neutral Impact – FQC are in receipt of a range of grants. Service users will experience no change in service delivery resulting in the maximisation of grant fundings and the reduced need for General Fund.</p> <p><u>Savings proposal 3 (FQC 3):</u> Neutral Impact – Discussions are at an early stage regarding plans for the disposal/sale of the site. Whilst no decision has been made yet, plans to relocate the small service, currently based on site, will ensure delivery from another location and therefore will have no negative impact on service users.</p> <p><u>Savings proposal 4 (FQC 4):</u> Positive Impact – plans to redesign service delivery from Children and Family Centres are currently underway. These changes will create a seamless and consistent offer of support that will further prevent inequality of access to service provision. The overall impact for service users will be positive with anticipated increase in access and more targeted provision to ensure we reach and engage more families from communities not currently accessing existing provision.</p> <p><u>Savings proposal 5 (FQC 5):</u> Neutral Impact – The division will continue to maintain existing vacancies. Service users will not be directly impacted as there will be no changes to service delivery.</p>
Staff
<p>Include evidence to support anticipated impacts, both positive and negative.</p> <p><u>Savings proposal 1 . (FQC1):</u> Positive Impact – Changes in business support responsibilities across Children’s Social Care and Families, Quality and Commissioning are ongoing, which will ensure a consistent level of business support across the division, create efficiencies and identify gaps and/or duplication in ways of working. Efficiencies within FQC business support function due to changes to ways of working will not impact staff negatively and there are no redundancies expected.</p> <p><u>Savings proposal 2 (FQC 2):</u> Neutral Impact – FQC are in receipt of a range of grants. Staff will experience no change in service delivery or ways of working resulting in the maximisation of grant fundings and the reduced need for General Fund.</p> <p><u>Savings proposal 3 (FQC 3):</u> Neutral Impact – Discussions are at an early stage regarding plans for the disposal/sale of the site. Whilst no decision has been made yet, plans to relocate the small service, currently based on site, will ensure delivery from another location and therefore will have no negative impact on staff.</p>

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Savings proposal 4 (FQC 4): Neutral Impact – plans to redesign service delivery from Children and Family Centres are currently underway. These changes will create a seamless and consistent offer of support that will further prevent inequality of access to service provision. The redesign will have no direct impact on council staff.

Savings proposal 5 (FQC 5): Neutral Impact – The division will continue to maintain existing vacancies. Service users will not be directly impacted as there will be no changes to service delivery.

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	Housing Services			
Director	Fen Beckman			
Service area	Private Sector Licensing and Home Improvements			
Cabinet Portfolio	Housing Management and Homelessness- Cllr Cooper			
Reference	HSG1 – Capitalise Posts to DSG			
Saving title	Capitalise posts to Disabled Facilities Grant			
Description of saving (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<p>The Housing Improvements and Assistance team work to support homeowners to adapt their homes to meet their changing needs through the distribution of loans and facilitating the construction/building works to enable them to continue to live independently. These loans include the Disabled Facilities Grant, (DFG), and other capital grants such as the Empty Homes Grant.</p> <p>In addition to the team manager, there are four surveyors, three of who work on DFG projects, an Empty Homes Officer, two Health and Housing Officers and two Programme Coordinators who provide administration support to the surveyors and disburse the grants. All except two posts have been capitalised to their relevant capital grants. Recent analysis of activity has highlighted that the team manager (PO6) spends at least 50% of her time on DFG work and the second coordinator, (SO1), also spends at least 75% of their time on DFG projects.</p> <p>This proposal is to therefore to capitalise 50% of the Team Manager salary and 75% of the Coordinator salary to the DFG. This equates to;-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Team Manager (50% of PO6) - £35,901 • Programme Coordinator (75% of SO1) - £37,408 • Total to be capitalised = 73,309 			
Division budget	Gross £	54,015,896	Net £k	3,883,337
Service area budget	Gross £	1,817,952	Net £k	-148,483
Saving proposed	2023/24 £k	£73	2024/25 £k	0
Risks:				
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N	N			
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	100%			
Impact of making the saving	There will be no impact to service being delivered to our clients. This saving can be made in 2023/24.			
Possible risk mitigation	Not Applicable			
Other considerations:				
Member or Officer decision	Officer			
Redundancies	Y/N	N	Number of staff	Not Applicable
Public consultation	Y/N	N	Audience(s)	Not Applicable
Investment required (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	N	Cost £k	Not Applicable
	In what:	Not Applicable		
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work				
Specific legal or statutory considerations	Not applicable			

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?				
Service Users				
There is no impact to service users				
Staff				
There is no impact to staff as this proposals just changes the funding stream from which the post is paid.				
Other Council Services				
There is no impact to other Council services				
Partners				
There is no impact to our partner organisations				
Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X
Disability				X
Ethnicity				X
Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality				X
Is a full EAA required?			N	

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	Housing Services			
Director	Fen Beckman			
Service area	Housing Needs and Refugee Services			
Cabinet Portfolio	Housing Management and Homelessness- Cllr Cooper			
Reference	HSG2 – Capitalisation of Housing Casework Officer to HRA			
Saving title	Capitalise salary of the Housing Casework Officer to the HRA			
Description of saving (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	This proposal is to capitalise the salary cost of the Housing Casework Officer post which is currently in the Housing Needs and Refugee Services/Housing Strategy Division establishment but will be moving to the new Directorate Casework Team in the Residents Engagement and Services Division from 1 st November 2023. The post will be incorporated into the former Lewisham House Customer Relations Team and the remit for the role will extend to include housing management casework.			
Division budget	Gross £	54,015,896	Net £k	8,383,337
Service area budget	Gross £	51,577,572	Net £k	9,276,448
Saving proposed	2023/24 £k	21	2024/25 £k	50
Risks:				
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N	No			
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	100%			
Impact of making the saving	There will be no impact to service users as this is essentially a change in the funding stream for the post.			
Possible risk mitigation	Not Applicable			
Other considerations:				
Member or Officer decision	Officer			
Redundancies	Y/N	No	Number of staff	Not Applicable
Public consultation	Y/N	Not Applicable	Audience(s)	Not Applicable
Investment required (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	Not Applicable	Cost £k	Not Applicable
	In what:	Not Applicable		
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work	Not Applicable			
Specific legal or statutory considerations	Not Applicable			

What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?
Service Users
There is no impact to service users
Staff
There is no impact to staff as this proposals just changes the funding stream from which the post is paid.

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Other Council Services				
There is no impact to other Council services.				
Partners				
There is no impact to our partner organisations.				
Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X
Disability				X
Ethnicity				X
Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality				X
Is a full EAA required?			N	

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	Housing Services			
Director	Fen Beckman			
Service area	Housing Needs and Refugee Services			
Cabinet Portfolio	Housing Management and Homelessness- Cllr Cooper			
Reference	HSG3 – TA Reduction Project			
Saving title	Increase savings from the Temporary Accommodation Reduction Project			
Description of saving (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<p>This would be an additional savings target to further reduce spend on temporary accommodation, building on the actions already being taken through the Temporary Accommodation Reduction Plan. The focus will be on procuring temporary accommodation that is an alternative to hotels/nightly paid accommodation that leads to a reduction in the limitation recharge, extracting more savings from the existing workstreams and identifying any new areas of activity.</p> <p>The TA Reduction Project is currently due to deliver £1m over the next three years, with £200k in 23/24, £300k in 24/25 and £500k in 25/26. This proposal is to increase the savings target for 2024/25 to £500k, which is an additional £200k.</p>			
Division budget	Gross £k	54,015,896	Net £k	8,383,337
Service area budget	Gross £k	51,577,572	Net £k	9,276,448
Saving proposed	2023/24 £k	0	2024/25 £k	200
Risks:				
Cost shunt to other service? N	No			
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	100%			
Impact of making the saving	Work is already underway to achieve the existing savings and from this work we believe there is potential to achieve more.			
Possible risk mitigation				
Other considerations:				
Member or Officer decision	Officer			
Redundancies	Y/N	N	Number of staff	Not Applicable
Public consultation	Y/N	N	Audience(s)	Not Applicable
Investment required (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	N	Cost £k	Not Applicable
	In what:	Not applicable		
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work	Some of the additional savings to be realised is dependent on acquisition programme delivering new properties for TA.			
Specific legal or statutory considerations	Homelessness duties apply – cannot refuse TA where there is a statutory obligation to provide it. However, there is some flexibility in location and type of accommodation.			

What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Service Users				
This proposal is not expected to impact on service users as the savings will be achieved from implementing more efficient processes within the temporary accommodation service.				
Staff				
This proposal is not expected to impact directly on staff.				
Other Council Services				
There is no impact to other Council services.				
Partners				
There is no impact to our partner organisations.				
Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				x
Disability				x
Ethnicity				x
Gender				x
Gender reassignment				x
Marriage and civil partnerships				x
Pregnancy and maternity				x
Religion and belief				x
Sexual orientation				x
Socio-economic inequality				x
Is a full EAA required?			N	

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	Housing Services			
Director	Fen Beckman			
Service area	Housing Needs and Refugee Services			
Cabinet Portfolio	Housing Management and Homelessness- Cllr Cooper			
Reference	HSG4 – Reduction of Property Negotiator Posts			
Saving title	Reduction of two Property Negotiator posts			
Description of saving (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<p>The Accommodation Supply establishment has four Property Negotiator posts all funded from the General Fund. This proposal is to reduce the General Fund allocation by the equivalent of two posts in 2024/25. Unless alternative funding, (eg Home Office), is secured this will lead to a reduction of two posts in the team.</p> <p>The Accommodation Supply team is responsible for procuring accommodation to meet the needs of services across the Council; this includes temporary accommodation as well as accommodation for discharge of duty into the PRS. The team includes the Accommodation Supply Manager, one Technical Surveyor who works primarily on repairs and maintenance of Private Sector Leased (PSL) properties due to be handed back to landlords as well as working with landlords and their agents to ensure that the standard of leased accommodation is high. The team also includes four Property Negotiators who are primarily responsible for sourcing accommodation to ensure that the numbers of people in TA reduces, and supply of accommodation meets the demands on the Housing Needs service and other Council services.</p> <p>There are just under 2800 households in temporary accommodation on 23rd October 2023 and the homelessness service continues to face increasing demand for support from residents in housing need. There is however a significant shortage of properties in the private rented sector for our officers to procure for use as TA or to discharge our homelessness duties.</p> <p>This shortage has been a result of landlords exiting the rental market due to a number of changes to the tax system which has increased the amount of tax payable on both the purchase of a buy-to-let property and its rental income, this has then been compounded by the rapid rise in interest rates earlier this year ultimately reducing viability for landlords. The result has been a significant reduction in properties available for officers to procure. During the first six months of this year, we procured a total 154 properties for all our housing duties including prevention, discharge of duty, rough sleepers, refugee resettlement and ex-offender accommodation etc. In 21/22 we had procured 245 in the same period, this is about 40% reduction in activity. Below are the total number of <u>new</u> properties (PMAs and PSLs) procured for temporary accommodation by the team between April and September of the following years</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 21/22 - 60 • 22/23 - 47 • 23/24 –27 <p>The reduction of two Property Negotiator posts is a reflection of the very challenging environment that the service is operating in and as there are no properties for staff to procure this proposal seeks to reduce the team by half.</p>			
Division budget	Gross £	54,015,896	Net £	8,383,337M
Service area budget	Gross £	51,577,572	Net £	9,276,448
Saving proposed	2023/24 £k	0	2024/25 £k	113
Risks:				
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N	No			
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	100%			
Impact of making the saving	The impact of making this saving is a reduction in the number of officers searching for properties for our families in housing need and a reduction in the overall capacity of the service to work with existing landlords and clients.			
Possible risk mitigation	The Accommodation Supply team will continue to retain two Property Negotiator posts. The remaining officers will work to secure the few properties that come onto the market as well as to negotiate with our existing landlords to keep our families in their properties and reduce the number of properties due to be handed back.			
Other considerations:				
Member or Officer decision	Officer			
Redundancies	Y/N	Yes (Possibly)	Number of staff	2
Public consultation	Y/N	No	Audience(s)	Not Applicable
	Y/N	No	Cost £k	Not Applicable

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Investment required (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	In what:	Not Applicable
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work	Not Applicable	
Specific legal or statutory considerations	This proposal would need to be implemented using the Council's Management of Change policy. There is no savings in 23/24 due to change management processes and timescales.	

What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?				
Service Users				
There is low impact to service users, ie our homeless households, as the number of new PRS properties that the team have been procuring has been very few and significantly below original targets set out in the Accommodation Supply Strategy. The remaining officers in the team will continue to access available supply of property in the market for our homeless households.				
Staff				
There will be an impact to staff as two posts are proposed to be deleted from the staffing establishment. Any vacancies that exist at the time of implementation will be included as part of the process. This will be done through the Council's Change Management process.				
Other Council Services				
There is no impact to other Council services				
Partners				
There is no impact to our partner organisations				
Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				x
Disability				x
Ethnicity				x
Gender				x
Gender reassignment				x
Marriage and civil partnerships				x
Pregnancy and maternity				x
Religion and belief				x
Sexual orientation				x
Socio-economic inequality				x
Is a full EAA required?				N

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	Housing Services			
Director	Fen Beckman			
Service area	Housing Needs and Refugee Services			
Cabinet Portfolio	Housing Management and Homelessness- Cllr Cooper			
Reference	HSG5 – Cease Contribution to Capital Letters			
Saving title				
Stop contribution to Capital Letters for Property Negotiator role				
Description of saving (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)				
<p>Lewisham is a member borough of Capital Letters, a pan London organisation working with ten London councils and private landlords to find homes for our homeless families in the private rented sector. Member boroughs currently have the option of either seconding staff to Capital letters or paying the salary cost of officers who are then employed by Capital Letters. Lewisham has chosen to pay the cost equivalent to the salary of one Property Negotiator which is £50,000.</p> <p>However, there is an unprecedented housing and homelessness crisis nationally and particularly in London, compounded by the cost-of-living crisis. Property listings have reduced by 41% since lifting the pandemic restrictions with only 2.3% of properties at LHA levels (down from 19% in 2020/21) and 25 applicants for each property listed. This has increased average rents by 23% in London, making them ever more inaccessible to those on low income or benefits. As a result, all London Boroughs are struggling to find sufficient good quality properties – whether PRS or PSL – to house those for whom they owe a duty, and costs of TA are escalating (£60m per month collectively).</p> <p>Capital Letters have not been able to acquire substantial numbers of affordable PRS properties for boroughs to use for discharge of duty. Capital Letters were offering 400 PRS properties a month to members but this year the projection is 300 for the entire 2023/24 year. It is therefore not sustainable to continue to pay for Negotiator roles when they are not able to deliver the outcomes, (properties), Boroughs need.</p> <p>This proposal is to stop paying Capital Letters the equivalent of an officer post and to make different arrangements with Capital Letters in return for access to any properties that they procure. Capital Letters have had discussions with Member Boroughs on alternatives to staff secondment.</p>				
Division budget	Gross £	54,015,896	Net £	8,383,337xx
Service area budget	Gross £	51,577,572	Net £	9,276,448
Saving proposed	2023/24 £k		2024/25 £k	50
Risks:				
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N		No		
Likelihood of making cut in full - %		100%		
Impact of making the saving	The impact of making this saving is a reduction in the number of officers searching for properties for our families in housing need and a reduction in the overall capacity of the service to work with existing landlords and clients.			
Possible risk mitigation	We will retain a couple of Negotiator posts in-house to work on renewal of tenancies and to work with landlords to access what supply there is still available.			
Other considerations:				
Member or Officer decision	Officer			
Redundancies	Y/N	Not Applicable to LBL	Number of staff	Not Applicable
Public consultation	Y/N	No	Audience(s)	Not Applicable
Investment required (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	No	Cost £k	Not Applicable
	In what:	Not Applicable		
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work	Not Applicable			
Specific legal or statutory considerations	Not Applicable			

Impact & Outcomes

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?				
Service Users				
There is very low impact to service users, ie our homeless households, as the number of new PRS properties that we have received have been very few and significantly below original targets. It should also be noted that the Council still has a Procurement team who are bringing in properties.				
Staff				
There is no direct impact to staff working in the Council as the funding was given to Capital Letters as a contribution to their staffing budgets and they employed the Property Negotiators.				
Other Council Services				
The Capital Letters Property Negotiator role was supposed to bring in PRS properties to use for our homeless households. These properties would be additional to what the in-house Property Negotiators procure. There is very low impact to the Procurement Team in the TA Service as the Capital Letters Property Negotiator role was not giving value for money with very low numbers of properties being secured.				
Partners				
There is no impact to our partner organisations				
Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				x
Disability				x
Ethnicity				x
Gender				x
Gender reassignment				x
Marriage and civil partnerships				x
Pregnancy and maternity				x
Religion and belief				x
Sexual orientation				x
Socio-economic inequality				x
Is a full EAA required?			N	

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	Place																																																						
Director	Patrick Dubeck																																																						
Service area	Inclusive Regeneration																																																						
Cabinet Portfolio	Housing Development and Planning- Cllr Dacres																																																						
Reference	PLA01 – Council Offices Rationalisation																																																						
Saving title																																																							
Description of saving (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<p>The Council's Catford office estate is made up of five buildings - Laurence House, Civic Suite, 9 Holbeach Road, Town Hall Chambers and Eros House. The table below summarises the current running cost for the complex:</p> <p><u>Catford Complex Running Cost 2022/23</u></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Rent</th> <th>Rates</th> <th>Utilities</th> <th>FM Costs</th> <th>Total</th> <th>Decarbonisation Cost</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Laurence House</td> <td>£0</td> <td>£601,160</td> <td>£507,678</td> <td>£762,110</td> <td>£1,870,948</td> <td>£2,083,160</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Town Hall Chambers</td> <td>£0</td> <td>£69,938</td> <td>£13,192</td> <td>£51,555</td> <td>£134,685</td> <td>£1,100,006</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Civic Suite</td> <td>£0</td> <td>£105,336</td> <td>£329,247</td> <td>£96,006</td> <td>£530,589</td> <td>£228,371</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Eros House</td> <td>£282,100</td> <td>£47,880</td> <td>£39,918</td> <td>£63,477</td> <td>£433,375</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Holbeach House</td> <td>£75,000</td> <td>£50,274</td> <td>£28,606</td> <td>£51,616</td> <td>£205,496</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>£357,100</td> <td>£874,588</td> <td>£918,641</td> <td>£1,024,764</td> <td>£3,175,093</td> <td>£3,411,537</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>As part of a wider and ongoing asset review, officers have been reviewing possibilities for office consolidation to realise savings or generate income. This builds on work already undertaken over previous years to rationalise the estate and resulted in the conversion of the Old Town Hall into a Public Sector Hub with a current net income of circa £400k a year.</p> <p>Laurence House is the Council's core office building and pre-Covid was the office base for around 1700 staff plus the CCG. Since Covid and with new and more agile ways of working, office utilisation in the traditional sense, has declined significantly and even with the new Housing Directorate occupying space in the building, occupation levels are still below capacity and significantly lower than pre Covid usage. This provides an opportunity for further consolidation into Laurence House. In the short-term as identified in the adopted Catford Town Centre framework, it is intended that Laurence House will remain the Council's primary office location.</p>							Rent	Rates	Utilities	FM Costs	Total	Decarbonisation Cost	Laurence House	£0	£601,160	£507,678	£762,110	£1,870,948	£2,083,160	Town Hall Chambers	£0	£69,938	£13,192	£51,555	£134,685	£1,100,006	Civic Suite	£0	£105,336	£329,247	£96,006	£530,589	£228,371	Eros House	£282,100	£47,880	£39,918	£63,477	£433,375		Holbeach House	£75,000	£50,274	£28,606	£51,616	£205,496		Total	£357,100	£874,588	£918,641	£1,024,764	£3,175,093	£3,411,537
	Rent	Rates	Utilities	FM Costs	Total	Decarbonisation Cost																																																	
Laurence House	£0	£601,160	£507,678	£762,110	£1,870,948	£2,083,160																																																	
Town Hall Chambers	£0	£69,938	£13,192	£51,555	£134,685	£1,100,006																																																	
Civic Suite	£0	£105,336	£329,247	£96,006	£530,589	£228,371																																																	
Eros House	£282,100	£47,880	£39,918	£63,477	£433,375																																																		
Holbeach House	£75,000	£50,274	£28,606	£51,616	£205,496																																																		
Total	£357,100	£874,588	£918,641	£1,024,764	£3,175,093	£3,411,537																																																	

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Of the other buildings in the complex, 9 Holbeach Road and Eros House are the only other two actively used office bases for Council teams. The former, 9 Holbeach Road, is the subject of this proposal.

The building is currently the base for about 100 staff across a number of services including Crime Reduction Service, Environmental Health and also houses the front-line Youth Offending Service.

The building is leased from CRPL on a full repairing and insuring basis at a rent of circa £75,000, a year. The current lease term is nearing expiry but has been extended previously and the Council can do so again. Building related operating costs for the property are approximately £200,000 a year, including rent. This is separate from other service specific costs such as security costs, which are borne by services as required. As part of the current lease obligation, the Council has planned works to the building estimated at over £300k, including refurbishment of the roof.

In line with the ongoing office rationalisation, it is proposed that the Council issues notice on its lease at Holbeach and staff and services moved to other buildings in the complex, primarily Laurence House. Many of the back-office functions currently operated from Holbeach can be moved relatively easily to the upper floors of Laurence House. However, front-line services, particularly Youth Offending Service, would require specific relocation consideration.

The former Catford Library space in Laurence House is not currently occupied and is an option for the relocation of Holbeach Road located services. It however requires extensive refurbishment and remodelling, including an upgrade of the mechanical heating and ventilation system in order to accommodate new uses. The current estimated cost to refurbish the space is £900k and is unfunded.

The table below provides a summary of the capital costs and the projected savings to the Place Directorate for implementing this proposal.

Projected Savings	
2024/25	£100k
2025/26	£105k
Total	£205k

This projected savings in the above table represents all the building related costs currently incurred by the FM (Corporate Resources Directorate) and the Property and Estates Team (Place Directorate). Therefore, the savings will be accrued across separate budget lines.

Division budget	Gross £k	Net £k

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Service area budget	Gross £k		Net £k	
Saving proposed	2023/24 £k	0	2024/25 £k	£100
Risks:				
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N	No			
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	60%			
Impact of making the saving	As noted above, staff working in Holbeach will need to move to a new location currently proposed to be Laurence House. While most of the back-office functions can be relatively easily accommodated on the upper floors of Laurence House, new and separate accommodation will be required for the Youth Offending Service because of the front line and specific nature of service delivery.			
Possible risk mitigation	<p>Alternative Accommodation: Suitable alternative accommodation cannot be found for the front-line services in Holbeach, particularly Youth Offending Service, which requires a safe, welcoming, and discreet space to be able to deliver their service.</p> <p><u>Mitigation:</u> The space in Laurence House formerly occupied by the Catford Library could be remodelled. There are other alternative sites in the Catford complex that will form part of options analysis, in consultation with the service.</p> <p>Empty 9 Holbeach Road: The implication of this proposal is that the Council surrenders its lease on 9 Holbeach Road and hands it back to CRPL. This could result in loss of income to CRPL.</p> <p><u>Mitigation:</u> The current phasing of the Catford Framework Plan suggests that the Holbeach site is in the latter phases of delivery which means that the building could be in situ for another 10-15 years. This provides the potential for CRPL to relet the property to support its income for the portfolio. The Property and Estates team are currently aware of a number of organisations who are interested in space in Catford town centre.</p>			
Other considerations:				
Member or Officer decision	Officer Decision			
Redundancies	Y/N	N	Number of staff	N/A
Public consultation	Y/N	N	Audience(s)	N/A
Investment required (value of saving shown above should be	Y/N	Y	Cost £k	c£980k
	In what:	Capital investment will be required to remodel existing Council assets to accommodate the services currently located at Holbeach Road.		

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

net of this investment)	
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work	
Specific legal or statutory considerations	N/A

Author	Gavin Plaskitt	Directorate	Place
Date	18.12.23	Service	Inclusive Regeneration
<p>1. The activity or decision that this assessment is being undertaken for</p> <p>This assessment is being carried out to determine the impact of the closure of Holbeach office and the transfer of services operating from that location to Laurence House. This proposal is driven by a requirement for costs savings and an approximately £100k p.a. saving can be achieved by closing this outlying office.</p>			
<p>2. The protected characteristics or other equalities factors potentially impacted by this decision</p>			
<input type="checkbox"/> Age	<input type="checkbox"/> Ethnicity/ Race	<input type="checkbox"/> Religion or belief	<input type="checkbox"/> Language spoken
<input type="checkbox"/> Gender/Sex	<input type="checkbox"/> Gender identity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disability	<input type="checkbox"/> Household type
<input type="checkbox"/> Income	<input type="checkbox"/> Carer status	<input type="checkbox"/> Sexual orientation	<input type="checkbox"/> Socio Economic status
<input type="checkbox"/> Marriage and Civil Partnership	<input type="checkbox"/> Pregnancy and Maternity	<input type="checkbox"/> Refugee/ Migrant/ Asylum seeker	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Health & Social Care
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other, please define: Client unease with formality/ authority figures</p>			

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

<input type="checkbox"/> Nationality	<input type="checkbox"/> Employment	<input type="checkbox"/> Armed forces		
<p>This proposal does not involve any reduction in the services offered. Its main impact is that the physical location for staff to work and service users to access services will change. The change of location/facilities may have an impact on staff and service users with disabilities or those accessing mental health services.</p> <p>It is not obvious that the relocation will have an appreciable impact on any of the other protected characteristics or equalities factors. The services will simply transfer from one accessible location to another nearby.</p>				
<p style="text-align: center;">3. The evidence to support the analysis</p> <p>Approximately 83 staff have Holbeach office as their designated workplace:</p> <p>Crime, Enforcement and Regulation – c.35 staff Youth Offending Service/Child & Adolescent Mental Health Services c.39 staff Environmental Health c.9 staff</p> <p>Most staff work in a flexible manner in common with colleagues across the Council.</p> <p>Face to face meetings are held between staff and clients for the purposes of managing youth offending, child and adolescent mental health and carrying out PACE interviews (under caution) by Environmental Health and Crime Enforcement and Regulation teams.</p>				
<p style="text-align: center;">4. The analysis</p> <p>There are no particular changes to the way we intend to deliver services to clients arising from the closure of the Holbeach office. The main difference is that the services will be delivered at a new location nearby, with new facilities.</p> <p>Holbeach office and Laurence House are only 250m apart in the centre of Catford and have similar levels of transport accessibility for people around the borough.</p> <p>It has been highlighted by Youth Offending Services that some of their client group experience unease with formality/ and uniformed security that are present in the main reception of Laurence House. This this will be need to be factored into the design of the new service delivery arrangements.</p> <p>New meeting and therapy rooms will allow face to face service delivery by YOS and CAMHS staff in a similar way to how services are currently provided at Holbeach</p>				

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

office. Children and young people will have a similar level of access to their case workers.

Staff from Holbeach will benefit from an improved office environment in the refurbished Laurence House. The building benefits from lifts and a range of accessibility features that are not present in their current building. This makes the building more suited to any staff with disabilities. The move will mean more hot desking for staff but the design and fit out of Laurence House with large monitors for hot desking and various collaboration spaces also contributes to a better working environment. One potential drawback requiring management is that increased hot desking can be disruptive for staff who require adapted workstations.

5. Impact summary

Characteristic	High (+ve or - ve)	Medium (+ve or -ve)	Low (+ve or - ve)	Neutral	Summary
Age				x	
Disability	x +ve				Staff and clients benefit from a more modern building with lifts, accessible toilets, powered doors etc.
Ethnicity				x	Ethnicity is not expected to be impacted by the project
Gender		x +ve			Reduction in concern about anti-social behaviour amongst female staff entering/leaving the Holbeach office.
Gender reassignment				x	Gender reassignment is not expected to be impacted by the project.
Marriage and civil partnerships				x	Marriage and civil partnerships is not expected to be impacted by the project.
Pregnancy and Maternity				x	is not expected to be impacted by the project.
Religion and belief		x +ve			Staff will have access to the reflection rooms in Laurence House for religious observance.
Sexual Orientation				x	Sexual orientation is not expected to be impacted by the project.
Socioeconomic inequality				x	Socioeconomic inequality is not expected to be impacted by the project.
Other factors		x -ve			Clients uneasy with formality/ and authority figures (uniformed

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

					security) associated with Laurence House main reception.
6. Mitigation					
Disability					
A staff survey will be completed to understand whether any transferring staff require an adapted workspace so that the necessary adjustments can be arranged as part of the workplan.					
Other factors					
It is proposed that there will be a separate reception for Youth Offending Services staffed by their own officers as it is important for their client group who sometimes feel uneasy in formal settings. By replicating the existing arrangements, we can ensure this does not create a barrier to attendance/service access.					
7. Service user journey that this decision or project impacts					
This project will change the location where services are delivered to a nearby location in Catford. With good communication it should be possible to transfer the services with minimum disruption to the way clients access services currently delivered from the Holbeach office.					
Signature of Director					

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	Place
Director	Patrick Dubeck
Service area	Inclusive Regeneration
Cabinet Portfolio	Businesses, Jobs and Skills- Cllr Powell
Reference	PLA06 – One-Council Employment Support
Saving title	One-Council Employment Support Proposal
Description of saving (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	<p>Lewisham Works is the Council's directly delivered employment and skills service for residents. This service launched in May 2022, and has already supported hundreds of residents to develop their employability, access training, and secure jobs related to their career goals. This element of the Jobs and Skills Service has been funded by a combination of S106 Employment and Skills ringfenced funding, but mostly since May 2022 by a European Social Fund "Connecting Communities" Grant. This grant allowed us to claim fully for staff salaries delivering employment support.</p> <p>The original ESF grant was due to finish in September 2023. Lewisham Works were able to achieve their core grant KPIs and were one of the best performing CLF boroughs in this area, and as a result we were able to draw down 100% of our grant allocation. Due to the Council's high performance, CLF offered Lewisham and two other boroughs the opportunity to utilise pan-CLF underspends on a focussed 18-24 ESF allocation until December 2023. This was known as the ESF 'NEET push'.</p> <p>The 'NEET push' presented an opportunity for Lewisham Works to collaborate with colleagues from Adult Learning Lewisham (Community Directorate) and Baseline (CYP) – to identify and encourage target young people to engage with the project. Our services overlap in our focus for supporting Lewisham residents with employment and skills participation.</p> <p>The Council is due to receive a UK Shared Prosperity Fund allocation for 'People and Skills' in 2024/25, although we are able to bring forward invoices and claims from January 2024. We are yet to receive a funding agreement for this grant, but we expect to receive circa £900k to be spent by March 2025 on supporting economically inactive residents to train and gain employment. We expect to claim staff salaries and commissioned employment support, and we must spend by March 2025. This funding is restricted to employment and skills.</p> <p>It is proposed that one officer from each service, providing overlapping advice and guidance to residents, is funded through UKSPF. These officers would be required to record resident interactions and outcomes on a single CRM system managed by Lewisham Works, used to report our performance to CLF against our UKSPF delivery. We expect to easily achieve our UKSPF KPIs, which are very modest. This would allow us to take a more integrated approach to how we support residents, from services across the Council.</p> <p>Claiming for these officer salaries offsets their General Fund cost in local budgets, as the Baseline and Adult Learning posts are funded through General Fund at present. We are not yet aware of future UKSPF allocations, so this represents a one-off contribution.</p> <p>This represents an in-year saving of £24,190.50.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 months of salary + on-cost at SCP25 (SO1) for two members of staff • This represents an individual saving to CYP and Communities of £12,095.25 in-year.

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

	<p>It is also proposed we claim the full salary of each of these SO1 officer for the 2024/25 financial year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This represents a saving of £96,762 approx. based on top of the SO1 salary scale. • This represents an individual budget saving of £48,381 to both CYP and Communities <p>*These savings are not from Place budgets, explicitly they are offering creative solutions to provide savings elsewhere in the Council.</p>			
Division budget	Gross £k		Net £k	
Service area budget	Gross £k		Net £k	
Saving proposed	2023/24 £k	£24	2024/25 £k	£96
Risks:				
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N	This represents a shunt from Adult Learning and Baseline salaries to UKSPF, managed by Economy, Jobs and Partnerships			
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	80%			
Impact of making the saving	<p>By increasing the amount of UKSPF utilised for staff salaries, we potentially reduce the available funding for commissioning local organisations to deliver complimentary services. This does not have a significant impact, because the Council is set to receive more UKSPF than first-thought, and the Council also has S106 employment and skills pots which must be spent in the next 12 months.</p> <p>Due to last minute interventions by DWP in the UKSPF funding agreement, Lewisham Council is receiving £300k more UKSPF directly than first anticipated, so this does not have an immediate negative impact on Jobs and Skills planned activity.</p>			
Possible risk mitigation	N/A – utilising S106 offsets any potential risk to planned Jobs and Skills activity.			
Other considerations:				
Member or Officer decision	Officers Decision			
Redundancies	Y/N	N	Number of staff	N/A
Public consultation	Y/N	N	Audience(s)	N/A
Investment required (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	N	Cost £k	£0k
	In what:	N/A		

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work	<p>This saving is contingent on Adult Learning and Baseline staff recording their resident support work on the Lewisham Works CRM.</p> <p>We will create and SLA and sufficient support to allow those staff to record progress in a compliant fashion.</p>
Specific legal or statutory considerations	N/A

EIA Screening

Impact & Outcomes				
What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?				
Service Users				
There is no impact expected for service users as a result of this decision. Service Users will continue to receive the same level of support from Lewisham Works, Adult Learning and Baseline.				
Staff				
There is a neutral impact on staff outside of the Lewisham Works funded by this grant – that they will be required to record monitoring data on the ‘Hanlon’ system used by Lewisham Works to record client progress. Otherwise, there is no impact on the employment status and day to day work of staff. The UKSPF People and Skills funding aligns with normal day-to-day duties of staff funded by this grant. The two officers outside of Lewisham Works will benefit from more joined-up working and practice across the Council.				
Other Council Services				
There is a positive financial benefit to Adult Learning and Baseline – who will both receive grant funding to supplement Council General Fund for salaries. There are no other impacts to Council services.				
Partners				
There are no impacts to external partners arising from this decision.				
Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X
Disability				X
Ethnicity				X
Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X
Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality				X
Is a full EAA required?			N	

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Directorate	Place			
Director	Zahur Khan			
Service area	Commercial Services			
Cabinet Portfolio	Environment and Climate Action- Cllr Krupski			
Reference	PLA02 – Commercial Waste Additional Income			
Saving title	Commercial Waste			
Description of saving (including any specific elements or phasing to be considered)	The service has undergone a recent restructure and has implemented new processes and procedures with new management arrangements. Changes to the service project a balancing of the budget target, and additional income. The service is confident going forward that it will improve on commercial sales which will result in consistent additional income. The figure which is been proposed is that amount the service is confident in delivering.			
Division budget	Gross £k		Net £k	
Service area budget	Gross £k		Net £k	
Saving proposed	2023/24 £k	100	2024/25 £k	
Risks:				
Cost shunt to other service? Y/N	No			
Likelihood of making cut in full - %	95%			
Impact of making the saving	No negative impact on residents or businesses. In order to ensure the service delivers the savings the use of interim arrangements with agency staff is required until key posts within the service have been filled.			
Possible risk mitigation	As with all commercial services the council is reliant on businesses renewing their contracts. The service is very competitive and is confident in delivering a good service to meet this saving and seek to improve on it in future years.			
Other considerations:				
Member or Officer decision	Officer			
Redundancies	Y/N	N	Number of staff	
Public consultation	Y/N	N	Audience(s)	
Investment required (value of saving shown above should be net of this investment)	Y/N	N	Cost £k	
	In what:			
Contingent on other actions / decisions / cross service work	The service relies on street environmental service emptying the bins.			
Specific legal or statutory considerations	All business must have a trade waste agreement in line with duty of care.			

Commercial Waste Service Equalities Screening

Impact & Outcomes

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

What is the likely impact of the proposed changes?				
Service Users				
<p>Commercial waste services users include businesses across the borough who wish to use the councils commercial waste service to meet their duty of care obligation as per Environmental Protection Act, for disposal of their waste.</p> <p>Currently the service has approximately 1500 customers, evenly split between our sack and bin service customers.</p> <p>Businesses across the borough can use any licences waste carrier and therefore those that use our service do so because they find our services to be most suitable for their business's requirements including equalities considerations.</p> <p>The changes proposed are to implement an increase of fees to the bin service in line with Consumer Price Index (CPI).</p>				
Staff				
<p>Staff are trained to support all individuals including those with protected characteristics to deliver an excellent service and support additional needs where required.</p>				
Other Council Services				
Not applicable				
Partners				
Not applicable				
Are there any specific equalities implications? Please provide a response for each protected characteristic/equalities consideration, even if the impact is neutral.				
Protected characteristics and other equalities considerations	High (Positive / Negative)	Medium (Positive / Negative)	Low (Positive / Negative)	Neutral
Age				X
Disability				X
Ethnicity				X
Gender				X
Gender reassignment				X
Marriage and civil partnerships				X
Pregnancy and maternity				X

Appendix 2 - Officers decisions

Religion and belief				X
Sexual orientation				X
Socio-economic inequality				X
Is a full EAA required?	Not required as this service is determined by businesses who have choice to use our services or other waste carriers as a business decision.			