

SUBJECT: MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN 2018/19 to 2021/22 and DRAFT BUDGET PROPOSALS 2018/19 FOR CONSULTATION

MEETING: CABINET

DATE: 22nd November 2017

DIVISION/WARDS AFFECTED: All

1. PURPOSE:

- 1.1 To highlight the context within which the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) will be developed for 2018/19 to 2021/22.
- 1.2 To agree the assumptions to be used to update the MTFP, and provide an early indication of the level of budget savings still to be found.
- 1.3 To update Members with the implications arising out of the provisional settlement announcement of Welsh Government.
- 1.4 To consider the 2018/19 budget within the context of the 4 year Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) to be incorporated within the emergent Corporate Plan
- 1.5 To provide detailed draft proposals on the budget savings required to meet the gap between available resources and need to spend in 2018/19, for consultation purposes.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 That the budget assumptions outlined in paragraphs 3.11 to 3.16 in the report are agreed and updated during the budget process should better information become available.
- 2.2 That Cabinet acknowledges the draft response to the Welsh Government on the provisional settlement (Appendix 3).
- 2.3 That Cabinet approves that the consultation period and opportunity to present alternative proposals ends on 31st January 2018.
- 2.4 That the budget process (as outlined in paragraphs 3.6 onwards) is adopted including member budget scrutiny and consultation conducted with select Committees and consultation with JAG, schools budget forum and other relevant fora
- 2.5 That Cabinet approves the release of the draft budget savings proposals for 2018/19 for consultation purposes.
- 2.6 That Cabinet agrees to continue to work on the areas required to balance the 2018/19 budget and Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP), through wider targeted activities that sit within the remit of Future Monmouthshire.

- 2.7 That Cabinet agrees to include the Future Monmouthshire budget of £200,000 as a base budget consideration from 2018/19 given the key role that Future Monmouthshire plays in facilitating a more sustainable and financially affordable future for Council activities.
- 2.8 To consider formal adoption of the Foundation Living wage as a financial planning assumption rather than Government Living wage. For 2018/19 the rates are £8.75 ph and £8.40 ph respectively. This would have a potential brought forward cost from 2019/20 pressures of £83.5k.

3. KEY ISSUES:

Background

- 3.1 Members will know that we have faced and will continue to face significant financial challenges. Over the last four years, the Council has had to manage £19.1 million of savings from its service budgets, whilst additionally also taking advantage of the cashflow savings effect of revising its capital finance arrangements of circa £3.3million. Funding from Welsh Government has reduced over the period and austerity looks set to continue for the foreseeable future. At the same time pressures on the budget have been increasing in terms of demographic growth, demand and expectations in children's services, contract price inflation and redundancy costs.
- 3.2 Whilst setting the budget annually within the context of a MTFP, the development of multi-year budget proposals has been a challenge. An ongoing forecast resource gap is being predicted however with the absence of future year's indicative settlements from Welsh government, planning for the future is challenging.
- 3.3 The *Future Monmouthshire* work programme recognizes that the challenges faced by the County and Council are not limited to financial pressures, but these should be seen in the round with other significant challenges. Taking a holistic approach to this work will ensure that the needs of our communities that we serve are put first within the financial constraints that we operate.
- 3.4 The year end position for 2016/17 and the current year monitoring continues to demonstrate the tightening of our financial position. The reports also assess the delivery of the savings we have previously identified. Overall the outturn position for 2016/17 delivered a small surplus, and meant that there was a minor opportunity to replenish some of our reserves.
- 3.5 A review of the earmarked reserves position was undertaken in June 2016 and agreed by Cabinet on 6th July 2016. The report highlighted that as reserves have been used extensively and there is less opportunity to replenish reserve balances as budgets get tighter, ear marked reserves need to work harder to help the Authority through the financial challenges and risks it faces. Reserves should not be used to plug the funding gap and fund on going expenditure, they are needed to help with one off costs to invest and transform services so that they can operate within a reduced financial envelop. Having clearer protocols and responsibility assigned can help to ensure the return from the use of reserves in the future is maximised.

Medium Term Financial Plan Context - Budget Assumptions

- 3.6 Taking significant levels of resource out of the budget year on year has been a massive achievement. In reviewing this process, questions have been raised about whether it is sustainable going forward. Whilst the Future Monmouthshire work is making progress and establishing key themes to work on there is still some way to go to establish the future operating model for the Authority. Therefore a one year approach has been taken albeit within the context of the MTFP, whilst the corporate plan including a more medium term approach can be adopted next year.
- 3.7 Initially the proposed budget setting process involved comparing MCC unit costs and performance with those of other Welsh Councils to understand where the greatest opportunity was to make further savings. The activity data used by Improvement colleagues indicated little correlation with the resourcing. Three challenge panels were held with specific services to share the provocations. Most challenged the activity data, but didn't actively hold any better quality of information, but highlighted their work in informing/improving the national benchmarking context, which appears an evolving consideration.
- 3.8 So in the short term SLT has reverted again to asking all services in the organisation to consider how their services would look within a 5% reduction in the resources available to them. The principles adopted through the Future Monmouthshire work will form an important back drop for services to explore the options available to meet the more immediate budget challenges.
- 3.9 In rolling forward the current MTFP, services have been provided with an opportunity to identify any material pressures anticipated during 2018-19 and beyond, and a review of all the existing assumptions and pressures previously agreed for inclusion in the model has been undertaken and provides a basis on which to scenario plan for the future, whilst recognizing that we are building from an extremely challenging starting point.
- 3.10 For the purposes of modelling across the medium term, the MTFP had made initial provision for unidentified pressures of £2.5m in each of the years. This is seen as a prudent estimate based on pressures that have been incorporated into the budget process in recent years. Pressures have subsequently been updated, as shown in the table above, and will continue to be reviewed and updated as further information becomes available.

Inflation Indicators

- 3.11 As a reminder the following assumptions have been used across the 4 year MTFP window.
- Council Tax – 3.95% increase per annum
 - AEF Central Government funding – 2.6% reduction 18/19, 1.8% reduction thereafter
 - Other external income – 2.5% increase per annum
 - Pay inflation – 1% increase per annum
 - Non pay inflation – 0%
 - Vacancy factor – 2% (except schools)
 - Superannuation – 22.1% (increasing 1% per annum)
 - Schools Budget – 0%
- 3.12 Reserves – It is assumed that additional reliance on reserves, except for one off investment that has a net on going benefit to the revenue budget, will be avoided in the MTFP. Ear marked reserves are an important part of the MTFP strategy for managing the changes required and are key to financial resilience in times of extreme financial challenge.
- 3.13 Capital financing - Capital financing costs are currently based on the approved Capital MTFP, the funding budgets will need to be reviewed following the development of the next capital MTFP taking into account any slippage, review of capital receipts position and further approvals of schemes.
- 3.14 Other Corporate Costs, such as precepts and levies, will also be updated as information becomes available.
- 3.15 The assumptions highlighted above are based on the best information available at the current time, however they will be subject to variation as new information comes to light and our forecasting techniques are refined. The current assumptions show the following cumulative gap in the MTFP model:

Year	MTFP Gap £'000s
2018/19	4,804
2019/20	8,400
2020/21	11,724
2021/22	14,038

- 3.16 What is clearly shown in the table above is that there will be a significant gap in the MTFP to find. It should be noted that this is the gap at this moment in time and as further information comes to light, this will be taken into account and may alter the figures. At the moment £14 million will be a working target until more information becomes available.

Work to Balance the 4 Year MTFP and 2018/19 Specifically

3.17 After several years of taking significant resource out of the budget, the means of achieving further savings becomes increasingly more challenging. The work on Future Monmouthshire has meant some changes to the budget process for 17/18, and an increase of such benefit is anticipated for the 2018/19 budget process. Future Monmouthshire is about keeping the Council 'going' and 'growing' and whilst the pressure of 18/19 is immediate, a one-year process has been developed which aims to position short-term decisions in the context of a longer-term programme which aligns with the medium Term Financial Plan. A currently unquantified level of savings is proposed from Future Monmouthshire facilitating cross cutting savings. That amount will become more explicit through the budget setting process.

Links to Vision and Priorities

3.18 During the budget process, it is usual to compare the MTFP plan with the Council strategic priorities and single integrated plan, to ensure resourcing remains directed to best effect. However the Single Integrated Plan is currently in the process of being replaced by the Public Service Board (PSB partnership) well-being plan and objectives for Monmouthshire when agreed in 2018. The detail of the plan is currently draft and subject to PSB approval next week a consultation will take place from 13th November. Below sets out the vision and objectives which in essence will replace the Single integrated plan priorities in 2018.

3.19 Given the incremental approach towards budget setting, the proposed budget is aligned with traditional core priorities, as identified within the Administration's Mid Term Report and Continuance Agreement 2015-17, namely:

- direct spending in schools,
- services to vulnerable children and adults and
- activities that support the creation of jobs and wealth in the local economy,
- maintaining locally accessible services

3.20 The following table demonstrates the links at a summary level that have been made with such 4 priorities, and the strategic risks:

Proposal	Link to Priority Areas	Link to Whole Authority Risk assessment
Schools budgets continue to have regard for cash flat line considerations	During the initial modelling it was noted that £288k pressure has been acknowledged in addressing new ALN responsibilities and school exam pressures. There are conversely £487k savings, resulting in a net saving from CYP of £199k. Cabinet have requested that MTFP modelling includes the effect of schools pay award (1%) with an anticipated cost of £387k, to model investments exceeding savings.	Budget proposals are mindful of the risk in the register around children not achieving their full potential

Social care budgets will see additional resources going into the budget for Children's and adults social services to meet the pressures in these areas.	Services to protect vulnerable people Nobody is left behind	These proposals seeks to address the risks around more people becoming vulnerable and in need and the needs of children with additional learning needs not being met
The drive for service efficiencies savings has continued across all service areas in order to avoid more stringent cuts to frontline services.	Further reviews of management and support structures and streamlining of processes, contributes to the aims of creating a sustainable and resilient communities.	Addresses risks around the ability to sustain our priorities within the current financial climate
The need to think differently what income can be generated has been a clear imperative in working up the proposals.	Being able to generate further income streams responds to the consultation responses in previous years regarding a preference for this compared to services cuts and contributes to the aims of creating a sustainable and resilient communities.	

3.21 Whilst these strategic priorities may iteratively get reviewed and refreshed when incorporated into Single Integrated Plan, early sight of draft proposals suggests a potential continuing alignment.

Purpose	Building Sustainable and Resilient Communities	
Our aspiration is to:	Reduce inequalities between communities and within communities Support and protect vulnerable people Consider our impact on the environment	
Our Well-being Objectives are:	<i>People / Citizens</i>	<i>Place / Communities</i>
	Provide children and young people with the best possible start in life	Protect and enhance the resilience of our natural environment whilst mitigating and adapting to the impact of climate change
	Respond to the challenges associated with demographic change	Develop opportunities for communities and businesses to be part of an economically thriving and well-connected county.

Provisional settlement

- 3.22 The provisional settlement was announced on the 10th October 2017. The overall increase in the Welsh Government revenue budget is 0.2% and following decisions by the WG on its budget, the Local Government settlement was announced with an overall decrease across Wales of 0.5%. However, this includes additional funding for new responsibilities relating to homelessness prevention which in itself results in further unfunded pressures being placed on the Authority. The Welsh Government's statement makes reference to protecting key public services and that 'the settlement will allocate £62m for schools and £42m for social services'. However, there is no additional funding provided to protect these services or any explanation of how these figures have been arrived at. These should be regarded as being within the funding envelope announced which sees an overall reduction of 0.5%. The Minister has also provided an indicative settlement for 2019-20 which will see the local government settlement reduce by on average a further 1.5%. Our financial planning assumption for 2018/19 and thereafter remains at 1.8% reduction per annum, as it isn't common for MCC to derive funding at average levels.
- 3.23 For Monmouthshire the provisional settlement for 2018/19 has delivered a reduction in the Authority's Aggregate External Finance (AEF) of 1% after taking into account new responsibilities and transfers into and out of the settlement. The AEF across Wales ranged from a 0.2% increase in Cardiff to reduction of 1% in Monmouthshire, Blaenau Gwent, Caerphilly, Merthyr Tydfil, Powys and Conwy. All authorities suffering a 1% reduction have been benefitted from a funding floor. A table showing each authorities position resulting from the provisional settlement is included at Appendix 2 to this report. Monmouthshire remains at the bottom of the table in terms of AEF per head of population
- 3.24 There have been several known transfers of grant into the settlement, which in total amount to £2.14m for Monmouthshire. When the 1.0% reduction in the provisional AEF is compared to the 2.6% reduction modelled in the MTFP the Authority is better off by circa £1.4 million. A response to WG regarding the Provisional Settlement is attached as Appendix 3.
- 3.25 As mentioned above, in para 3.10, experience suggests that annual pressures experienced are of the order of £3.4 million, so a balancing item, known as unidentified pressures, has been used to bolster service identified pressures to this level. As pressures manifest themselves, unidentified pressures are reduced and replaced instead by specific aspects. Part of the strategy during the budget setting process will be to zealously consider and mitigate where possible identified pressures. This would allow any balance on "unidentified pressures" to be matched off against the deficit bottom line of the budget and avoid a need to generate additional savings.

3.26 Currently, summary identified pressures within the MTFP include,

Pressures by Directorate	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000	2020/21 £000	2021/22 £000
Children & Young People	675	66	0	0
Social Care & Health	1,108	1,124	857	70
Enterprise	499	0	0	0
Resources	143	0	0	0
Chief Executives Unit	135	72	75	62
Corporate Costs & Levies	202	112	0	0
Unidentified pressures	693	2,061	2,276	2,368
Totals	3,455	3,435	3,208	2,500

Further detail is supplied in Appendix 4.

3.27 Other potential pressures which have not yet been factored in are currently being assessed. The budget is being prepared on an incremental basis, so it doesn't automatically presume continued funding of any initiative after its reserve funding has expired, or any new additions, so for instance currently it doesn't include any allowance yet for any net costs resulting from member consideration of Leisure, Culture and Tourism outsourcing proposals, any tranche B Future schools financing assumptions, or any borrowing presumption to continue to supplement capital DFG budget or afford waste services vehicle replacement, that in the main will be subject to separate reports of much greater detail. Other pressures can manifest themselves through introduction of new legislation. The above list includes statute introduced pressures known to date. Grant reductions are another common volatility during the budget process. If specific grants cease, it is expected that the activity will cease. Continuance of an activity following grant funding ceasing, would require a business case to assess each case on its merits.

3.28 Welsh Government has, subsequent to the provisional settlement, provided emerging details of the anticipated grants available nationally. Current national details are supplied in Appendix 1. Of note, are the significant reductions in Educational Improvement spending and Single Revenue Grant. The single Revenue Grant contains the funding that was traditionally supplied as the Sustainable Waste management Grant, part of that funding is anticipated to fall instead with RSG settlement figures, however the net decline in grant is greater than already anticipated within pressure forecasts. Also of note, Councils still do not have a comprehensive grant position regarding particular notable grants. Of particular interest to MCC, bus subsidy, concessionary fares and post 16 funding is unlikely to be available before December which continues to introduce an unfortunate element of volatility to the budget setting process.

Savings Proposals for 2018/19

3.29 Across the board, all service areas were asked to consider how their services would look within a range of reductions available to them, whilst simultaneously, looking ahead and

ensuring wherever possible, proposals support the medium term direction of travel. To in-build an additional element of review, all proposals have been considered and tested through an initial process of independent challenge by SLT and Cabinet members

- 3.30 The budget proposals contained within this report have sought to ensure these key outcomes and priorities can be continued to be pursued as far as possible within a restricting resource base. This does not, however, mean that these areas will not contribute to meeting the financial challenges. The aim is to make sure everything is efficient so that as broad a range of service offer, in line with those functions that matter most to our communities, can be maintained. Chief Officers in considering the proposals and strategy above have also been mindful of the whole authority risk assessment.

Extent of Summary Savings Identified to Date

Disinvestment by Directorate	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000	2020/21 £000	2021/22 £000
Children & Young People	(487)	(23)	0	0
Social Care, Health & Housing	(751)	(725)	(189)	(189)
Enterprise	0	0	0	0
Resources	(350)	0	0	0
Chief Executives Units	(565)	40	0	0
Corporate Costs & Levies	(26)	0	0	0
Appropriations	(296)	63	113	(86)
Financing	(530)	0	0	0
Totals	(3,005)	(645)	(76)	(275)

Further detail is supplied in Appendix 5.

Treasury Impact

- 3.31 The Capital MTFP will be considered as a separate report but for the purposes of establishing the revenue impact of the capital MTFP, the current assumptions presume that the 2017/18 capital programme will be incurred in full other than an anticipated slippage of £6million to Future Schools spend, that should have no effect on 2018/19 Treasury budget as the funding source remains capital receipts rather than borrowing.
- 3.32 Last year Members subscribed to £500k Treasury Headroom to assist with 5 likely schemes that did not have cost certainty during the budget setting process. Whilst there is still uncertainty around elements of tendered costs for these schemes, the following cost predictions have been presumed in relationship to these schemes.
- £300k was added to DFG's as a one off contribution in 2017/18 to reduce backlog.
 - Monmouthshire leisure centre cost circa £7.3m. After Future schools funding, section 106 usage and the service providing the majority of prudential borrowing from additional income, the core Treasury budget will absorb the remaining annualised effect of £835k worth of funding afforded by unsupported borrowing (MRP starting 19/20).
 - J & E block office costs. budget presumes £1.4million project, E block costs circa £400k, J block costs still to be confirmed (MRP starting 19/20). The intention is for such costs to be self financed from savings realised.

- Abergavenny Hub, budget presumes an indicative £2.3million (MRP starting 20/21).
- City deal contribution predicted to total £7.3million, with annual contributions increasing over 9 year duration, 2018/19 contribution expected to be £83k. (MRP presumed to start the full year after contribution made).

For MRP purposes all assets are presumed to have a 25 year life

- 3.33 Further work on the Treasury aspects of the budget are still being validated and include a review of the current year underspend, the profile of capital expenditure and potential slippage, a review of maturing debt over the medium term and the balance between the level of fixed and variable rate debt in the Council's portfolio. The balance of risk is an important consideration in this review as are the principles of security, liquidity and yield when considering any investment strategies.

Council Tax

- 3.34 The Council Tax increase in the budget has been modelled as 3.95% per annum across the MTFP as a planning assumption. As part of the savings proposals, an assessment of collection rates and growth in properties has been undertaken. Anticipated recovery rates reflect very high recovery practice (99%), such that there is little scope to increase such further. However a growth in properties has been presumed to achieve (net of Council Tax reduction scheme) an extra £530 income per annum, and is including in the savings table.

Summary position

- 3.35 In summary, the 2018/19 budget gap is now £482k, if all the pressures and savings proposals contained in the Appendix 4 are approved.

Services	Adjusted Base 2017/18 £000	Indicative Base 2018/19 £000	Indicative Base 2019/20 £000	Indicative Base 2020/21 £000	Indicative Base 2021/22 £000
Children & Young People	49,630	49,891	49,923	49,961	50,000
Social Care & Housing	42,953	44,780	45,448	46,428	46,626
Enterprise	8,495	9,759	9,275	9,318	9,380
Resources	7,687	7,588	7,608	7,688	7,769
Chief Executive's Unit	15,860	16,481	16,676	16,833	16,977
Corporate Costs & Levies	20,273	20,825	23,166	25,703	28,207
Sub Total	144,897	149,323	152,095	155,932	158,958
Transfers to reserves	167	201	162	70	30
Transfers from reserves	(504)	(1,009)	(127)	(96)	(188)
Treasury	7,883	7,792	7,670	7,783	7,697
Appropriations Total	7,546	6,984	7,705	7,757	7,539
Total Expenditure Budget	152,444	156,308	159,800	163,689	166,497
Aggregate External Financing (AEF)	(91,799)	(93,000)	(91,326)	(89,682)	(88,068)
Council Tax (MCC)	(47,744)	(50,160)	(52,120)	(54,158)	(56,276)
Council Tax (Gwent Police)	(10,421)	(10,186)	(10,369)	(10,556)	(10,746)
Council Tax (Community Councils)	(2,480)	(2,480)	(2,480)	(2,480)	(2,480)
Sub Total Financing	(152,444)	(155,825)	(156,295)	(156,876)	(157,570)
(Headroom)/Shortfall	0	482	3,505	6,813	8,927

Clearly there is a gap still to meet and further work is progressing through Future Monmouthshire to bring forward measures to balance to budget around the themes of services integration, commercialisation, adult care and procurement.

Reserves strategy

- 3.36 Earmarked reserve usage over the MTFP is projected to decrease the balance on earmarked reserves from £6.2 million at end of 2017/18 to £5.2 million at the end of 2021/22.
- 3.37 The approved Reserves strategy has sought to ensure that earmarked reserves are not used to balance the budget for ongoing expenditure and that they are instead used to the best effect and impact on one off areas of spend to help the authority transform itself to the new resource levels available to it. Taking into account that some of these reserves are specific, for example relating to joint arrangements or to fund capital projects, this brings the usable balance down to £1.4 million by the end of this MTFP window.
- 3.38 The general fund reserve forecast for the end 2017/18 predicts £7.1 million balance, and remains within the 4-6% of net expenditure range considered as appropriate to maintain. This will be updated for anticipated outturn following month 7 monitoring activities within the next fortnight.
- 3.39 Deficit school balances haven't been factored into general fund balance, as the focus will be one of reintroducing a net surplus position.

Next Steps

- 3.40 The information contained in this report constitutes the budget proposals that are now made available for formal consultation. Cabinet are interested in consultation views on the proposals and how the remaining gap may be closed. This is the opportunity for Members, the public and community groups to consider the budget proposals and make comments on them. Cabinet will not however, be prepared to recommend anything to Council that has not been subject to a Future Generations Assessment and Equality Impact Assessment and therefore a deadline to receive alternative proposals has been set as 31st January 2018.
- 3.41 Public consultation (to include the formal requirement to consult businesses) and Select Committee Scrutiny of Budget proposals, will take place between the 1st December 2017 and the 31st January 2018. In the past four years we have undertaken extensive community engagement around the budget and the impact of any potential changes under the banner of #MonmouthshireEngages. The budget proposals contained within this report are extensions of previously agreed changes and in addition there has not been any substantive or material service developments; on this basis we will not be conducting another large scale public engagement. There will be opportunity for the community to provide consultation responses via public meetings to be held in Usk, meetings of the Schools budget forum, JAG, and other relevant fora and via the website and social media where details of the proposals will be published and a short film will be available.
- 3.42 The scrutiny of the budget proposals are key areas of this part of the budget process. The following dates have been set for Select committees:

Economy and Development – 30th November 2017

Children and Young People – 7th December 2017

Adults – 12th December 2017

Strong Communities – 4th January 2018

- 3.43 Deadline for the receipt of Community Council precepts is 31st January 2018
- 3.44 Consequently final budget proposals following consultation and receipt of the final settlement will go to a special Cabinet in mid Feb 2018 and Council Tax and budget setting will then take place at Full council on 1st March 2018.

4 REASONS:

- 4.1 To agree budget proposals for 2018/19 for consultation purposes

5. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

- 5.1 As identified in the report and appendices

6. FUTURE GENERATIONS AND EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS:

- 6.1 The Wellbeing of Future Generations initial evaluation for the emerging 18-19 budget proposals has been developed in narrative form in appendix 6, ahead of formalisation of proposals and the completion of the official assessment framework. This enables setting out of the backdrop to the emerging proposals, commentary on how the process has been developed; its various iterations and the picture it paints as a whole for the county of Monmouthshire. Presenting in this way at this stage provides an opportunity to demonstrate the dynamic and real-time nature of the approach. In addition, it helps to highlight application of continual learning and improvement.
- 6.2 In the past and notwithstanding the council's strong record on financial planning and delivery, achieving the goal of keeping frontline services going and strengthening commitments to sustainability and resilience, the budget has tended to be developed through the setting of targets, directorate-led approaches and a relatively uneven smattering of proposals. Whilst under this budget round, individual directorate's have still put forward proposals – this process has been more in keeping with our Future Monmouthshire programme and the design principles that guide how we keep our county 'going' and 'growing'. It signals very clearly, that money should follow purpose and priorities and not precede them.
- 6.3 It must be borne in mind that this WFG evaluation is an early one, applying to budget *proposals* only at this pre-consultation, pre-decision stage. The aim of the narrative in appendix 6 is thus, to demonstrate the 'live' nature of the process and the application of robust and ongoing scrutiny and challenge as the proposals continue to be shaped and honed in line with what matters.
- 6.4 The emerging budget proposals for 18-19 are more than a standalone one-year budget. As a contributor to our wider Future Monmouthshire work, they help build a bridge between the present we have and the future we wish to see. With a blend of ongoing sustainable efficiencies; continued income generation and a focus on investing in areas such as education and social care – where returns in terms of service outcomes and financial benefits are starting to pay early dividends – the platform is building for the development of more targeted 'big ticket' interventions. We are not kicking the 'too difficult' problems into the long grass. As well as keep the Council 'going' – work is underway to keep it 'growing' – as these proposals clearly demonstrate. Proposals to review the development plan, as a means of addressing demographic and economic pressures is underway. Exploration of targeted procurement opportunities that save money and create local

markets is taking shape. A 'challenge-driven' approach to tackling rural transport issues is being developed. Exploration of machine learning, artificial intelligence and automation are contributing to the ways in which we must re-imagine services and the positive impact they can have on the lives of people and communities in Monmouthshire - now and in the future.

- 6.5 Further to the narrative provided in appendix 6 the wellbeing of future generations impacts of the saving proposals have been initially identified per Directorate in Appendix 4. As the impact on services has been kept to a minimum, no significant negative impact has been identified. Further consultation requirements have been identified and are on going. As stated above further assessment of the total impact of the all the proposals will be undertaken for the final budget report.

The actual equality impacts from the final budget report's recommendations will be reviewed and monitored during and after implementation.

7. CONSULTEES:

SLT
Cabinet
Head of Legal Services

8. BACKGROUND PAPERS:

Appendix 1: Welsh Government Provisional Settlement – National grant notification
Appendix 2: Welsh Government Provisional Settlement – Aggregate External Funding
Appendix 3: Proposed letter in response
Appendix 4: Details of pressures
Appendix 5: Details of savings proposals
Appendix 6: Future Generations Evaluation

9. AUTHOR:

Mark Howcroft
Assistant Head of Finance

10. CONTACT DETAILS:

Tel: 01633 644740
E-mail: markhowcroft@monmouthshire.gov.uk

Appendix 1 - Details of Welsh Local Government Provisional Revenue Settlement 2018-19

Table 9: List and estimated amounts of Grants for total Wales

Existing Grant name	2017-18	2018-19
Communities and Children		
Supporting People	123.688	123.688
Flying Start Revenue Grant	76.052	76.052
Families First	38.352	38.352
Communities First	19.647	0.000
Childcare Offer	10.000	25.000
Communities for Work	7.120	7.199
Cardiff Bay Legacy	5.891	5.400
Promoting Positive Engagement for Young People	4.330	4.330
Out of School Childcare	2.300	2.300
Violence against Women, Domestic Abuse & Sexual Violence Grant	1.938	2.438
St David's Day Fund	1.000	1.000
Lift	0.990	0.000
National Approach to Advocacy	0.550	0.550
Community Cohesion	0.360	0.360
Maintaining the Delivery of the Wales Adoption Register	0.172	0.172
Armed Forces Day	0.035	0.100
Remploy Employment Support Grant	0.006	0.002
Communities First Legacy	0.000	6.000
Communities Work Plus	0.000	10.050
Economy and Infrastructure		
Concessionary Fares	60.466	NA
Bus Services Support Grant	25.000	NA

Bus Revenue Support Traws Cymru	3.057	NA
Road Safety Grant	2.000	2.000
Young Persons Discounted Bus Travel Scheme	1.000	NA
Bus Revenue Support	0.546	NA
New Developments	0.500	0.000
Enterprise Zones	0.271	0.064
Ports Development Fund	0.090	NA
Community Rail Partnership	0.065	NA
Travel Plan Co-ordinators	0.011	0.000

Education

Education Improvement Grant	133.282	118.137
Pupil Development Grant	91.333	91.333
Pioneer Schools	7.895	NA
Youth Support Grant	3.856	3.470
Reducing infant class sizes grant	2.000	3.000
School Uniform Grant	0.700	0.000
Modern Foreign Languages	0.480	0.432
Senior Business Managers	0.200	0.200
Mentoring and Networking Support for Headteachers	0.150	NA
National Numeracy Tests - Supported Marking Grant to Consortia	0.020	0.020

Environment and Rural Affairs

Single Revenue Grant - See note below	61.790	20.793
Waste Infrastructure Procurement Programme - Gate Fee Contributions	7.507	7.867
Animal Health & welfare Framework Funding	0.200	0.200
Renewal of Grant for the South Wales Regional Aggregate Working Party	0.050	0.050
Waste Planning Monitoring Report - North Wales and South East Wales	0.049	0.049
Waste Planning Monitoring Report - South West Wales	0.025	0.025

Finance and Local Government

Cardiff Capital City Deal	20.000	10.000
---------------------------	--------	--------

Lifelong Learning and Welsh Language

Post-16 Provision in Schools	98.587	NA
Adult Community Learning	4.307	NA
Additional Learning Needs Innovation Fund	1.320	0.000
Learning in Digital Wales (Phase 2)	0.500	0.450
Promote and Facilitate the use of the Welsh language	0.314	0.314
Development of the Seren Network	0.120	0.250

Social Services and Public Health

Welsh Independent Living Grant	27.000	RSG
Substance Misuse Action Fund	22.663	22.663
Social Care Workforce Grant	19.000	RSG
Expanding Edge of Care Services	5.000	RSG
Carer's Respite Care Grant	3.000	RSG
Support for Care Leavers	1.650	RSG
Reflect Project	0.850	RSG
Secure Estates	0.412	RSG
National Framework for Fostering	0.400	RSG
Development of Adoption Support Services in Wales	0.215	0.090

All Grants	900.454	584.424
-------------------	----------------	----------------

All Grants excluding NA (for like-for like comparison)	606.861	584.424
---	----------------	----------------

1 The information shown above details the total amount of each grant. Some grants may be split between local authorities and other bodies

2 It is important to note that amounts for future years are indicative at this stage and are liable to change

3 Formal notification of grant allocations is a matter for the relevant policy area

NA = figures not available at time of publication

RSG = funding transferring to Revenue Support Grant

Single Revenue Grant - £35m of Waste Budget element transferred to Revenue Support Grant

Provisional

Table 1c: Aggregate External Finance (AEF) plus top-up per capita, by Unitary Authority, 2018-19

Unitary Authority	2018-19 provisional Aggregate External Finance plus top-up funding (£'000s)	Provisional Aggregate External Finance per capita (£)*	Rank
Isle of Anglesey	94,924	1,353	11
Gwynedd	173,859	1,406	9
Conwy	152,770	1,307	15
Denbighshire	142,144	1,488	5
Flintshire	187,816	1,212	19
Wrexham	173,485	1,242	18
Powys	172,644	1,309	14
Ceredigion	99,905	1,309	13
Pembrokeshire	160,084	1,290	17
Carmarthenshire	257,960	1,386	10
Swansea	316,499	1,293	16
Neath Port Talbot	210,832	1,492	4
Bridgend	190,718	1,335	12
The Vale of Glamorgan	151,996	1,185	21
Rhondda Cynon Taf	362,219	1,519	2
Merthyr Tydfil	89,683	1,514	3
Caerphilly	265,600	1,467	6
Blaenau Gwent	109,761	1,581	1
Torfaen	130,800	1,422	8
Monmouthshire	93,000	1,001	22
Newport	211,682	1,423	7
Cardiff	437,867	1,193	20
Total unitary authorities	4,186,247	1,339	

* Based upon 2014-based, 2018 population projections

Appendix 3 – Proposed Response to Welsh Government on the Provisional Settlement

Simon Edwards
Local Government Funding Policy Branch,
Welsh Government,
Cathays Park,
Cardiff.
CF10 3NQ

Your Ref/Eich Cyf:
Our Ref/Ein Cyf:
Date/Dyddiad:
File Ref:
The Person dealing with
this matter is/ Y
Person sy'n delio gyda'r
mater yma yw:
Tel/Ffôn: 01633 644270
Fax/Ffacs: 01633 644260
e-mail address/ cyfeiriad
e-bost Monmouthshire.gov.uk

Dear Mr. Edwards,

Re: Provisional Local Government Settlement 2018/19

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Provisional Settlement announced recently. This response has been endorsed by Monmouthshire County Council's Cabinet and provides the views of members.

This is a disappointing settlement for local government across Wales and follows reductions that Councils have experienced in recent years. The Welsh Government has chosen to use additional money passed to it by the UK government in ways that don't best meet the needs of the people in Wales.

Monmouthshire has yet again received one of the worst settlements in Wales receiving 1% less than the previous year and the settlement continues an eight-year run of real terms reductions to local government funding in Wales. This does not take into account the current inflation rate of 2.7% and therefore represents a 3.7% real term reduction in funding. While the average cut to Welsh councils is 0.5%, Monmouthshire's 1% decrease, shared with five other counties, is the biggest in Wales.

The provisional settlement has done nothing to alleviate our position as the worst funded Council in Wales per head of population. The average per capita funding in Wales is £1,339 compared to Monmouthshire's £1,001.

The Council is very conscious of the pressures on household budgets and so the Council is doing its utmost to deliver a balanced budget but this will inevitably put pressure on Council Tax rises.

Monmouthshire welcomes the commitment to providing a funding floor to mitigate any volatility. Looking forward to 2019/20 and beyond, the prospect of continuing austerity remains and is set against very real pressures in already stretched services. Whilst Monmouthshire welcomes the provision of an indicative revenue settlement for 2019-20 the provision of indicative revenue settlements for the next three years would help Councils in planning for the future through these very difficult times.

As a rural authority Monmouthshire is confronted by particular challenges in offering services like social care, waste collection, transport and highways across a wide area. Indeed, the council has recognised these difficulties by prioritising the maintenance of locally accessible services to combat rural isolation. Monmouthshire calls on the government to base funding on

a fairer system, acknowledging the problems rural counties face when providing services. There are also a range of preventative services that will not survive unless the Welsh Government has a long hard look at the way it allocates money across the totality of public services.

Monmouthshire calls for more transparency around some of the figures in the provisional settlement announcement. The settlement suggests increases in funding in education and social services of £62m and £42m respectively. However, there is no additional resource to protect them or explanation of how these figures have been calculated. The all-wales settlement for local government has quite simply reduced been reduced by 0.5%.

Monmouthshire supports and encourages the transfer of specific grants into the settlement and is disappointed that more progress has not been made in this regard.

If there are opportunities to put more grants into the final settlement this would be welcomed providing it continues to be distributed on the same basis as the original grant to prevent large changes at a very late stage in the process.

On capital account, the settlement does not address the previous reductions in capital funding and is still therefore a serious concern, especially as it comes at a time when councils are struggling to raise capital receipts from asset sales. The need to invest in priority areas such as 21st Century Schools, waste management, carbon reduction and infrastructure remains high, with WG support remaining a critical success factor.

Despite the fact that the reasons for the level of the provisional settlement are both known and understood, it is difficult to reconcile the revenue and capital settlements with the increasing expectations and demands on local council services are continuing to grow. Councils will face difficult decisions in reconciling budgets next year and in the medium term and it is important that the WG recognises the need for difficult decisions, is supportive of local authorities facing difficult times and does not promote undeliverable policy expectations. This is a time for us all to work together to minimise the consequences of the downturn in public finances on the most vulnerable in society and to send clear and consistent expectations to the public we exist to serve.

Yours sincerely,

Councillor Philip Murphy – Cabinet Member

Appendix 4 – Pressures Proformas

Pressure	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000	2020/21 £000	2021/22 £000	Page Reference
CYP P1 New Bill Responsibilities ALN	121				22
CYP P2 Exam Fees	167				33
CYP P3 School staff (pay award 1%)	387				42
SCH P1 National living wage	434	434			43
SCH P2 Capital threshold	501	501	668		53
SCH P3 Childrens Services Overspend (£561k tot)	113	189	189	70	60
SCH P4 Safeguarding Post	60				67
ENT P1 Leisure Income - Extended Monmouth rebuild consequences	146				71
ENT P2 Housing Private leasing Pressure	288				88
ENT P3 Community Development Partnership	65				96
OPS P1 Passenger Transport Unit	47	72	75		104
OPS P1 Passenger Transport - Reduction of 18-19 pressure. Duffryn transport	(22)				104
OPS P2 Waste Grant pressure	110				111
RES P1 10% reduction in Housing Benefit Grant	26				114
RES P1 Summons income reduction	20				114
RES P1 Merchant Card Fee costs	10				114
RES P2 SRS Enhanced security & enterprise agreement (£75k to £105k)	105				121
CORP P1 Living Wage Foundation increase	58	112			133
CORP P2 Insurance Renewal Premia Cost Increase	124				134
CORP P3 Redundancy strain cost	20				144
Unidentified Pressures	675	2,127	2,276	2,430	No proforma

CYP PRESSURES

Pressure Mandate Proposal Number: CYP P1

Pressure Mandate Title: New Bill Responsibilities ALN

All information requested must be completed on the proposed mandate to enable the Cabinet to decide whether to proceed with the proposal.

Mandate Completed by	<i>Sharon Randall-Smith</i>
Date	<i>08/11/2017</i>

Why is this pressure required?

There will be an additional pressure to the ALN budget as the local authority implement the additional requirements of the new ALN Bill and revised Code of Practice because:

- the local authority will be responsible for providing strategic oversight of the system and for supporting mainstream schools to fulfil their duties
- the local authority will have a role in the identification of ALN and providing expertise where necessary to meet the needs of learners and supporting education settings to deliver these functions. This means that additional officer time will be needed to provide enhanced support and advice to schools and settings during the implementation period
- the local authority will have additional responsibilities in respect of Early Years and for young people up to the age of 25 years, compared to the current 3 – 19 years, increasing the number of live cases in the authority by almost 50%
- statements of SEN will cease and be replaced by Individual Development Plan (IDP). This process will take a period a minimum of two years during which time both systems will run concurrently
- the time line for completing an IDP is up to a maximum of 10 weeks compared to the current 26 weeks for a statutory statement of SEN

- the development of IDPs will be based on a person centred approach that will require a multi-agency approach and will take time to develop, refine and quality assure, increasing demands on officer time to attend multi-agency meetings
- the local authority will have a statutory duty to provide avoidance and resolution of disagreement processes
- additional Educational Psychology (EP) clinical expertise and advice will be required to accommodate increases in numbers of children and young people and attendance at multi-agency meetings
- Appeals to ALN Tribunals and DDA will increase as a result of the introduction the New Bill, especially during the early transition period because there is some ambiguity about the legal status of an IDP and no existing precedent
- the increase in demand to deliver statutory services will result in an increase in administration time needed to maintain recording and reporting systems

How much pressure is there and over what period?

The pressure arises from:

- the additional work force required to introduce and implement two complex and legal statutory systems concurrently
- the extension of the age range covered by the New Bill and subsequent increase in numbers
- an increase in the demand for Officer, EP and multi-agency partner time to provide advice and support to education settings
- an increase in time for officers preparation for and attendance at ALN Tribunals and DDA under the New Bill
- an increase in officer time to facilitate resolution and disagreement processes

The pressure will be at its most intense over the initial two years in terms of increased workload and the manageability of the implementation. It will be important during this period to ensure that we have the capacity to implement the changes effectively so that there is confidence in the quality and impact of the process going forward.

Once the new systems and processes become embedded, new pressures are likely to emerge to support increases in the number of children and young people with IDPs and accessing additional provision, however, until the New Bill and Code are finalised, the extent of this increase is unclear.

Directorate & Service Area responsible

Children and Young People
Additional Learning Needs

Mandate lead(s)

TBC

Have you undertaken any initial consultation on the need for this pressure to be included in the MTFP?		
Name	Organisation/ department	Date
Welsh Government Statutory Bill	NA	September 2018?

Has the specific budget pressure been consulted on?		
Function	Date	Details of any changes made?
Department Management Team	10 th October 2017	
Other Service Contributing to / impacted		
Senior leadership team		
Select Committee		
Public or other stakeholders		
Cabinet (sign off to proceed)		

Will any further consultation be needed?		
Name	Organisation/ department	Date
Welsh Government Statutory Bill	NA	NA

Final pressure approved by Cabinet	Date:
---	--------------

1. Vision and Outcomes of the Pressure Mandate

Give a business context for the budget pressure. This must pick up on the vision and what the new / improved / reduced service will look like in the future including the anticipated experience of users. It must also consider any impact on the Council's key priorities and strategic outcomes. Similarly does it impact on service performance within the immediate service area or any impact on other services provided by the authority / any other providers. In doing so, the pressure mandate must be tested against the

equality impact assessment and sustainable development impact assessment and must consider impact in relation to the new Future Generations Bill.

What are the outcomes of investing in the identified pressure?
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. All learners' needs are identified early, addressed quickly, and their views, wishes and feelings are at the heart of the planning processes so that they can participate in and enjoy learning2. The Local Authority will comply in full with all statutory duties under the New Bill and ALN Code of Practice
Expected positive impacts
<p>Additional capacity within the Directorate will ensure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• resources and support are in place to manage the transition from the current system for meeting the needs of children and young people with ALN to the new system• sufficient time and capacity is available to introduce IDPs without undue pressure so that they are of good quality and of equitable quality across the county• there is sufficient capacity to develop and embed effective multi-agency working practices so that everyone involved in supporting the child or young person can work in their best interests and minimise the need for avoidance and resolution of disagreements procedures• adequate officer time is available to provide support and advice to schools and settings up to the age of 25 years.• effective arrangements are in place to develop and facilitate avoidance and resolution of disagreements procedures to reduce the number of appeals to ALN Tribunals• wellbeing and good will of staff is maintained
Expected negative impacts
<p>The implementation of the New Bill will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• significantly increase officer workload a significantly greater demand on officer time• significantly increase the workload of the ALNCo in schools• require additional financial resources to meet the needs of a wider remit and age range of pupils, particularly where these are health needs, for example diabetes, that are not currently included within the existing bill.• place pressure on schools to meet the requirements of the new Bill without support and within existing resources

- require a significant investment of time to support parents, children and young people through the process and effectively manage expectations
- result in some parental opposition as the legal status of IDPs is unclear at this point and the process is untried across the system as a whole

2. Pressure proposed

Show how the budget pressure has been evidenced and will increase the current service budget. This must cover each year implicated. This section must also cover any other efficiency that will arise from the pressure.

What is the evidence for the pressure? How has it been estimated?								
2 officers 1 admin Additional EP time								
Service area	Current Budget £	Proposed Cash Pressure £	Proposed non cash efficiencies – non £	Target year				Total pressure proposed
				17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	
ALN and Admin	£115,216		NA	£57,132	£67,677	£43,487	£0	£168,296
EPS	£220,614		NA	£30,926	£53,323	£22,328	£0	£106,577

3. Actions required to minimise the pressure

Describe the key activities that will be undertaken to minimise the investment required and the action holders. This includes any actions contributed to by other services. Give the timescales to complete the work. This must also factor in any business activities that will need to be done differently or cease in order to achieve the mandate.

Action	Officer/ Service responsible	Timescale
Appointment of Officer with Post 16/ALN expertise (1 fte) [two year fixed term]	CYP ALN	September 2018

Appointment of Officer with Early Years/ALN expertise (0.5 fte) [two year fixed term]	CYP ALN	September 2018
Appointment of Administration Officer [30 hours]	CYP ALN	September 2018
Appointment of Educational Psychologist [0.5]	CYP ALN	September 2018

4. Additional skills/ business needs

Describe any additional skills, resource and capability needed in order to carry out the proposed mandate successfully. For example new expertise and knowledge etc.

Any additional capability required	Where will this come from	Any other resource/ business need (non-financial)
Training on the New Bill for Officers/Schools	WG and Region	Office space/ICT and equipment/travel/release time
Training for Administration Support on systems and processes	LA internal training	System Licence for One
Educational Psychology expertise across a wider age range for example EY and post 16	Recruitment	Office space/ICT and equipment/travel

5. Measuring performance on the mandate

How do you intend to measure the impact of the investing in the pressure identified? This will include budget measures and further possible measures that cover process, staff and customers. Targets need to be set over the duration of the mandate where appropriate.

Focus- Budget / Process / Staff / Customer	Indicator	Actual 2017/18	Actual 2018/19	Actual 2019/20	Target 2017/18	Target 2018/19	Target 2019/20
Customer	Number of cases appeal to ALN Tribunal	1	8	4	2	2	1
Process	Timeline for conversion for Statutory statement to IDP on target	NA	New measures	New measures	New measures	New measures	New measures
Schools	Proportion of IDP Reviews completed on time	NA	New measures	New measures	New measures	New measures	New measures
Staff	Local Authority IDPs issued on time	NA	New measures	New measures	New measures	New measures	New measures

6. Key Risks and Issues

Are there any potential barriers and risks that will need to be managed in delivering the outcomes expected from investing in the pressure identified, including any negative impacts identified in section 1 that need to be accounted for. Also, set out the steps that will be taken to mitigate these.

Barrier or Risk	Strategic/ Operational	Reason why identified (evidence)	Risk Level (High, Medium or Low) Based on a score assessing the probability & impact	Mitigating Actions
LA does not comply with statutory duties	Strategic	The New Bill places a far wider range of duties on Local Authorities across an extended age range up to 25 years.	High	Increase in workforce to meet the increased demand

Judicial Review resulting from non-compliance	Strategic	If the local authority do not comply with statutory timescales we will be vulnerable to judicial review	High	Increase in workforce to meet the timescales and follow processes in the new Bill
Engagement with wider agencies is inadequate	Strategic	Person centred planning, supported by all of the relevant agencies is at the heart of the new Bill. Unless the engagement is purposeful and effective, we will not meet the needs of the child or young person appropriately.	High	Work has started to train schools in PCP processes. CYP will take the lead on developing engagement with wider agencies ahead of the implementation of the new Bill.
Greater reliance on providers to enable the LA to meet statutory deadlines	Operational	Not all agencies are legally required to comply with the new Bill and therefore delays from these partners will result in the LA missing statutory deadlines.	High	
Officer wellbeing	Operational	There is a significant increase in the workload for staff compared to the current system.	High	Increase in workforce will maintain officer wellbeing
Increase in appeals to ALN Tribunal resulting in increased costs to the LA	Operational	Given the current uncertainties surrounding the legal status of IDPs we expect the number of appeals to Tribunal to increase. In the current	High	Early development and introduction of avoidance and resolution of disagreements procedures

		version of the new code pupil voice and the wishes of the parent appear to take priority.		
Educational providers do not have sufficient support to discharge their duties in full under the new code	Strategic	There is a significant deficit in skills and expertise within LAs and schools to enable them to deliver the new Bill. WG have committed to providing training to support the implementation however, it is unclear if this will be completed before implementation. This is particularly significant for ALNCOs.	High	Training will be delivered regionally supported by WG through the Innovation Grant.

7. Assumptions

Describe any assumptions made that underpin the justification for the option.

Assumption	Reason why assumption is being made (evidence)	Decision Maker
The New Bill will be introduced in its current form by the due date of September 2018	The timescale has been set by Welsh Government	Welsh Government

Current levels of ALN and EPS staff remain and any new staff are additional	The current level of staffing is not sufficient to ensure that the Local Authority will be able to adhere to statutory requirements and deadlines during the period of transition from the current to the new system.	The department believe that additional capacity is required and this view is supported by ADEW based on information from other LAs

8. Options

Prior to the pressure mandate being written, an options appraisal will have taken place. Summarise here the outcome of the Options considered and detail the rationale on why they were disregarded. (see options appraisal guide for further information)

Options	Reason why Option was not progressed	Decision Maker
1. Capacity of ALN Team remains unchanged	The New Bill will not be implemented in line with statutory Welsh Government timelines	
2. Full implementation of the proposal	The New Bill will be implanted in full and in line with WG timelines	

9. Monitoring the pressure mandate

The pressure mandates must be monitored through directorate budget monitoring. This will lead into corporate budget monitoring. In addition the action plan, performance measures and the risk assessment must be transferred into the service plans for the business area in order to monitor and challenge the delivery of the pressure mandate, including the performance being achieved and the level of impact.

Pressure Mandate Proposal Number : CYP P2
 Pressure Mandate Title : Secondary School Examination Fees

All information requested must be completed on the proposed mandate to enable the Cabinet to decide whether to proceed with the proposal.

Mandate Completed by	<i>Nikki Wellington</i>
Date	<i>05/10/2017</i>

Why is this pressure required?
Secondary schools have seen a significant increase in their pupil exam entry costs over the last few years due to the monopoly that WJEC have. Also, the number of entries have risen considerably due to the introduction of national compulsory sittings and registration fees e.g. Welsh Bacc, Numeracy GCSE. For each GCSE, the cost per exam is £35 where the minimum number of exams per pupil is 9. For the Welsh Bacc, which is now compulsory, there is an additional registration fee of £46 per pupil. At KS5, this fee rises to £66 per pupil, plus £51 per exam entry.
How much pressure is there and over what period?
£167,000 per year, across all secondary schools. This ranges from £30k to £57k per school.
Directorate & Service Area responsible
CYP Finance
Mandate lead(s)

Nikki Wellington

Have you undertaken any initial consultation on the need for this pressure to be included in the MTFP?

Name	Organisation/ department	Date
All secondary schools	Business Managers	May 2017

Has the specific budget pressure been consulted on?

Function	Date	Details of any changes made?
Department Management Team	10/10/2017	
Other Service Contributing to / impacted		
Senior leadership team		
Select Committee		
Public or other stakeholders		
Cabinet (sign off to proceed)		

Will any further consultation be needed?

Name	Organisation/ department	Date
We will consult with secondary schools on distribution if the pressure is realised		

Final pressure approved by Cabinet

Date:

1 Vision and Outcomes of the Pressure Mandate

Give a business context for the budget pressure. This must pick up on the vision and what the new / improved / reduced service will look like in the future including the anticipated experience of users. It must also consider any impact on the Council's key priorities and strategic outcomes. Similarly does it impact on service performance within the immediate service area or any impact on other services provided by the authority / any other providers. In doing so, the pressure mandate must be tested against the equality impact assessment and sustainable development impact assessment and must consider impact in relation to the new Future Generations Bill.

What are the outcomes of investing in the identified pressure?

Funding to schools would be more reflective of actual costs being incurred and therefore remaining funding devolved to schools can be better targeted towards teaching and learning as it is intended. This would be direct investment in Welsh Government priorities to give our learners the best outcomes possible and ensure appropriate pathways into further education.

This would be specifically targeted to Year 11, therefore allowing the remaining school budget not to be subsidising other areas.

Given that education is compulsory up until the age of 16, parents cannot be asked to make a financial contribution.

Expected positive impacts

As per point above.

Expected negative impacts

None.

2 Pressure proposed

Show how the budget pressure has been evidenced and will increase the current service budget. This must cover each year implicated. This section must also cover any other efficiency that will arise from the pressure.

What is the evidence for the pressure? How has it been estimated?								
All four business managers have individually calculated the additional financial cost of having to enrol their current co-hort of pupils onto the new compulsory examination sittings at their school. CYP Finance have collated this information and the total additional cost of these new examinations amounts to £167,000. We have been able to verify these costs against invoices processed through Agresso.								
Service area	Current Budget £	Proposed Cash Pressure £	Proposed non cash efficiencies – non £	Target year				Total pressure proposed
				17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	
Schools	£124,000	£167,000	N/A		£167,000	Then in base	Then in base	£167,000 in 18/19, and then for that to remain in CYP base budget.

3 Actions required to minimise the pressure

Describe the key activities that will be undertaken to minimise the investment required and the action holders. This includes any actions contributed to by other services. Give the timescales to complete the work. This must also factor in any business activities that will need to be done differently or cease in order to achieve the mandate.

Action	Officer/ Service responsible	Timescale
This is a requirement of Welsh Government – examination entry is compulsory.		

4 Additional skills/ business needs

Describe any additional skills, resource and capability needed in order to carry out the proposed mandate successfully. For example new expertise and knowledge etc..

Any additional capability required	Where will this come from	Any other resource/ business need (non-financial)
None – as schools have been subsidising this for a number of years, hence a significant contribution towards the deterioration of secondary school balances.		

5 Measuring performance on the mandate

How do you intend to measure the impact of the investing in the pressure identified? This will include budget measures and further possible measures that cover process, staff and customers. Targets need to be set over the duration of the mandate where appropriate.

Focus- Budget / Process / Staff / Customer	Indicator	Actual 2017/18	Actual 2018/19	Actual 2019/20	Target 2017/18	Target 2018/19	Target 2019/20
Budget	Direct improvement to year end projected balances.	-	£167,000		-	£167,000	-

6 Key Risks and Issues

Are there any potential barriers and risks that will need to be managed in delivering the outcomes expected from investing in the pressure identified, including any negative impacts identified in section 1 that need to be accounted for. Also, set out the steps that will be taken to mitigate these.

Barrier or Risk	Strategic/ Operational	Reason why identified (evidence)	Risk Level (High, Medium or Low) Based on a score assessing the probability & impact	Mitigating Actions

WJEC increase costs further as they have the monopoly.	Strategic	ADEW currently establishing the increases in cost/volume over the past few years to see whether they are in line with the English system.	Medium	This can only be challenged at a national level as this would require a Welsh Government change of policy.

7 Assumptions

Describe any assumptions made that underpin the justification for the option.

Assumption	Reason why assumption is being made (evidence)	Decision Maker
None made. All based on actual costs.		

8 Options

Prior to the pressure mandate being written, an options appraisal will have taken place. Summarise here the outcome of the Options considered and detail the rationale on why they were disregarded. (see options appraisal guide for further information)

Options	Reason why Option was not progressed	Decision Maker
Do nothing.	Continuation in the decline in secondary school reserves.	CYP DMT.

9 Monitoring the pressure mandate

The pressure mandates must be monitored through directorate budget monitoring. This will lead into corporate budget monitoring. In addition the action plan, performance measures and the risk assessment must be transferred into the service plans for the business area in order to monitor and challenge the delivery of the pressure mandate, including the performance being achieved and the level of impact.

SCHOOLS PAY AWARD 1% (CYP P3) EXPLANATION

Recent annual budget settlements have introduced cash flat line considerations to schools budgets.

Initial examination of CYP pressures (£288k) and savings proposals (£487k) introduces an indicative net saving of £199k.

Cabinet have requested that initial MTFP modelling includes the provision of 1% pay award for staff.

This has been calculated as circa £387k in 2018/19.

SCH PRESSURES

Pressure Mandate Proposal Number : SCH P1

Pressure Mandate Title : Increase in Domiciliary Care and Care Home provider fees due to introduction of the National Living Wage

All information requested must be completed on the proposed mandate to enable the Cabinet to decide whether to proceed with the proposal.

Mandate Completed by	<i>Tyrone Stokes</i>
Date	<i>10th September 2015 (amended 8th November 2017)</i>

Why is this pressure required?
<p>Current discussion is on the removal of the 1.7% non-pay budget inflation factor from the 2016/17 MTFP on the basis of present low to near zero RPI.</p> <p>Within the SCH 2016/17 budget we have a £8,822,039 third party budget covering payments to domiciliary care agencies providing 9,532 weekly hours of care as at 31st March 2015.</p> <p>For 2016/17 the current minimum wage of £6.50 per hour will be replaced by the Living wage of £7.20 per hour rising to £9 per hour in 2020, which is a direct cost to providers and impacts on our fees.</p> <p>In his budget statement this summer, the Chancellor announced that the current minimum wage will be replaced in 2016 with the Living wage of £7.20 per hour increasing to £9 per hour by 2020. Recent information gathered shows that these agencies can no</p>

longer bear the cost of wage increases and in order to sustain a supply market in this sector, we will need to reflect any future rises in our fees.

The United Kingdom Homecare Association (UKHCA) has sent out recent research suggesting a domiciliary care hourly fee rate of £16.70 be charged for domiciliary services. This research has been quoted by one of our major domiciliary care agency in a letter to Paul Matthews. If we compare the UKHCA rate against our current average framework rate of £12.52 per hour, this is over £4 per hour less. This mandate is not seeking to address this difference but to only acknowledge the Living wage increase from the current £6.50 minimum wage, and the future increases up to the £9 per hour in 2019/20.

In relation to Care Homes, we have a £10,186,788 third party budget covering payments to residential/nursing care homes for the elderly supporting 280 placements as at 31st March 2015.

Work we have done with the Adult Residential and Nursing care home sector through the “Fair Fee” exercise tells us that care providers have a cost base of 70% wages not sensitive to RPI but sensitive to wage increases, in this mandate Living Wage. We are unable to mitigate this increase and are contractually bound to reflect in our fees. The reason why we cannot mitigate this increase is that four years ago the Council agreed to undertake the fair fee exercise to defend the Council against a judicial review in not considering the true costs of running a care homes in its fees. Two Authorities namely Pembrokeshire and Vale of Glamorgan did have a judicial review and in the case of Pembrokeshire, led to a million plus sum in fines and legal costs and the back payment in increased fees.

Our fair fee toolkit does sufficiently safeguard the Authority from a potential judicial review but ties us into the need to understand the costs pressures that face care homes and to reflect this in our fees paid to homes. The fair fee toolkit uses the minimum wage as a base which will now be replaced by the Living Wage.

How much pressure is there and over what period?

£1,131,349 for 2016/17 just to address the introduced Living wage rate of £7.20. If we make an assumption on how the Government will increase the NLW to meet the pledged rate of £9 per hour in 2019/20, there needs to be a 60p per hour increase each year, which gives the annual pressure of £634,018 until the £9 per hour rate is reached.

Directorate & Service Area responsible

SCH and Community Care

Mandate lead(s)

Tyrone Stokes

Have you undertaken any initial consultation on the need for this pressure to be included in the MTFP?

Name	Organisation/ department	Date
Mark Howcroft	Assistant Head of Finance	20 th July then challenge panel 4 th September
Joy Robson	Head of Finance	20 th July then challenge panel 4 th September
Simon Burch	Former SCH Director	20 th July
Julie Boothroyd	Interim SCH Director	20 th July

Has the specific budget pressure been consulted on?

Function	Date	Details of any changes made?
Department Management Team		
Other Service Contributing to / impacted		
Senior leadership team		
Select Committee		
Public or other stakeholders		
Cabinet (sign off to proceed)		

Will any further consultation be needed?

Name	Organisation/ department	Date

Final pressure approved by Cabinet

Date:

--	--

1 Vision and Outcomes of the Pressure Mandate

Give a business context for the budget pressure. This must pick up on the vision and what the new / improved / reduced service will look like in the future including the anticipated experience of users. It must also consider any impact on the Council’s key priorities and strategic outcomes. Similarly does it impact on service performance within the immediate service area or any impact on other services provided by the authority / any other providers. In doing so, the pressure mandate must be tested against the equality impact assessment and sustainable development impact assessment and must consider impact in relation to the new Future Generations Bill.

What are the outcomes of investing in the identified pressure?
To ensure we have a market that will contract with the Authority and provide sustainable services.
Expected positive impacts
Harbour good relations with providers and sustain a viable market which can meet cost pressures through the introduction of the Living wage to care staff.
Expected negative impacts
Domiciliary care agencies will decide not to contract with Monmouthshire and of those that do, face financial hardship. Over the past 12 months four agencies have gone financially insolvent and we are currently working with two who are on the edge of insolvency.

2 Pressure proposed

Show how the budget pressure has been evidenced and will increase the current service budget. This must cover each year implicated. This section must also cover any other efficiency that will arise from the pressure.

What is the evidence for the pressure? How has it been estimated?									
Evidence for the pressure is based on the introduction of the Living Wage hourly rate of £7.20 in 2016 and research issued by the UKHCA. We have determined the pressure using the weekly care hours provided.									
The total estimated pressure is £1,131,348 but a decision has been taken to opt for the high risk mitigation of reducing this pressure by £200,000 (£200,000 mitigation in total across domiciliary care and residential care sectors).									
The Government pledge is the increase the National Living Wage (NLW) each year until it reaches £9 per hour in 2019/20.									
Service area	Current Budget £	Proposed Cash Pressure £	Proposed non cash efficiencies – non £	Target years					Total pressure proposed
				16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	
Community Care	£19,008,827	£931,348	0	£931,348	£434,018	£434,018	£434,018	£0	£2,233,402

3 Actions to required to minimise the pressure

Describe the key activities that will be undertaken to minimise the investment required and the action holders. This includes any actions contributed to by other services. Give the timescales to complete the work. This must also factor in any business activities that will need to be done differently or cease in order to achieve the mandate.

Action	Officer/ Service responsible	Timescale
There are two distinct areas of action: -		
Action 1 – Work with providers to gauge the level of workers under 25, any mitigation from future tax assistance by the Chancellor and VAT reclaims are maximised. Industry advice will be obtained from	Shelley Welton and Tyrone Stokes	31 st March 2016

consultants such Rockhaven Healthcare Ltd to fully understand and maximise opportunities.		
Action 2 – Embark on a piece of work to understand, review and scrutinise rate increases thereby entering negotiations to limit any impact.	Ceri York and Shelley Welton	Initial scoping by 31 st March 2016

4 Additional skills/ business needs

Describe any additional skills, resource and capability needed in order to carry out the proposed mandate successfully. For example new expertise and knowledge etc..

Any additional capability required	Where will this come from	Any other resource/ business need (non-financial)

5 Measuring performance on the mandate

How do you intend to measure the impact of the investing in the pressure identified? This will include budget measures and further possible measures that cover process, staff and customers. Targets need to be set over the duration of the mandate where appropriate.

Focus- Budget / Process /	Indicator	Actual 2016/17	Actual 2017/18	Actual 2018/19	Target 2016/17	Target 2017/18	Target 2018/19

Staff / Customer							

6 Key Risks and Issues

Are there any potential barriers and risks that will need to be managed in delivering the outcomes expected from investing in the pressure identified, including any negative impacts identified in section 1 that need to be accounted for. Also, set out the steps that will be taken to mitigate these.

Barrier or Risk	Strategic/ Operational	Reason why identified (evidence)	Risk Level (High, Medium or Low) Based on a score assessing the probability & impact	Mitigating Actions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of people aged 25 and under is not known and any there is a risk we might over-estimate. • There may be no compensatory tax breaks announced by the Chancellor. • Many providers will not wish to take the opportunity to reconfigure to enable the recovery of VAT. • Some providers have an active self funding market and may 	Both		<p>In considering the likely reductions that could result from undertaking these two courses of action it is suggested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A confident estimate: £100,000 • With some risk of non-achievement: £150,000 • With a high risk of non-achievement of all mitigations: £200,000 	<p>Reduce the amount reflected in rates paid to providers by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Factoring in people who are under 25 who will not qualify for the National Living Wage. • Assuming that the Chancellor of the Exchequer will introduce measures such as tax breaks to offset some of the effects of the National Living wage for providers.

<p>decide not to seek business from the Council thus placing areas where it is difficult to attract providers at greater risk.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Much of the 'right sizing' work has already been undertaken so the likelihood of identifying significant reductions is limited. • Providers may decide not to accept Monmouthshire's business. Many of the spot purchase arrangements are in place to accommodate gaps in the market. • Some potential savings from reducing rates could be double-counted as they may have already been attributed to a separate adult services mandate. • Future transformation approaches are based on good relationships and this approach could put these at risk. 			<p>The decision at SLT has been taken to opt for the high risk action which spans both the National Living Wage pressures so £100,000 will be attributed to the Domiciliary care pressure and the other £100,000 to the residential care pressure.</p>	<p>Making strenuous efforts to encourage providers to alter their status to enable them to recover VAT. Many of the care management arrangements in Social Care and Health are individually negotiated. Whilst it is fully expected that providers will uplift the set rates to reflect the National Living Wage, Officers have agreed to undertake a process to review and scrutinise rates that appear to higher than the norm with a view to negotiating a reduced increase.</p>
---	--	--	--	---

7 Assumptions

Describe any assumptions made that underpin the justification for the option.

Assumption	Reason why assumption is being made (evidence)	Decision Maker
------------	--	----------------

8 Options

Prior to the pressure mandate being written, an options appraisal will have taken place. Summarise here the outcome of the Options considered and detail the rationale on why they were disregarded. (see options appraisal guide for further information)

Options	Reason why Option was not progressed	Decision Maker
Do not reflect Living wage increases in our fee	Care agencies face financial hardship, domiciliary care business in no longer viable in Monmouthshire	Julie Boothroyd
Increase eligibility criteria	<p>Previous raising of eligible criteria has not materialised savings. Adult services approach to manage practice is by maximising support from family and community before providing formal services, which has resulted in Community Care delivering to budget, despite demographics and increased complexity pressures.</p> <p>In addition, mandate 34 has addressed the raising of eligibility criteria to removing the 'moderate' threshold.</p>	Julie Boothroyd
Reduce services provided	As with above this is addressed in mandate 34 and mirrors our current direction of travel. At present we are looking to support service users	Julie Boothroyd

	through community support, small local enterprises and community co-ordination that will see less reliance on formal support and a more blended approach for people to remain safe and connected to communities.	
--	--	--

9 Monitoring the pressure mandate

The pressure mandates must be monitored through directorate budget monitoring. This will lead into corporate budget monitoring. In addition the action plan, performance measures and the risk assessment must be transferred into the service plans for the business area in order to monitor and challenge the delivery of the pressure mandate, including the performance being achieved and the level of impact.

Pressure Mandate Proposal Number: SCH P2

Pressure Mandate Title : Capital threshold increase pressures

All information requested must be completed on the proposed mandate to enable the Cabinet to decide whether to proceed with the proposal.

Mandate Completed by	Tyrone Stokes
Date	8 th November 2017

Why is this pressure required?

As part of a series of financial support measures by the Welsh Government borne out of the introduction of the Social Services and Wellbeing (SSWB) Act 2014, the capital threshold limit will be increased from its current level of £24,000 as at 2016/17, to £50,000 in 2020/21.

The capital threshold limit is the amount an individual is allowed to keep before they are able to apply to the Local Authority for funding of residential/nursing care.

The present level as at 2016/17 was £24,000 set under the old Community Care Act and the Charging for Residential Accommodation Guidelines.

From the introduction of the SSWB Act 2014, and the replacement of its charging regulations which came into force from 1st April 2016, the Government announced the capital threshold would be increased from 2017/18 to £30,000 up to a maximum of £50,000 in 2020/21.

The Government announced a financial grant to compensate Local Authorities and it would be disbursed under the present Older Peoples funding formula.

Based on the amount of clients that were previously self funding and their capital fell below the capital threshold limit in 2016/17, we had 14 in seven months during 2016/17 so full year we could expect 23. The calculated annual pressure would far exceed the grant so there is a net annual pressure which will not be met by the grant provided.

How much pressure is there and over what period?

Based on the expected number of clients that will fall into Local Authority funding under the increased capital threshold limits, for 2017/18 the increase to £30,000 will result in a GROSS pressure of £629,000. When we offset the grant of £128,000, the net annual pressure for 2017/18 is £501,000.

If we assume the capital threshold limit will increase by a further £6K each year (being £36K in 2018/19 and £42K in 2019/20), in 2020/21 the increase will be £8K to the £50K limit the Government has pledged.

Therefore the NET pressure for 2018/19 will be £501,000, 2019/20 will be a further £501,000 and the final year 2020/21 will be £668,000.

Directorate & Service Area responsible

SC&H and Community Care division

Mandate lead(s)

Tyrone Stokes

Have you undertaken any initial consultation on the need for this pressure to be included in the MTFP?

Name	Organisation/ department	Date
Tyrone Stokes	SC&H	July to September 2016

Has the specific budget pressure been consulted on?

Function	Date	Details of any changes made?
Department Management Team	17/10/16	SCH DMT

Will any further consultation be needed?		
Name	Organisation/ department	Date
No		

Final pressure approved by Cabinet	Date: When the 2017/18 MTFP was agreed

1 Vision and Outcomes of the Pressure Mandate

Give a business context for the budget pressure. This must pick up on the vision and what the new / improved / reduced service will look like in the future including the anticipated experience of users. It must also consider any impact on the Council's key priorities and strategic outcomes. Similarly does it impact on service performance within the immediate service area or any impact on other services provided by the authority / any other providers. In doing so, the pressure mandate must be tested against the equality impact assessment and sustainable development impact assessment and must consider impact in relation to the new Future Generations Bill.

What are the outcomes of investing in the identified pressure?

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows the Council to meet the legal obligations of meeting funding for clients who's capital falls below the introduced capital threshold limit, • Makes sure the Council are compliant with its obligations under the SSWB Act, • Social Care to have the budget available to meet these obligations set by Government.
Expected positive impacts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promotes the Government pledge under this scheme, • From the client perspective allows them to retain more of their capital when going into a residential/nursing care home setting
Expected negative impacts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional financial burden for the Local Authority which unfortunately as the grant provision is hypothecated, Monmouthshire doesn't get the true cost met, • The grant provision did not consider nor recognise other factors that have a financial impact on Local Authorities such as clients that were previously self funding have a higher weekly fee level which then transfers over to the Local Authority when their capital falls to the higher threshold limit, • Clients lose Attendance Allowance and Severe Disability payments when they become eligible for Local Authority financial support, which again were not recognised by Welsh Government when introducing this scheme, • More clients into Local Authority funding for residential/nursing care provision.

2 Pressure proposed

Show how the budget pressure has been evidenced and will increase the current service budget. This must cover each year implicated. This section must also cover any other efficiency that will arise from the pressure.

	What is the evidence for the pressure? How has it been estimated?					
	As above.					
Service area					Target year	

	Current Budget £	Proposed Cash Pressure £	Proposed non cash efficiencies – non £	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	Total pressure proposed
Community Care	£10,186,788	£2,171,000		£501K	£501K	£501K	£668K	£2,171,000

3 Actions required to minimise the pressure

Describe the key activities that will be undertaken to minimise the investment required and the action holders. This includes any actions contributed to by other services. Give the timescales to complete the work. This must also factor in any business activities that will need to be done differently or cease in order to achieve the mandate.

Action	Officer/ Service responsible	Timescale
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		

4 Additional skills/ business needs

Describe any additional skills, resource and capability needed in order to carry out the proposed mandate successfully. For example new expertise and knowledge etc..

Any additional capability required	Where will this come from	Any other resource/ business need (non-financial)

5 Measuring performance on the mandate

How do you intend to measure the impact of the investing in the pressure identified? This will include budget measures and further possible measures that cover process, staff and customers. Targets need to be set over the duration of the mandate where appropriate.

Focus- Budget / Process / Staff / Customer	Indicator	Actual 2017/18	Actual 2018/19	Actual 2019/20	Target 2017/18	Target 2018/19	Target 2019/20

6 Key Risks and Issues

Are there any potential barriers and risks that will need to be managed in delivering the outcomes expected from investing in the pressure identified, including any negative impacts identified in section 1 that need to be accounted for. Also, set out the steps that will be taken to mitigate these.

Barrier or Risk	Strategic/ Operational	Reason why identified (evidence)	Risk Level (High, Medium or Low) Based on a score assessing the probability & impact	Mitigating Actions

7 Assumptions

Describe any assumptions made that underpin the justification for the option.

Assumption	Reason why assumption is being made (evidence)	Decision Maker
		DJ/LD
		DJ/HO

8 Options

Prior to the pressure mandate being written, an options appraisal will have taken place. Summarise here the outcome of the Options considered and detail the rationale on why they were disregarded. (see options appraisal guide for further information)

Options	Reason why Option was not progressed	Decision Maker

9 Monitoring the pressure mandate

The pressure mandates must be monitored through directorate budget monitoring. This will lead into corporate budget monitoring. In addition the action plan, performance measures and the risk assessment must be transferred into the service plans for the business area in order to monitor and challenge the delivery of the pressure mandate, including the performance being achieved and the level of impact.

Budget Project Pressure and Savings Proposal Combined 2018/19 (SCH P3)

This form should be completed in full for all proposals of £50,000 and over, and for proposals of less than where the impact will be felt directly by citizens. For proposals below this threshold you can complete questions 1 and 2 only and then use your service plan to capture your actions, measures and risks.

Form completed by	Jane Rodgers
Date	05/10/17
Reference Number	SCH P2

Service area	Children's Services
Directorate	SCH
Savings targets (based on 17/18 budget)	
2018/19	Savings = £112,564 (£357,217 off set by £244,653* workforce pressures) Anticipated Overspend b/fwd from 2017/18 = £561,000 Overspend c/fwd = £448,436
2019/20	Savings £189,294 Overspend b/fwd from 2018/19 = £448,436 Overspend c/fwd = £259,142
2020/21	Savings £189,294 Overspend b/fwd from 2019/20 = £259,142 Overspend c/fwd = £69,848
2021/22	Savings = £189,294 Overspend b/fwd from 2020/21 = £69,848 Net Savings = £119,446

* £244,653 is the worst case scenario taken from the business case for workforce pressures

CURRENT PROJECTED OVERSPEND for the Service @ M5 = £641,000 (based on dynamic forecasting model) of which £80,000 relates to pressure of agency staff = £561,000 (see business case)

Project lead & Key project team members	Jane Rodgers Rhian Evans Charlotte Drury Tyrone Stokes / Rob Long Claire Robins Craig Williams
--	---

1 Vision and outcomes of the project

Give a business context for the project. Include what the new / improved / reduced service will look like in the future. Consider the impact in the service area and on any other services provided by the Council. From the service user and service provider perspective.

What does the project propose to do?

Delivering Excellence in Children's Services

Monmouthshire Children's Services are currently implementing a 3 year improvement programme with inter-related work streams spanning areas of workforce, social work practice, commissioning, expanding placement provision, increasing our in-house fostering provision, edge of care and family support. The project aims to achieve sustainable change which is built on best practice foundations and within that to achieve a financially sustainable service that makes best use of resources both regionally and locally.

Expected impact of the project?

3 areas have been identified where savings could be achieved.

1. Increasing opportunities for children with more complex / specialist needs, currently placed in residential placements, to be cared for by MCC carers
2. Incentivising Independent Fostering Agency (IFA) carers **currently** looking after MCC children to transfer to MCC terms and conditions
3. Recouping the financial contribution from Health for a young person who meets the criteria for continuing care

2 Savings proposed

Show how project will deliver savings against the current service budget, will this be a saving or income generation. This must be profiled over each year implicated.

What savings are expected to be achieved?			
	Year	Proposed Savings (£)	Proposed income generation (£)
1	2018/19 and over each subsequent year	Unit Cost Residential = £194,096 Unit cost MCC carer (enhanced package / IFA) = £46,084 Unit Cost saving = £148,012	Bring back 1 child from residential to foster care
2	2018/19 Each subsequent year	Unit cost IFA = £46,084 Unit cost MCC carer = £25,443 Unit cost saving = £20,641 Proposed saving 2018/19 = £103,205 Proposed yearly saving over 3 subsequent years = £41,282	Transfer carers from IFAs to MCC carers, 5 placements in the first year and 2 in each subsequent year.
3	2018/19 only	7 months of 50% placement costs = £106,000	Achieve health contribution @ 50% for one placement

			where continuing health care is met

NB UNIT COSTS USED ARE BASED ON M2 FORECASTS YEAR 2017/18

3 Options appraisal

List all options that have/are being considered (further details on these may be required to inform scrutiny/decision making reports)

Option 1
Do Nothing
Reason why not progressed/progressed?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In line with national and local trends, demands for Looked After Services will continue to increase. To do nothing would increase cost to MCC through on-going reliance on IFA and residential placements • Achieving Monmouthshire carers for Monmouthshire children is in keeping with intended strategic direction and should help us achieve better outcomes for our Looked After Children.
Option 2
Proposed ADM for fostering
Reason why not progressed/progressed?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional delivery models will be implemented in the medium term under the National Fostering Framework and through the Children and Families Regional Partnership. • MCC require a short-term solution that will work in parallel with the development of regional ADMs

4 Actions to deliver the project

Describe the key activities that will be undertaken to deliver the project and the action holders. This provides a further breakdown of the actions that need to be taken, each project should also be included in the service plan action.

Action	Timescale
<u>Implementation of Fostering Project</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recruitment and Retention carers - Targeted care planning for individual children currently in residential settings - Targeted recruitment of carers specific to individual children - Increase 'bespoke' offers for 'therapeutic carers' - Development of family support within CS including foster carers - Target specific recruitment for individual children current with IFA carers - Development of enhanced fee structure and support packages for complex children 	Already commenced and on-going
<u>Continuing Care</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use existing mechanisms to implement dispute resolution for individual young person - Develop integrated CHC policy with ABUHB for shared decision making in complex cases and dispute resolution process 	Already commenced

5 Additional resource/ business needs

Have you identified any resource / capacity required to carry out the project?

Area resource required	What will this be used for?
Consultancy until March 2018	Project lead for the implementation of the Fostering Project

6 Key Risks and Issues

Are there any initial barriers or risks that have been identified at this early stage. Any actions to mitigate risk should be included in section 4 and any ongoing risks include in the main service plan risk register.

Risk	Reason why identified	Risk Level (High, Medium or Low – see risk matrix)
Carers will not be willing to transfer to MCC terms	Carers will not have sufficient motivation or incentive to leave the IFAs IFAs may 'up their offer' to counteract MCC attempts to bring carers over	Medium
Loss of good will with existing MCC carers	It has happened in the past	High
Carers with the skills required to meet the needs of identified children will not be found	There is a national shortage of skilled foster carers	High
Other young people not currently identified will need residential placements	We are working with a dynamic population both those within the LAC system and young people still living with their families. The situation can change quickly and is not stable or predictable.	High
There will be a breakdown in partnership relationships with health	The issue of health financial contributions has been a source of tension over a long period. There is a lack of national guidance or direction in respect of CC for children.	Medium

7 Evaluation

How will you measure the impact of the proposal? What are the measures that you expect to see change as a result of what you're proposing. This could be positive or negative. When will you evaluate the change?

Metric	Baseline
NET increase of placements per year	17 carers representing 23 placements
Numbers of MCC placements : IFA placements	23 : 48
Numbers of IFA carers transferred to MCC	0 representing 0 placements
# of children meeting criteria for CHC or Sec 117 funding and % proportion of funding received from health	TO BE DEVELOPED
# on CASP prevented from becoming LAC (WG indicator)	59.6% (Aug 2017)
# LAC	147
# CP	104

Evaluation Date	6 monthly intervals
-----------------	---------------------

8 Future Generations Evaluation

The project must be assessed from the start against the equality impact assessment and sustainable development impact assessment using the [Future Generations Evaluation](#).

9 Next steps for budget projects

- i. The project form will be subject to internal review, as well as scrutiny through the political decision making process, at which point further information may need to be provided.
- ii. An evaluation timescale will need to be set out to detail how and when the progress and impact of the project will be evaluated
- iii. In addition the project should be incorporated within service plan arrangements to monitor the progress and impact of the project on the service.

Safeguarding Post (SCH P4) – Incurred following Council report



SUBJECT:	Safeguarding and Quality Assurance Service Manager
MEETING:	COUNCIL REPORT
DATE:	9th March 2017
DIVISION/WARDS AFFECTED:	All/ Whole Authority

1. PURPOSE

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek approval to create a Safeguarding and Quality Assurance Service Manager to provide leadership to whole authority safeguarding and manage the Safeguarding and Quality Assurance Unit.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 That members approve and endorse the proposal for creation of a Safeguarding and Quality Assurance Service Manager and the revised structure for the Safeguarding and Quality Assurance Service Unit within Appendix 2 to this report.

2.2. Members agree to reserve fund the c£60k for 2017/18. The budget will need to be substantially into the 2018/19 budget round.

3. KEY ISSUES:

- 3.1 Safeguarding children and adults at risk has the very highest priority in Monmouthshire County Council. Safeguarding is recognised as everybody's business and considerable progress has been made over the last 5 years to systematically embed safeguarding culture, knowledge and practice in every area of the Council's responsibility. There are, however, areas where the understanding and operation of safeguarding are not yet of the standard they need to be. We need to be constantly vigilant in understanding the effectiveness of our governance and assurance systems.
- 3.2 The Safeguarding and Quality Assurance Unit has a very important role in supporting safeguarding in Monmouthshire. The Unit works with directorates to support them to understand their safeguarding responsibilities and improve their practice. The Council has developed a SAFE self-assessment tool which has recently been reviewed and strengthened to incorporate adult as well as children's safeguarding. An analysis of the Unit, and its ability to deliver its' purpose, has highlighted the need to strengthen leadership and capacity to ensure it is fit for purpose; i.e. to enable it to support to all parts of the Council in their self –evaluation and analysis and improvement actions arising from their evaluation.
- 3.3 The Service Manager post recommended in this report will ensure manage a Joint Children and Adult safeguarding unit comprising the following functions: independent review of Looked After Children (LAC), co-ordination of child protection and Protection of Vulnerable Adults (POVA), safeguarding in education and corporate safeguarding. The postholder will works with a variety of partners both internal and external to the Council. and be the main operational link to the Gwent-wide Children and Adult Safeguarding Boards which are now on a statutory footing. The postholder will also be responsible for driving up standards and good safeguarding practice within the borders of Monmouthshire and across Council services. The post-holder will be part of the Children's Social Services division within

Social Care and Health and as such the changes proposed in this report would amend the structure approved by Cabinet in January 2017 (**Appendix 1**)

4. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

- 4.1 The creation of the Safeguarding and Quality Assurance Service Manager is a financial pressure of £60k. It is proposed that in 2017/18 this is reserve funded; it will need to be substantively reflected in the 2018/19 budget build.

5. WELLBEING OF FUTURE GENERATIONS IMPLICATIONS (INCORPORATING EQUALITIES, SUSTAINABILITY, SAFEGUARDING AND CORPORATE PARENTING)

- 5.1 Strengthening safeguarding leadership and capacity impacts positively on all children, young people and their families and adults at risk. The impact will be regularly updated and reviewed to ensure fitness for purpose. The proposed structure looks to will increase effectiveness of safeguarding arrangements and put the Council in a strong position to deliver the all age approach set out within the Social Services and Well Being Act.

6. CONSULTEES:

Jane Rodgers, Head of Children's Services and Safeguarding
Senior Leadership Team

7. BACKGROUND PAPERS

Children's Services – Service Redesign – Cabinet, January 11, 2017.

7. AUTHOR:

Claire Marchant, Chief Officer, Social Care and Health

8. CONTACT DETAILS:

Tel: 01633 644054

E-mail: clairemarchant@monmouthshire.gov.uk

ENTERPRISE PRESSURES

Pressure Mandate Proposal Number :ENT P1

Pressure Mandate Title : Monmouth Pool

All information requested must be completed on the proposed mandate to enable the Cabinet to decide whether to proceed with the proposal.

Mandate Completed by	<i>Ian Saunders</i>
Date	<i>01st Nov 2017</i>

Why is this pressure required?
As per the reprovision of Monmouth Swimming Pool agreed by members and the democratic process as part of the future schools/ Monmouth Leisure Centre projects.
How much pressure is there and over what period?
146k
Directorate & Service Area responsible
Enterprise – Leisure Services
Mandate lead(s)

Richard Simpkins/Marie Bartlett

Have you undertaken any initial consultation on the need for this pressure to be included in the MTFP?

Name	Organisation/ department	Date

Has the specific budget pressure been consulted on?

Function	Date	Details of any changes made?
Department Management Team		
Other Service Contributing to / impacted		
Senior leadership team		
Select Committee		
Public or other stakeholders		
Cabinet (sign off to proceed)		

Will any further consultation be needed?

Name	Organisation/ department	Date

Final pressure approved by Cabinet

Date:

1. Vision and Outcomes of the Pressure Mandate

Give a business context for the budget pressure. This must pick up on the vision and what the new / improved / reduced service will look like in the future including the anticipated experience of users. It must also consider any impact on the Council's key priorities and strategic outcomes. Similarly does it impact on service performance within the immediate service area or any impact on other services provided by the authority / any other providers. In doing so, the pressure mandate must be tested against the equality impact assessment and sustainable development impact assessment and must consider impact in relation to the new Future Generations Bill.

What are the outcomes of investing in the identified pressure?
Expected positive impacts
Expected negative impacts

2. Pressure proposed

Show how the budget pressure has been evidenced and will increase the current service budget. This must cover each year implicated. This section must also cover any other efficiency that will arise from the pressure.

What is the evidence for the pressure? How has it been estimated?								
Service area	Current Budget £	Proposed Cash Pressure £	Proposed non cash efficiencies – non £	Target year				Total pressure proposed
				17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	

3. Actions to required to minimise the pressure

Describe the key activities that will be undertaken to minimise the investment required and the action holders. This includes any actions contributed to by other services. Give the timescales to complete the work. This must also factor in any business activities that will need to be done differently or cease in order to achieve the mandate.

Action	Officer/ Service responsible	Timescale

4. Additional skills/ business needs

Describe any additional skills, resource and capability needed in order to carry out the proposed mandate successfully. For example new expertise and knowledge etc..

Any additional capability required	Where will this come from	Any other resource/ business need (non-financial)

5. Measuring performance on the mandate

How do you intend to measure the impact of the investing in the pressure identified? This will include budget measures and further possible measures that cover process, staff and customers. Targets need to be set over the duration of the mandate where appropriate.

Focus- Budget / Process / Staff / Customer	Indicator	Actual 2017/18	Actual 2018/19	Actual 2019/20	Target 2017/18	Target 2018/19	Target 2019/20

6. Key Risks and Issues

Are there any potential barriers and risks that will need to be managed in delivering the outcomes expected from investing in the pressure identified, including any negative impacts identified in section 1 that need to be accounted for. Also, set out the steps that will be taken to mitigate these.

Barrier or Risk	Strategic/ Operational	Reason why identified (evidence)	Risk Level (High, Medium or Low) Based on a score assessing the probability & impact	Mitigating Actions

7. Assumptions

Describe any assumptions made that underpin the justification for the option.

Assumption	Reason why assumption is being made (evidence)	Decision Maker

8. Options

Prior to the pressure mandate being written, an options appraisal will have taken place. Summarise here the outcome of the Options considered and detail the rationale on why they were disregarded. (see options appraisal guide for further information)

Options	Reason why Option was not progressed	Decision Maker

9. Monitoring the pressure mandate

The pressure mandates must be monitored through directorate budget monitoring. This will lead into corporate budget monitoring. In addition the action plan, performance measures and the risk assessment must be transferred into the service plans for the business area in order to monitor and challenge the delivery of the pressure mandate, including the performance being achieved and the level of impact.

SUBJECT: Investment Proposal Monmouth Leisure Centre

MEETING:	County Council
DATE:	27th July 2017
DIVISION/WARDS AFFECTED:	Monmouth

1. PURPOSE:

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to re-present the Business Case for the replacement pool and the significant redesign of Monmouth Leisure Centre, following cabinet approval to spend £204,000 to identify cost certainty in January 2017. Cost certainty has now been established at £6,989,109 for the main build.
- 1.2 To provide the school and community with a temporary structure and negate the loss of the sports hall facility during the build. The building costs including the temporary structure increase to a maximum of £7,404,539 depending on site logistics on known information. However the most likely scenario is the total cost would be £7,276,704. **The additional site closure will result in the loss of a net revenue figure of £146,486.**
- 1.3 To consider the four options volunteered as a way to progress the project, listed in 3.5, recommending the most pragmatic (option 2) for approval.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 To approve the overall funding envelop of £7,404,539 to deliver the new pool and building re-design as indicated in the resources section. This includes the following:
 - Additional funding from the S106 agreement has been confirmed at £985,000 from the Wonastow Road Development.
 - There is also £1,928,000 that has been confirmed by Welsh Government, which is committed to the project.

- The income assumptions from having new and different facilities is anticipated to be sufficient to support £3,580,000 of the capital expenditure necessary.
- The council will borrow the remainder, appreciating an allowance was made by Members during budget setting process 2017-18 to create £500k headroom in Council's treasury budget, to support 5 particular policy commitments, of which this was one.
- There could be potential of further funding depending on developments from section 106 in the local area (but this is not included in the calculations).

For this investment the community will be benefiting from a state of the art facility in response to the Well-being and Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 including:

- A 5 lane 25 metre swimming pool
- 50-60 station fitness facility and additional studios
- A large adventure play facility with café

Please refer to page 7 of the Final Business Case for further information on facilities included.

2.2 To approve option 2 with the installation of a temporary structure of 700 metre squared to replace the existing sports hall whilst the works are being completed at a minimum cost of £287,595 and a maximum cost of £415,430 pending suitable planning and a flood consequences survey.

3. KEY ISSUES:

3.1 Cost certainty on the Leisure facility has resulted in an increased figure to £6,989,109 through price inflation and a client risk contingency sum, which identified a number of additional costs associated with the scheme in liaison with our Property Services and the Contractors. Such areas as ground conditions, IT requirements and out of hour's security all contributed to this figure.

3.2 Following the demolition of the swimming pool in March 2016 Council agreed to re-provide the facility and the community continue to engage with Leisure Services on the proposed date for completion. Expectations are high from within the community but the improved offer should more than satisfy demand for future generations.

3.3 Following consultation with the school it has been identified that the closure of the Sports Hall will lead to on-site PE provision no longer being available. Furthermore, disruption to exam timetabling due to lack of suitable on-site amenities could have a detrimental impact on student attainment and safeguarding. This could impact on students' future career pathways and the continued improvement of outcomes in Monmouth Comprehensive School.

3.4 Planning has since been granted for the building proposal as mentioned in the Cabinet report presented in January 2017.

3.5 As a result four options have been identified to mitigate any issues this may cause:

- **Option One** – Reinstatement refurbishment of Leisure Centre and new pool, leaving the school without any Sports Hall provision (cost certainty option);
- **Option Two** – Reinstatement refurbishment of Leisure Centre and new pool with temporary sports hall type structure with a caveat that the Sports Hall in the Leisure Centre will remain open until the temporary structure is in place;
- **Option Three** – Delay whole Leisure Centre build project until school site is complete;
- **Option Four** – Build Leisure Centre now resulting in Sports Hall remaining open until School build is complete and then convert the existing sports hall into a swimming pool.

3.6 The table below outlines the 'Pros and Cons' of each of the four options:

Table One – Situational Analysis of Four Options

Analysis	Option One	Option Two	Option Three	Option Four
Pros	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Honours decision to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per option one; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School retains 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School retains

	<p>return pool facility;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintains leisure centre staff morale; • Keeps leisure centre build project on financial target. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides on-site Sports Hall like facility to address school issues. 	<p>Sports Hall facility.</p>	<p>Sports Hall facility;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community benefits from new leisure facilities.
Cons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fails to address school concerns as leaves school without Sports Hall provision; • Plan are already in place to mitigate impact, school will therefore be compromised and will need review issues at a very late stage in proceedings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional costs for structure; • Potential Impact on school safeguarding; health & safety; timetabling; • Will take time to address site issues e.g. flood assessment surveys, safety concerns, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional financial costs due to inflation and additional loss of income; • Continuing lack of leisure facilities, impact on community well-being; • Broken promise to the community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional financial costs due to inflation and additional loss of income; • Doesn't solve pool delay, still no facilities for three and a half years, so still broken promise.
Risks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disruption to school management; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Siting of temporary structure within 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased impact on already 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased impact on already

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall safety and well-being of students could be compromised 	timeframe proves to be impractical	constrained budgets; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reputational risk to the Authority. 	constrained budgets; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reputational risk to the Authority.
--	--	------------------------------------	--	--

3.7 Table Two below provides a detailed financial analysis of the four options:

Options for the Redevelopment of Monmouth Leisure Centre	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
	Refurbish Leisure Centre and New Pool £	Refurbish Leisure Centre and New pool with temporary structure £	Delay whole project until School build is complete £	Refurbish Leisure Centre now, build pool when school build complete £
Cost of Project				
Cost of Works	5,379,557	5,379,557	5,379,557	5,379,557
Contingency & risk allowance	290,250	290,250	290,250	290,250
Additional costs from phasing	0	0	0	371,137
Extra Inflation on works delay	0	0	375,000	50,000
Equipment etc.	1,319,302	1,319,302	1,319,302	1,319,302
Inflation on Equipment delay	0	0	98,000	0
Facility Costs Sub total	6,989,109	6,989,109	7,462,109	7,410,246
Temporary structure	0	287,595	0	0

If temporary structure needs to be raised above 450mm		127,835		
Total Costs	6,989,109	7,404,539	7,462,109	7,410,246
Revenue impact				
Costs of Site Closure	146,486	146,486	146,486	133,157
Loss of additional surplus - 1 year	0	172,000	172,000	112,000
School Disruption Risk				76,000
Total	7,135,595	7,723,025	7,780,595	7,731,403
Net Additional Cost from option 1	0	459,595	645,000	595,808

Completion	Oct 2018	Dec 2018	July 2019	Other: May 2018
				Pool: April 2019
Planning delay		Jan 2019		

Based on 450mm

Based on 6 week delay risk should the programme be frustrated through school programming

Worked through from existing budgets and best assumptions on projected lost income

3.8 Based on the above table and all considerations option two is the preferred option because it allows the school curriculum to continue whilst ensuring the Monmouth build is not further delayed impacting upon the community.

3.9 The project is expected to take 55 weeks and as it's on a dual use site that is also undertaking a school rebuild, it is anticipated an initial 31 week shut down. Week 32 could see part of the centre re-opened (play, cafe, health & fitness) with the exception of the pool that would open at the end of the build programme. Significant health and safety issues have been identified which would indicate that it may be in the best interests of MCC and the community to close the site for the whole period of the development.

4. REASONS:

4.1 The service has provided sound reasons for the Monmouth project in the attached business case. These are summarised below;

- To meet the requirements of the Well-being and Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 which seeks to improve the social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being of Wales. This project will play a fundamental role in ensuring we improve people's lives through health and well-being. The learning to swim programmes fit with Sport Wales strategic aspirations, which is that 'Every Child is Hooked on Sport for Life and every child a swimmer' and the second is for a 'Nation of Champions'.
- The project also aims to react to the flat lining levels of sport participation and high levels of inactivity and to create a more physically active population where children and young people enjoy the best sporting opportunities available and people of all ages and backgrounds can enjoy the many benefits that sport and physical activity bring, at every stage in their lives.
- It is recognised that 'sport' is no longer delivered solely for 'sport' sake and that increasing participation in sport and physical activity and reducing levels of inactivity are key to both local and national government to achieve outcomes in public health (physical and mental), adult social care and education.

4.2 The new facility would meet current Amateur Swimming Association (ASA), Sport Wales, Curriculum and club requirements. It will also be DDA compliant, the revenue costs will be reduced and changing facilities would meet current requirements.

5. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

5.1 The full business case confirms the cost certainty for building a new 25m five lane swimming pool, removing the sports hall and adding and enhancing more commercial leisure activities such as adventure play, fitness suites, toning and spinning studio has been established at £6,989,000. This is the cost associated with commencing the project once the temporary structure is in place. The new temporary structure allows the school to best deliver its curriculum whilst balancing this against the need to re-provide the leisure facilities to the communities of Monmouth.

5.2 Option two in table 3.7 is the preferred option and details are provided for financial analysis. All proposals include an enhanced leisure provision to increase the capacity to generate income. The main difference in costs arise from the fact that inflation accrues if there are delays in starting the construction works.

5.3 Funding for the capital investment is as follows:

- Extra income through additional usage of the new facilities by year 3 would improve the revenue position by £287,000, this extra income could fund £3.58m of the initial investment through prudential borrowing.(as per the Full Business case)
- S106 funding Wonastow Road (£0.985m)
- Funding released from the 21st century schools programme £1,928,000 less £204,000 cost of feasibility work previously agreed by Members. Written confirmation received from WG to indicate their endorsement to earmark this money to the pool reprovision.
- The remaining gap, depending on which option is chosen, will need to be facilitated by additional borrowing funded by MCC, indicatively this would be capped at £1,115,539 for option 2 reflective of a worse case that the temporary structure needs to be raised and contingency and risk allowance is utilised in full.

- 5.4 In terms of this balance of funding - the current revenue budget for 2017/18 contains headroom in the Treasury budgets for additional borrowing to enable schemes that have been given political commitment to proceed. Indicatively of the £500k set aside for these particular commitments, the borrowing costs associated with this borrowing are circa £60k per annum. Opportunities to seek out alternative sources of funding will continue including any additional Section 106 monies should they arise which would offset the additional borrowing costs for the authority.
- 5.5 Currently provision is made within the Leisure budget for the loss of income resulting from the period during which the pool is decommissioned and not operational. In the light of this revised proposal, there will now be a likely gap in provision arising from the re-location and re-operation of the Sports Hall. The estimated financial loss to leisure during this interim period is estimated at £146,000 and it is proposed that the impact of this is built into the MTFP for the period required.

6 SUSTAINABILITY AND EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS:

- 6.1 The significant equality impacts identified in the Equality Impact Assessment appendix.

SAFEGUARDING AND CORPORATE PARENTING IMPLICATIONS

- 6.2 There have been regular meetings between construction colleagues and Property Services to ensure any health and safety and safeguarding issues are identified and the risk managed appropriately.

7 CONSULTEES:

Strategic Leadership Team
Cabinet Members
Head of Legal Services
Head of Finance
Assistant Head of Finance
Head of Planning
21st Century Programme Manager
Procurement Manager

Headteacher and Chair of Governors, Monmouth Comprehensive School

8 BACKGROUND PAPERS:

Business Case – Monmouth Pool Build (Appendix A)

9 AUTHORS:

Ian Saunders, Head of Tourism, Leisure, Culture and Youth

Marie Bartlett, Finance Manager

Richard Simpkins, Business Manager Tourism, Leisure, Culture and Youth

10 CONTACT DETAILS:

1. iansaunders@monmouthshire.gov.uk

2. Phone number 01633 644499 Mob 07876545793

mariebartlett@monmouthshire.gov.uk

Phone number 01633 644292

richardsimpkins@monmouthshire.gov.uk

Phone number 01633 644285 Mob 07884061183

Pressure Mandate Proposal Number :ENT P2
 Pressure Mandate Title : Housing Private Leasing

All information requested must be completed on the proposed mandate to enable the Cabinet to decide whether to proceed with the proposal.

Mandate Completed by	Ian Bakewell
Date	06.11.17

Why is this pressure required?
Through Welfare Reform changes, the Temporary Accommodation Management Fee Subsidy payable through housing benefit for homeless related accommodation has been removed from 1 st April 2017 by the Dept. for Work & Pensions. The value to Monmouthshire was approximately £380,000 in April 2017. Welsh Government have replaced this with additional RSG of £148,000. The reduction in funding is insufficient to run the Council's Shared Housing and the Melin Private Leasing scheme. There is a risk the number of units may have to be reduced which will impact upon the Council's homeless prevention performance. It would also create a pressure if there was a need to re-house existing applicants.
How much pressure is there and over what period?
At September 2017 it was £228,000 for 2018/19. The pressure is subject to a number of variables, such as the outcome of negotiations with individual landlords or landlords withdrawing from the scheme. On-going work will continue in respect of reviewing and refreshing the components that make up this pressure.
Directorate & Service Area responsible
Housing & Communities, Enterprise.

Mandate lead(s)
Ian Bakewell and Karen Durrant

Have you undertaken any initial consultation on the need for this pressure to be included in the MTFP?		
Name	Organisation/ department	Date
Justin Wigmore	Melin Homes	25.01.17
Joy Robson & Mark Howcroft	MCC	On-going
Kellie Beirne & Mark Hand	MCC	On-going
Ceri Breeze	Welsh Government	24.01.17
Childrens & Communities Minister	Welsh Government	21.09.17

Has the specific budget pressure been consulted on?		
Function	Date	Details of any changes made?
Department Management Team		
Other Service Contributing to / impacted		
Senior leadership team		
Select Committee	12.09.17	None.
Public or other stakeholders		
Cabinet (sign off to proceed)		

Will any further consultation be needed?		
Name	Organisation/ department	Date
Adult Select Committee	MCC	Dec or Jan 18

Final pressure approved by Cabinet	Date:
---	--------------

1. Vision and Outcomes of the Pressure Mandate

Give a business context for the budget pressure. This must pick up on the vision and what the new / improved / reduced service will look like in the future including the anticipated experience of users. It must also consider any impact on the Council's key priorities and strategic outcomes. Similarly does it impact on service performance within the immediate service area or any impact on other services provided by the authority / any other providers. In doing so, the pressure mandate must be tested against the equality impact assessment and sustainable development impact assessment and must consider impact in relation to the new Future Generations Bill.

What are the outcomes of investing in the identified pressure?
There is a need to decide about the future of private leasing and the associated implications. The options include cease operating or reducing the scale of the scheme; increase the available funding or try and identify an alternative provider. (An alternative provider will still need funding).
Background Paper Adult Select 12.09.2017 Homelessness & Prevention - Future of Private Leasing Scheme
Expected positive impacts
Expected negative impacts

--

2. Pressure proposed

Show how the budget pressure has been evidenced and will increase the current service budget. This must cover each year implicated. This section must also cover any other efficiency that will arise from the pressure.

What is the evidence for the pressure? How has it been estimated?								
Service area	Current Budget £	Proposed Cash Pressure £	Proposed non cash efficiencies – non £	Target year				Total pressure proposed
				17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	

3. Actions to required to minimise the pressure

Describe the key activities that will be undertaken to minimise the investment required and the action holders. This includes any actions contributed to by other services. Give the timescales to complete the work. This must also factor in any business activities that will need to be done differently or cease in order to achieve the mandate.

Action	Officer/ Service responsible	Timescale

4. Additional skills/ business needs

Describe any additional skills, resource and capability needed in order to carry out the proposed mandate successfully. For example new expertise and knowledge etc..

Any additional capability required	Where will this come from	Any other resource/ business need (non-financial)

5. Measuring performance on the mandate

How do you intend to measure the impact of the investing in the pressure identified? This will include budget measures and further possible measures that cover process, staff and customers. Targets need to be set over the duration of the mandate where appropriate.

Focus- Budget / Process / Staff / Customer	Indicator	Actual 2017/18	Actual 2018/19	Actual 2019/20	Target 2017/18	Target 2018/19	Target 2019/20

6. Key Risks and Issues

Are there any potential barriers and risks that will need to be managed in delivering the outcomes expected from investing in the pressure identified, including any negative impacts identified in section 1 that need to be accounted for. Also, set out the steps that will be taken to mitigate these.

Barrier or Risk	Strategic/ Operational	Reason why identified (evidence)	Risk Level (High, Medium or Low) Based on a score assessing the probability & impact	Mitigating Actions

7. Assumptions

Describe any assumptions made that underpin the justification for the option.

Assumption	Reason why assumption is being made (evidence)	Decision Maker

8. Options

Prior to the pressure mandate being written, an options appraisal will have taken place. Summarise here the outcome of the Options considered and detail the rationale on why they were disregarded. (see options appraisal guide for further information)

Options	Reason why Option was not progressed	Decision Maker

9. Monitoring the pressure mandate

The pressure mandates must be monitored through directorate budget monitoring. This will lead into corporate budget monitoring. In addition the action plan, performance measures and the risk assessment must be transferred into the service plans for the business area in order to monitor and challenge the delivery of the pressure mandate, including the performance being achieved and the level of impact.

Pressure Mandate Proposal Number :ENT P3

Pressure Mandate Title : Whole Place and Community Development Partnership

All information requested must be completed on the proposed mandate to enable the Cabinet to decide whether to proceed with the proposal.

Mandate Completed by	<i>Cath Fallon, Head of Enterprise and Community Development</i>
Date	<i>6th November 2017</i>

Why is this pressure required?
How much pressure is there and over what period?
Prior to the completion of the Community Engagement Review a £100k saving was built into the 17-18 MTFP to reflect anticipated efficiencies from the restructuring of both the Whole Place and Partnerships teams. However a complete review of the staffing structure identified a need for re-evaluation of posts which has resulted in only £35k saving being realised. This has left a £65k pressure that needs to be returned to the base budget in order for the service to be fully funded.
Directorate & Service Area responsible
Enterprise and Social Care
Mandate lead(s)
Cath Fallon

Have you undertaken any initial consultation on the need for this pressure to be included in the MTFP?

Name: Kellie Beirne & Claire Marchant	Organisation/ department: Enterprise/Social Care	Date September/October 2017

Has the specific budget pressure been consulted on?		
Function	Date	Details of any changes made?
Department Management Team	24.10.17	
Other Service Contributing to / impacted		
Senior leadership team	27.06.17	
Select Committee		
Public or other stakeholders		
Cabinet (sign off to proceed)	06.09.17	

Will any further consultation be needed?		
Name	Organisation/ department	Date

Final pressure approved by Cabinet	Date:
---	--------------

1. Vision and Outcomes of the Pressure Mandate

Give a business context for the budget pressure. This must pick up on the vision and what the new / improved / reduced service will look like in the future including the anticipated experience of users. It must also consider any impact on the Council's key priorities and strategic outcomes. Similarly does it impact on service performance within the immediate service area or any impact on other services provided by the authority / any other providers. In doing so, the pressure mandate must be tested against the

equality impact assessment and sustainable development impact assessment and must consider impact in relation to the new Future Generations Bill.

What are the outcomes of investing in the identified pressure?
<p>The Well-being of Future Generations Act requires co-delivery with partners. To enable this an identified disconnect between the Public Service Board (PSB), the Authority and the local community needed to be addressed by repositioning community engagement within a more centralised role. In addition, a lack of specialist support in strategic PSB areas such as health, isolation and ageing well is also required whilst providing whole Authority support for Cluster Area activities and town/community council liaison with a view to identifying and addressing community needs and priorities.</p> <p>The restructure of the Whole Place and Partnerships Teams into a new Community & Partnership Development Team enables cross directorate working to tackle future challenges by identifying and delivering tangible outcomes to ensure the county's future sustainability. Strategic working with the Community Well-Being and Enterprise Development Leads will also maximise funding resources and reduce the potential for service duplication.</p>
Expected positive impacts
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The team will act as enablers, working with communities and partners to enable them to realise their full potential through the identification and achievement of common goals;• Use of collective, asset and place based methodologies to improve well-being within our communities and reduce demand on public services;• Targeting pockets of inequality between and within communities to address issues of isolation and poverty through a programme of sustainable regeneration activities.
Expected negative impacts
None anticipated.

2. Pressure proposed

Show how the budget pressure has been evidenced and will increase the current service budget. This must cover each year implicated. This section must also cover any other efficiency that will arise from the pressure.

What is the evidence for the pressure? How has it been estimated?								
Original £100k MTFP saving not achievable – restructure savings after merger only realised £35k as additional funding was required to support the job re-evaluation exercise and the match funding required for a project manager post. £65k needs to be built back into base in 18-19.								
Service area	Current Budget £	Proposed Cash Pressure £	Proposed non cash efficiencies – non £	Target year				Total pressure proposed
				17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	
Community and Partnership Development	278024	65			65			65

3. Actions to required to minimise the pressure

Describe the key activities that will be undertaken to minimise the investment required and the action holders. This includes any actions contributed to by other services. Give the timescales to complete the work. This must also factor in any business activities that will need to be done differently or cease in order to achieve the mandate.

Action	Officer/ Service responsible	Timescale
Additional Grant funding opportunities will be sought in order to reduce the pressure	Cath Fallon	On going
Staff savings on vacant posts	Cath Fallon	On going

4. Additional skills/ business needs

Describe any additional skills, resource and capability needed in order to carry out the proposed mandate successfully. For example new expertise and knowledge etc..

Any additional capability required	Where will this come from	Any other resource/ business need (non-financial)
n/a		

5. Measuring performance on the mandate

How do you intend to measure the impact of the investing in the pressure identified? This will include budget measures and further possible measures that cover process, staff and customers. Targets need to be set over the duration of the mandate where appropriate.

Focus- Budget / Process /	Indicator	Actual 2017/18	Actual 2018/19	Actual 2019/20	Target 2017/18	Target 2018/19	Target 2019/20

Staff / Customer							
Delivery of the team's action plan	As detailed in 'Way Forward' document which can be found here						

6. Key Risks and Issues

Are there any potential barriers and risks that will need to be managed in delivering the outcomes expected from investing in the pressure identified, including any negative impacts identified in section 1 that need to be accounted for. Also, set out the steps that will be taken to mitigate these.

Barrier or Risk	Strategic/ Operational	Reason why identified (evidence)	Risk Level (High, Medium or Low) Based on a score assessing the probability & impact	Mitigating Actions
None anticipated				

7. Assumptions

Describe any assumptions made that underpin the justification for the option.

Assumption	Reason why assumption is being made (evidence)	Decision Maker
n/a		

8. Options

Prior to the pressure mandate being written, an options appraisal will have taken place. Summarise here the outcome of the Options considered and detail the rationale on why they were disregarded. (see options appraisal guide for further information)

Options	Reason why Option was not progressed	Decision Maker
Community Engagement Review	Full assessment can be found here	Cabinet 6.9.17

9. Monitoring the pressure mandate

The pressure mandates must be monitored through directorate budget monitoring. This will lead into corporate budget monitoring. In addition the action plan, performance measures and the risk assessment must be transferred into the service plans for the business area in order to monitor and challenge the delivery of the pressure mandate, including the performance being achieved and the level of impact.

Pressure Mandate Proposal Number :OPS P1

Pressure Mandate Title : Passenger Transport Unit (revision to previously disclosed figure)

All information requested must be completed on the proposed mandate to enable the Cabinet to decide whether to proceed with the proposal.

Mandate Completed by	<i>Richard Cope</i>
Date	<i>1st November 2017</i>

Why is this pressure required?
This is a previous pressure reported in 2015/16 for transport to the new welsh school in Duffryn Newport. This was part of another mandate which included other elements. This is to report a reduction in pressure mandate costs for 18/19 as we have collaborated with Newport CC on some of the routes and also the uptake in numbers is not as great as first expected. We cannot at present forecast future years pressures as we don't know how many pupils will be taking up the offer of places at this time.
How much pressure is there and over what period?
£47k 18/19 Reduce to £25K(Saving £22K) £72k 19/20 £75k 20/21 £62k 21/22
Directorate & Service Area responsible
Chief Executive –Operations
Mandate lead(s)

Richard Cope

Have you undertaken any initial consultation on the need for this pressure to be included in the MTFP?		
Name	Organisation/ department	Date
Roger Hoggins	Head Of Operations	2015/16b

Has the specific budget pressure been consulted on?		
Function	Date	Details of any changes made?
Department Management Team	2015/16	
Other Service Contributing to / impacted	2015/16	
Senior leadership team	2015/16	
Select Committee	2015/16	
Public or other stakeholders	N/a	
Cabinet (sign off to proceed)	2015/16	

Will any further consultation be needed?		
Name	Organisation/ department	Date

Final pressure approved by Cabinet	Date:
---	--------------

1 Vision and Outcomes of the Pressure Mandate

Give a business context for the budget pressure. This must pick up on the vision and what the new / improved / reduced service will look like in the future including the anticipated experience of users. It must also consider any impact on the Council's key

priorities and strategic outcomes. Similarly does it impact on service performance within the immediate service area or any impact on other services provided by the authority / any other providers. In doing so, the pressure mandate must be tested against the equality impact assessment and sustainable development impact assessment and must consider impact in relation to the new Future Generations Bill.

What are the outcomes of investing in the identified pressure?
A reduction in budget required to implement the extra services required.
Expected positive impacts
Less resource required to implement contracts
Expected negative impacts

1. Pressure proposed

Show how the budget pressure has been evidenced and will increase the current service budget. This must cover each year implicated. This section must also cover any other efficiency that will arise from the pressure.

What is the evidence for the pressure? How has it been estimated?
--

	Numbers were taken from current intake of primary welsh schools that are in the catchment for this new secondary school.							
Service area	Current Budget £	Proposed Cash Pressure £	Proposed non cash efficiencies – non £	Target year				Total pressure proposed
				17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	

2. Actions to required to minimise the pressure

Describe the key activities that will be undertaken to minimise the investment required and the action holders. This includes any actions contributed to by other services. Give the timescales to complete the work. This must also factor in any business activities that will need to be done differently or cease in order to achieve the mandate.

Action	Officer/ Service responsible	Timescale

3. Additional skills/ business needs

Describe any additional skills, resource and capability needed in order to carry out the proposed mandate successfully. For example new expertise and knowledge etc..

Any additional capability required	Where will this come from	Any other resource/ business need (non-financial)

4. Measuring performance on the mandate

How do you intend to measure the impact of the investing in the pressure identified? This will include budget measures and further possible measures that cover process, staff and customers. Targets need to be set over the duration of the mandate where appropriate.

Focus- Budget / Process / Staff / Customer	Indicator	Actual 2017/18	Actual 2018/19	Actual 2019/20	Target 2017/18	Target 2018/19	Target 2019/20

5. Key Risks and Issues

Are there any potential barriers and risks that will need to be managed in delivering the outcomes expected from investing in the pressure identified, including any negative impacts identified in section 1 that need to be accounted for. Also, set out the steps that will be taken to mitigate these.

Barrier or Risk	Strategic/ Operational	Reason why identified (evidence)	Risk Level (High, Medium or Low) Based on a score assessing the probability & impact	Mitigating Actions

6. Assumptions

Describe any assumptions made that underpin the justification for the option.

Assumption	Reason why assumption is being made (evidence)	Decision Maker

7. Options

Prior to the pressure mandate being written, an options appraisal will have taken place. Summarise here the outcome of the Options considered and detail the rationale on why they were disregarded. (see options appraisal guide for further information)

Options	Reason why Option was not progressed	Decision Maker

8. Monitoring the pressure mandate

The pressure mandates must be monitored through directorate budget monitoring. This will lead into corporate budget monitoring. In addition the action plan, performance measures and the risk assessment must be transferred into the service plans for the business area in order to monitor and challenge the delivery of the pressure mandate, including the performance being achieved and the level of impact.

WASTE GRANT PRESSURE (OPS P4) EXPLANATION

The forward potential for declining awards was highlighted nationally earlier this year

Sent: 20 July 2017 10:24

Subject: Waste grant into RSG 18/19

Please see the email from WLGA below which indicates how the “Waste” element of the Single Revenue Grant will be distributed from 2018/19. Not ideal, but I’ve been part of the process and it is better than where we were a few weeks ago.

Total value of the SRG from WG to LAs is about £75m in 2017/18. Of this £58m is made up from the Waste MEG within WG. WG waste colleagues have made a commitment to reduce the Waste Element by £2m each year as their contribution to corporate savings therefore the total value that has been up for discussion is £56m.

What does this mean for MCC?

The total amount of SRG coming to MCC in 2017/18 is £ £ 1,840,259 and it is distributed:

Local Environment Quality	£110,000
Natural Resource Management	£148,000
Waste & Resource Efficiency	£1,582,259

We do not know the WG total plans for the SRG at this stage, but in terms of a cash reduction just off the waste element it amounts to 6% or £1,729,843 **which is a £110,416 reduction.**

Since then the provisional grant settlement has been released and the following email from WLGA representative indicates a worse position than anticipated, which hasn't yet been added to pressures, but indicatively is double the level of pressure previously presumed i.e. a further £110k..

From: WLGA Representative

Sent: 25 October 2017 13:00

Subject: Waste / SRG funding 2018-19

To: Directors of Environment

.cc CSS LA reps

Please see below the grant details released by WG in their budget announcement yesterday. In particular, see the Single Revenue Grant line (highlighted). This shows £20.793m in the SRG for 2018/19, down from £61.790m in 2017/18. The transfer of £35m into RSG accounts for some of this change but is still leaves a gap of £5,997m ($£61,790 - [35,000 + 20,793]$). We were expecting a cut of c£2m as part of the planned gradual reduction in the grant year on year - not the figure of nearly £6m. We think that the planned £2m top slice been taken out, so the actual cut is £4m - **but this is still a cut of £2m more than expected.**

We have raised this with Welsh Government and expressed our concern. We have a meeting with them tomorrow and will highlight the impact this (if confirmed) will have not only on the current task and finish group work but also on planned meetings to discuss the SRG for next year. We will update you after the meeting.

The position is proposed to be updated in conjunction with final settlement figures in December

Pressure Mandate Proposal Number :RES P1

Pressure Mandate Title : Revenues Sub Division Pressures

All information requested must be completed on the proposed mandate to enable the Cabinet to decide whether to proceed with the proposal.

Mandate Completed by	Ruth Donovan
Date	1 st November 2017

Why is this pressure required?
<p>This is required to fund known pressures within the Revenues, Systems & Exchequer budget and should be read in conjunction with the savings proforma.</p> <p>The pressures reflect current and anticipated service activity plus planned grant cuts from the Department of Works & Pensions.</p>
How much pressure is there and over what period?
<p>Pressures of £56,000 have been identified for the 2018/19 financial year. Given the nature of these pressures there is the potential that some will continue through to future financial years (although the details are currently unclear).</p>
Directorate & Service Area responsible
Resources: Revenues, Systems & Exchequer
Mandate lead(s)
Ruth Donovan

Have you undertaken any initial consultation on the need for this pressure to be included in the MTFP?		
Name	Organisation/ department	Date
Joy Robson & Peter Davies	Monmouthshire County Council	5 th October 2017

Has the specific budget pressure been consulted on?		
Function	Date	Details of any changes made?
Department Management Team		
Other Service Contributing to / impacted		
Senior leadership team		
Select Committee		
Public or other stakeholders		
Cabinet (sign off to proceed)		

Will any further consultation be needed?		
Name	Organisation/ department	Date
n/a		

Final pressure approved by Cabinet	Date:
---	--------------

1. Vision and Outcomes of the Pressure Mandate

Give a business context for the budget pressure. This must pick up on the vision and what the new / improved / reduced service will look like in the future including the anticipated experience of users. It must also consider any impact on the Council's key priorities and strategic outcomes. Similarly does it impact on service performance within the immediate service area or any impact on other services provided by the authority / any other providers. In doing so, the pressure mandate must be tested against the

equality impact assessment and sustainable development impact assessment and must consider impact in relation to the new Future Generations Bill.

What are the outcomes of investing in the identified pressure?

Three pressures make up the £56,000 and these are listed in section 2 below.

The Authority's digital strategy focuses on customers doing more for themselves on line, including paying for their services and taxes. These online payments are normally made using a debit or credit card, both of which incur a transaction processing fee from our merchant provider. The number of card payments is increasing year on year and we have seen a corresponding increase in our Merchant acquiring fees. It is anticipated that these fees will increase further once the new cash receipting system is introduced next year and the Authority's online payment offer is extended further.

Monmouthshire has one of the best in year collection rates for council tax collection, which is improving year on year. With improved collection comes the requirement to send fewer summonses and hence a corresponding reduction in income from summons fees.

The Westminster Government's decision to introduce Universal Credit shifts the administration of certain benefits away from Local Authority Housing Benefit departments. This planned introduction is also linked with a reduction in the Administration Grant each council annually receives from the Department of Works and Pensions.

Expected positive impacts

Ability to manage the service within its budget envelope.

Expected negative impacts

None identified in this investment

2. Pressure proposed

Show how the budget pressure has been evidenced and will increase the current service budget. This must cover each year implicated. This section must also cover any other efficiency that will arise from the pressure.

What is the evidence for the pressure? How has it been estimated?								
The estimated pressures are based on:								
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> known policy decisions actual activity known future developments 								
Service area	Current Budget £	Proposed Cash Pressure £	Proposed non cash efficiencies – non £	Target year				Total pressure proposed
				17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	
Reduction in Housing Benefit Administration Grant	239,482	26,000	0					26,000
Reduction in summons income	145,945	20,000	0					20,000
Merchant card fees	76,000	10,000	0					10,000

3 Actions required to minimise the pressure

Describe the key activities that will be undertaken to minimise the investment required and the action holders. This includes any actions contributed to by other services. Give the timescales to complete the work. This must also factor in any business activities that will need to be done differently or cease in order to achieve the mandate.

Action	Officer/ Service responsible	Timescale
As noted in section 1 above, these are largely outside our control		

4 Additional skills/ business needs

Describe any additional skills, resource and capability needed in order to carry out the proposed mandate successfully. For example new expertise and knowledge etc..

Any additional capability required	Where will this come from	Any other resource/ business need (non-financial)
n/a		

5 Measuring performance on the mandate

How do you intend to measure the impact of the investing in the pressure identified? This will include budget measures and further possible measures that cover process, staff and customers. Targets need to be set over the duration of the mandate where appropriate.

Focus- Budget / Process / Staff / Customer	Indicator	Actual 2017/18	Actual 2018/19	Actual 2019/20	Target 2017/18	Target 2018/19	Target 2019/20
Budget	Budget forecast in line with the annual budget set	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Customer	Take up of online payment service	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

6 Key Risks and Issues

Are there any potential barriers and risks that will need to be managed in delivering the outcomes expected from investing in the pressure identified, including any negative impacts identified in section 1 that need to be accounted for. Also, set out the steps that will be taken to mitigate these.

Barrier or Risk	Strategic/ Operational	Reason why identified (evidence)	Risk Level (High, Medium or Low) Based on a score assessing the probability & impact	Mitigating Actions
None identified				

7 Assumptions

Describe any assumptions made that underpin the justification for the option.

Assumption	Reason why assumption is being made (evidence)	Decision Maker
------------	--	----------------

Detailed above		

8 Options

Prior to the pressure mandate being written, an options appraisal will have taken place. Summarise here the outcome of the Options considered and detail the rationale on why they were disregarded. (see options appraisal guide for further information)

Options	Reason why Option was not progressed	Decision Maker
Linked to savings mandate for service		

9 Monitoring the pressure mandate

The pressure mandates must be monitored through directorate budget monitoring. This will lead into corporate budget monitoring. In addition the action plan, performance measures and the risk assessment must be transferred into the service plans for the business area in order to monitor and challenge the delivery of the pressure mandate, including the performance being achieved and the level of impact

Pressure Mandate Proposal Number : RES P2

Pressure Mandate Title : Information Technology budget pressures

All information requested must be completed on the proposed mandate to enable the Cabinet to decide whether to proceed with the proposal.

Mandate Completed by	<i>Sian Hayward</i>
Date	<i>14/11/17</i>

Why is this pressure required?
<p>The Enterprise agreement is renewed every 3 years and is due for renewal on 1st January 2018. Monmouthshire has taken a decision to upgrade to O365 from the current 'On Premise' provision. This releases enhanced functionality and efficiencies is in line with the Cloud First strategy of the SRS.</p> <p>Provisionally this means a net increase of £30k in the upgraded licence fee for a decision to upgrade to O365 from the standard On Premise version, offset by the release of two contracts for security and archiving.</p> <p>Additionally, an agreement has been made to enter into an advanced internet and e-mail security system at a cost of £75k</p>

There are additional pressures that have been revealed during the budget setting process as follows -

1. An increase in the Enterprise price due to the dollar exchange rate from the 1st January 2018
2. An increase in protection for Mobile Device Management protection as required by GDPR and PSN accreditors to come into force when SharePoint online becomes available in

Directorate & Service Area responsible

Mandate lead(s)

Have you undertaken any initial consultation on the need for this pressure to be included in the MTFP?

Name

Organisation/ department

Date

--	--	--

Has the specific budget pressure been consulted on?		
Function	Date	Details of any changes made?
Department Management Team		
Other Service Contributing to / impacted		
Senior leadership team		
Select Committee		
Public or other stakeholders		
Cabinet (sign off to proceed)		

Will any further consultation be needed?		
Name	Organisation/ department	Date

Final pressure approved by Cabinet	Date:
---	--------------

1 Vision and Outcomes of the Pressure Mandate

Give a business context for the budget pressure. This must pick up on the vision and what the new / improved / reduced service will look like in the future including the anticipated experience of users. It must also consider any impact on the Council’s key priorities and strategic outcomes. Similarly does it impact on service performance within the immediate service area or any impact on other services provided by the authority / any other providers. In doing so, the pressure mandate must be tested against the equality impact assessment and sustainable development impact assessment and must consider impact in relation to the new Future Generations Bill.

What are the outcomes of investing in the identified pressure?
Expected positive impacts

Expected negative impacts

2 Pressure proposed

Show how the budget pressure has been evidenced and will increase the current service budget. This must cover each year implicated. This section must also cover any other efficiency that will arise from the pressure.

What is the evidence for the pressure? How has it been estimated?
There are pressures against this budget of £105k next year for the following agreed items -

- £75k for enhanced email and internet security to mitigate cybercrime or attacks
- Increase in licencing for the O365 cloud enhancement, with an additional gross cost of £50k, offset by savings on The Vault e-mail archiving system (£13k) and VPN savings of £7k which are no longer required when we have O365. This makes a net pressure of £30k

During the budget pressure identification process we have received information on the effect of price increases to the Enterprise Agreement reflecting the following -

- Increase in the EA licencing for additional users and devices in the areas of Social Care and Operations £40,000
- Increase in the overall Enterprise Agreement pricing due to the dollar exchange rate £56,000
- Increase in Mobile Device Management charges to comply with GDPR and PSN requirements for all mobile users from 2018/19 £46,000
- £9k Event Management software that alerts for any fraudulent cyber activity – this is also requirement of PSN accreditation

These latter considerations will be discussed with Director and SLT prior to any inclusion in MTFP

Service area	Current Budget £	Proposed Cash Pressure £	Proposed non cash efficiencies – non £	Target year			Total pressure proposed
				15/16	17/18	18/19	
Security Enhancements (SRS partner cost)					75,000		
Enterprise agreement (SRS partner cost)					30,000		

3 Actions to required to minimise the pressure

Describe the key activities that will be undertaken to minimise the investment required and the action holders. This includes any actions contributed to by other services. Give the timescales to complete the work. This must also factor in any business activities that will need to be done differently or cease in order to achieve the mandate.

Action	Officer/ Service responsible	Timescale
The price increase for the dollar exchange rate cannot be minimised		
Every action will be taken to identify any offsetting reductions in systems or efficiency savings that can be realised as a result of upgrading to O365. This will involve identifying opportunities to replace existing legacy systems with products already included within		

the O365 suite and 'sweat' the modules and functionality of the Enterprise Agreement.		

4 Additional skills/ business needs

Describe any additional skills, resource and capability needed in order to carry out the proposed mandate successfully. For example new expertise and knowledge etc..

Any additional capability required	Where will this come from	Any other resource/ business need (non-financial)
None		

5 Measuring performance on the mandate

How do you intend to measure the impact of the investing in the pressure identified? This will include budget measures and further possible measures that cover process, staff and customers. Targets need to be set over the duration of the mandate where appropriate.

Focus- Budget / Process / Staff / Customer	Indicator	Actual 2016/17	Actual 2017/18	Actual 2018/19	Target 2016/17	Target 2017/18	Target 2018/19

6 Key Risks and Issues

Are there any potential barriers and risks that will need to be managed in delivering the outcomes expected from investing in the pressure identified, including any negative impacts identified in section 1 that need to be accounted for. Also, set out the steps that will be taken to mitigate these.

Barrier or Risk	Strategic/	Reason why identified (evidence)	Risk Level (High, Medium or Low) Based	Mitigating Actions

	Operational		on a score assessing the probability & impact	
Security enhancement	Strategic	The authorities risk register identifies that cyber security and crime represents a significant risk to the authority		This expenditure of £75k per annum has been agreed as an appropriate solution to mitigate risks.
MDM management	Operational and strategic	It is critical that cyber-crime and security is reduced, and that information governance is maintained. Mobile devices are increasingly becoming the norm for flexible and community based working, and there is a requirement of our PSN accreditation that devices have appropriate security.		

--	--	--	--	--

7 Assumptions

Describe any assumptions made that underpin the justification for the option.

Assumption	Reason why assumption is being made (evidence)	Decision Maker

8 Options

Prior to the pressure mandate being written, an options appraisal will have taken place. Summarise here the outcome of the Options considered and detail the rationale on why they were disregarded. (see options appraisal guide for further information)

Options	Reason why Option was not progressed	Decision Maker

9 Monitoring the pressure mandate

The pressure mandates must be monitored through directorate budget monitoring. This will lead into corporate budget monitoring. In addition the action plan, performance measures and the risk assessment must be transferred into the service plans for the business area in order to monitor and challenge the delivery of the pressure mandate, including the performance being achieved and the level of impact.

LIVING WAGE PRESSURE (CORP P1) EXPLANATION

The Government Living Wage accelerator looked to move living wage from £7.20 per hour at April 2016 to £9.00 per hour by April 2020. The Council has previously embraced the “Foundation” Living Wage annually through the budget setting process, such that it will achieve Government Living wage a year earlier than required.

An examination of payroll records indicated 267 individuals potentially affected by this accelerated pay award. These individuals commonly tend to work less than standard 37 hours a week. As an indication of this, these 267 individuals translate into 66 full time equivalents.

The pressure reflects the difference between salary paid and £8.40 per hour in 2018/19, which equates commonly to £0.31 per hour. In 2019/20 the difference is £0.60 per hour, being the difference between £8.40 per hour and £9.00 per hour.

The anticipated consequence of this is £58k in 2018/19 and £112k in 2019/20.

Should the Council more formally adopt the Foundation Living Wage as a financial planning assumption, the hourly rate applicable for 2018/19 is £8.75 per hour, rather than £8.40. In applying 2.5% inflation to £8.75, gives a 2019/20 indicative rate of £8.97, which harmonises closely with Government rate. Consequently adopting the Foundation Living wage is anticipated simply to bring forward a pressure from 2019/20, the additional effect of £0.35 per hour in 2018/19 is anticipated to cost £83.5k, with a corresponding decrease to 2019/20 pressure.

Pressure Mandate Proposal Number :CORP P2/RES S9

Pressure Mandate Title Insurance Premium Uplift and Staff Saving :

All information requested must be completed on the proposed mandate to enable the Cabinet to decide whether to proceed with the proposal.

Mandate Completed by	<i>Mark Howcroft</i>
Date	<i>3/11/17</i>

Why is this pressure required?
Two causes, annual premiums are based on a review of insurance activity, review of cover and extent of building/vehicles/contracts to apply. As examples, the solar farm and one of two secondary schools have come onstream, and the proposal reflects the anticipated Monmouth Leisure Centre contract. National terror attacks have heightened security aspects for public entities. Motor insurance activity has unfortunately been more significant than is usual. The premiums also attract insurance premium tax, and that was increased from 10% to 12% in June 17.
How much pressure is there and over what period?
Our renewals run October to September, so in reality the budget will bear 6 months increase from recent changes and 6 months in relation to next October renewal. However we won't know with certainty next year's activity or potential for tax rises, so for the purposes of financial modelling the pressure for next year's budget has been equated to 12 months cost increase introduced October 17, i.e. £124k.pa.
Directorate & Service Area responsible
Resources – Accountancy

Mandate lead(s)
Mark Howcroft

Have you undertaken any initial consultation on the need for this pressure to be included in the MTFP?		
Name	Organisation/ department	Date
Joy Robson	Head of Finance	Sept 17
SLT		Oct 17

Has the specific budget pressure been consulted on?		
Function	Date	Details of any changes made?
Department Management Team		
Other Service Contributing to / impacted		
Senior leadership team	Oct 17	None, although have checked what level excesses would need to increase to, to keep costs at 2017/18 premia levels. It is anticipated the excess for our own vehicles being circa £6k, which wouldn't be cost effective, and would introduce additional volatility to the costs incurred
Select Committee		
Public or other stakeholders		
Cabinet (sign off to proceed)		

Will any further consultation be needed?		
Name	Organisation/ department	Date

Final pressure approved by Cabinet	Date: Nov 17
---	---------------------

1. Vision and Outcomes of the Pressure Mandate

Give a business context for the budget pressure. This must pick up on the vision and what the new / improved / reduced service will look like in the future including the anticipated experience of users. It must also consider any impact on the Council's key priorities and strategic outcomes. Similarly does it impact on service performance within the immediate service area or any impact on other services provided by the authority / any other providers. In doing so, the pressure mandate must be tested against the equality impact assessment and sustainable development impact assessment and must consider impact in relation to the new Future Generations Bill.

What are the outcomes of investing in the identified pressure?
Risk and volatility removed
Expected positive impacts
Peace of mind and certainty of protection
Expected negative impacts
Increased Cost

--

2. Pressure proposed

Show how the budget pressure has been evidenced and will increase the current service budget. This must cover each year implicated. This section must also cover any other efficiency that will arise from the pressure.

	What is the evidence for the pressure? How has it been estimated?
	<p>The previous year's insurance costs are circa £699k per annum, the latest renewal details forecast a cost of £823k, an uplift of £124k</p> <p>Details of specific costs per policy are attached overleaf.</p>

LOT NO:	CODE:	TITLE:	NET ANT:	IPT AMT:	GROSS AMT:	COMPANY:
Lot 1	I002	Property	261,696.41	31,403.57	293,099.98	RMP / AIG – GB
Lot 1A	I002	Contract Works	4,328.00	519.36	4,847.36	RMP / HSB – GB
Lot 2	I018	Computer	2,192.40	263.09	2,455.49	RSA
Lot 3	I001	Public Liability	116,969.00	14,036.28	131,005.28	Aspen
Lot 3A	I001	Claims Handling	(included above)	0.00	0.00	B4 Legal
Lot 4	I005	Motor	263,585.00	31,630.20	295,215.20	Maven / Amlin
Lot 4A	I005	ULR	1,838.45	367.69	2,206.14	OPUS
Lot 5	I012	Fidelity	15,000.00	1,800.00	16,800.00	Maven
Lot 6	I022	Engineering	7,208.78	865.05	8,073.83	ZM
Lot 6A	I022	Inspections	21,939.01	4,387.80	26,326.81	ZM / CRIMSON
Lot 7	I023	Travel	14,208.21	1,704.99	15,913.20	RSA
Lot 8	I024	Fine Art	3,841.55	460.99	4,302.54	AXA
Lot 9	I008	Terrorism	17,252.00	2,070.24	19,322.24	AUM Terrorism

	Lot 10	I025	Councillors	1,397.37	167.68	1,565.05	ZM / DAS	
	Lot 11	I009	Aviation	1,000.00	100.00	1,100.00	Lloyds	
	Lot 12	I021	MBC/MDC Run-off	800.00	80.00	880.00	Municipal Mutual	
			TOTALS:	733,256.18	89,856.94	823,113.12		
Service area	Current Budget £	Proposed Cash Pressure £	Proposed non cash efficiencies – non £	Target year				Total pressure proposed
				17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	
Insurance Premia	£699k	£124k		£124k				£124k
Saving in freezing insurance staff vacancy position 1fte (effect included in savings table)	Establishment 3.7 fte, salary budget with oncost circa £115k	(£26k)						(26k)
Net		£98k						£98k

3. Actions to required to minimise the pressure

Describe the key activities that will be undertaken to minimise the investment required and the action holders. This includes any actions contributed to by other services. Give the timescales to complete the work. This must also factor in any business activities that will need to be done differently or cease in order to achieve the mandate.

Action	Officer/ Service responsible	Timescale
Freezing of insurance staff vacancy	Mark Howcroft	Oct 17
Reflection on whether excess levels could rise instead of premia e.g. self insure	Mark Howcroft	June 18
Adequate driver training when introducing new/unfamiliar vehicles	Corporate	Ongoing
Passport risk responsibility on new developments to contractors	Corporate	Ongoing

4 Additional skills/ business needs

Describe any additional skills, resource and capability needed in order to carry out the proposed mandate successfully. For example new expertise and knowledge etc..

Any additional capability required	Where will this come from	Any other resource/ business need (non-financial)
None		

5 Measuring performance on the mandate

How do you intend to measure the impact of the investing in the pressure identified? This will include budget measures and further possible measures that cover process, staff and customers. Targets need to be set over the duration of the mandate where appropriate.

Focus- Budget / Process / Staff / Customer	Indicator	Actual 2017/18	Actual 2018/19	Actual 2019/20	Target 2017/18	Target 2018/19	Target 2019/20
Insurance Team	Next year's renewal and activity data, lower cost than £734k (excl Insurance Premia tax)	734k				<734k	

6 Key Risks and Issues

Are there any potential barriers and risks that will need to be managed in delivering the outcomes expected from investing in the pressure identified, including any negative impacts identified in section 1 that need to be accounted for. Also, set out the steps that will be taken to mitigate these.

Barrier or Risk	Strategic/ Operational	Reason why identified (evidence)	Risk Level (High, Medium or Low) Based on a score assessing the probability & impact	Mitigating Actions
Activities and practices of Council colleagues	Operational	Significant cost involved in annual insurance premia	Medium, big impact but limited effect of isolated improved activity	

7 Assumptions

Describe any assumptions made that underpin the justification for the option.

Assumption	Reason why assumption is being made (evidence)	Decision Maker

8 Options

Prior to the pressure mandate being written, an options appraisal will have taken place. Summarise here the outcome of the Options considered and detail the rationale on why they were disregarded. (see options appraisal guide for further information)

Options	Reason why Option was not progressed	Decision Maker
Review of excesses	Would result in disproportionate volatility and less value in securing insurance cover given the volume of activity involved. Example, motor excess for our vehicles is £1k, it would have to rise fivefold to £5k before premia could be contained at existing levels. The Council would incur greater cost based on last 12 months activity on its own vehicles against the saving in premia. Plus it wouldn't mitigate the liability to third parties which is the predominant cost driver.	Mark Howcroft

9 Monitoring the pressure mandate

The pressure mandates must be monitored through directorate budget monitoring. This will lead into corporate budget monitoring. In addition the action plan, performance measures and the risk assessment must be transferred into the service plans for the business area in order to monitor and challenge the delivery of the pressure mandate, including the performance being achieved and the level of impact.

REDUNDANCY STRAIN COSTS (CORP P3) EXPLANATION

The pressure is the consequence of redundancies taking place after the last MTFP was approved which result in a requirement to further top up the pension fund for the additional strain cost. At the time the budget is prepared, whilst service re-engineering is known, the effect on particular individuals cannot easily be presumed, as commonly the process may involve a competitive interview process, individuals may be redeployed, and the costs involved are affected by the individual's circumstances e.g. their earnings and their length of service.

Strain costs are incurred where the employee is allowed to retire before their normal retirement age without any actuarial reduction to their pension. This means the pension fund will assume that the employee's benefits will be paid over a longer period and also because employee and employer contributions will not have been paid on for as long as anticipated. Therefore the pension fund require the Authority to top up the fund via the "Strain cost", and £20k reflects the amount communicated by Pension Fund administrators in relation to last year's redundancy decisions.

Appendix 5 – Savings Proposals

Ref	Saving Proposal	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000	2020/21 £000	2021/22 £000	Page Reference
CYP S1	Federated school model	(32)	(23)			147
CYP S2/RES S4	Term time only payments (Payroll identify £203k)	(95)				152
CYP S3	Breakfast club charging	(178)				157
CYP S4	General 5% reduction on supplies & services	(132)				162
CYP S5	Reduce school premature retirement budget	(50)				167
SCH S1	Adult Disability Services	(638)	(536)			172
SCH P3/S2	Childrens Services (Saving £680k, pressure £561k, net saving in yr 4 £119k)	(113)	(189)	(189)	(189)	178
ENT S1	Cross cutting list to be populated during budget process					186
OPS S1	Car parks charging blue badge holders	(60)				186
OPS S2	Car Parks Net 7.5% increase in charges above 2.5% RPI (10% in total)	(100)				186
OPS S3	Car Parks 10% increase in permits	(10)				186
OPS S4	Car Parks Increase resident permits from £40-£60	(3)				186
OPS S5	Car Parks Penalties increase to £70 discounted £35	(9)				186
OPS S6	Grounds/waste - Close CA sites Usk and troy 2 days a week	(27)				192
OPS S7	Grounds/waste - Reduce grass cutting across authority	(60)				197
OPS S8	Grounds/waste - Stop Bailey park bowls maintenance	(10)				204
OPS S9	Grounds/waste - Rationalise shrub bed maintenance	(35)				208
OPS S10	Grounds/waste - Reduce 1 mini sweeper.	(50)				212
OPS S11	Grounds/waste - 1 year freeze of Head of waste post	(40)	40			217
RES S1	Property - School meals Price Increase (net after 2.5% RPI)	(23)				237
RES S2	Property income - External Fees (net after 2.5% RPI)	(19)				242
RES S3	Property - Council wide Postage savings	(5)				242
OPS S12	Highways - Road Traffic Incident recovery of costs	(15)				221

OPS S13	Highways - Improved Plant utilisation/recovery	(40)				223
OPS S14	Passenger Transport - Route changes	(51)				225&229
OPS S15	Passenger Transport - CPC Staff Training	(9)				233
CYP S2/RES S4	Term time only payments (Payroll identify £203k as full year effect where as CYP identifies £95k as 7 month effect)	(23)				247
RES S5	Schools based Revenues SLA (to reflect actual)	(39)				249
RES S5	Comino system change	(10)				249
RES S5	Housing Benefit team savings	(8)				249
RES S6	IT Equipment budget saving	(30)				254
RES S7	SRS saving (5% of 17-18 budget £2.134 unestablished)	(107)				259
RES S8	Public Sector Broadband Agreement PSBA saving (£155k-£22k)	(133)				259
CORP P2/RES S9	Insurance staff saving	(26)				134
APP1	Interest Receivable (net effect)	186	76	(1)	1	Not required
APP1	Interest Payable (net effect)	(533)	140	53	(67)	Not required
APP1	MRP (net effect)	51	(153)	61	(20)	Not required
FIN1	Council Tax Increase from Base changes (net of CTRS)	(530)				Not required
TOTAL SAVINGS		3,005	645	76	275	

CYP PROPOSALS

Budget Project Proposal 2018/19

This form should be completed in full for all proposals of £50,000 and over, and for proposals of less than where the impact will be felt directly by citizens. For proposals below this threshold you can complete questions 1 and 2 only and then use your service plan to capture your actions, measures and risks.

Form completed by	Nikki Wellington
Date	1 st November 2017
Reference Number	CYP S1

Service area	Schools
Directorate	CYP
Savings targets (based on 17/18 budget)	
2018/19	£32,000
2019/20	£23,000
2020/21	
2021/22	

Project lead & Key project team members	Nikki Wellington and CYP DMT members.
--	---------------------------------------

1. Vision and outcomes of the project

Give a business context for the project. Include what the new / improved / reduced service will look like in the future. Consider the impact in the service area and on any other services provided by the Council. From the service user and service provider perspective.

What does the project propose to do?

The proposal is to look to federate of a small number of primary schools to reduce management costs. The vision is that one head will manage a couple of schools in a local area, with a deputy in each school to support.

Expected impact of the project?

The impact will be minimal, there will need to be careful consultation with parents / governors and staff to ensure that they understand the vision and how this will work in practise.

2. Savings proposed

Show how project will deliver savings against the current service budget, will this be a saving or income generation. This must be profiled over each year implicated.

What savings are expected to be achieved?

Year	Proposed Savings (£)	Proposed income generation (£)
2018-19	£32,000	£0
2019-20	£23,000	£0

3. Options appraisal

List all options that have/are being considered (further details on these may be required to inform scrutiny/decision making reports)

Option 1

No other options are being considered.

Reason why not progressed/progressed?

This model has been used in a number of our schools where the head has been absent. This has worked and the lessons learnt will inform how this is developed.

Option 2**Reason why not progressed/progressed?**

Option 3

Reason why not progressed/progressed?

4. Actions to deliver the project

Describe the key activities that will be undertaken to deliver the project and the action holders. This provides a further breakdown of the actions that need to be taken, each project should also be included in the service plan action.

Action	Timescale
Identification of schools that can federate.	Jan 18 – Mar 18
Consultation with stake holders	Mar 18 – August
Implementation of new model	September 18

5. Additional resource/ business needs

Have you identified any resource / capacity required to carry out the project?

Area resource required	What will this be used for?
Possible redundancy costs, it is too early to identify the actual cost required.	Redundancy costs.

6. Key Risks and Issues

Are there any initial barriers or risks that have been identified at this early stage. Any actions to mitigate risk should be included in section 4 and any ongoing risks include in the main service plan risk register.

Risk	Reason why identified	Risk Level (High, Medium or Low – see risk matrix)
Model of federation cannot be progresses.	Adverse feedback from stakeholders and Governing Bodies not agreeing to this.	Low

7. Evaluation

How will you measure the impact of the proposal? What are the measures that you expect to see change as a result of what you're proposing. This could be positive or negative. When will you evaluate the change?

Metric	Baseline
Cost savings	Base line April 2018
Standards Measured in July 2019	Baseline July 2018

Evaluation Date	August 2019
------------------------	-------------

8. Future Generations Evaluation

The project must be assessed from the start against the equality impact assessment and sustainable development impact assessment using the [Future Generations Evaluation](#).

9. Additional comments

Budget Project Proposal 2018/19

This form should be completed in full for all proposals of £50,000 and over, and for proposals of less than where the impact will be felt directly by citizens. For proposals below this threshold you can complete questions 1 and 2 only and then use your service plan to capture your actions, measures and risks.

Form completed by	Nikki Wellington
Date	1 st November 2017
Reference Number	CYP S2/ RES S6

Service area	Schools & Central
Directorate	CYP
Savings targets (based on 17/18 budget)	
2018/19	£95,000
2019/20	
2020/21	
2021/22	

Project lead & Key project team members	Nikki Wellington and CYP DMT members.
--	---------------------------------------

1. Vision and outcomes of the project

Give a business context for the project. Include what the new / improved / reduced service will look like in the future. Consider the impact in the service area and on any other services provided by the Council. From the service user and service provider perspective.

What does the project propose to do?

The current calculation used to calculate pay for employees working term time only is incorrect. This calculation has been used for a long period of time and has led to a discrepancy between Part time employees and those only employed during the term. This has led to term time only staff being over paid.

Expected impact of the project?

Staff employed during term time will see a reduction in pay, this reduction will be different for each employee, and however it on average the reduction will be £300 - £350 per annum per employee. This will ensure that both term time only and part time are paid on the same basis.

2. Savings proposed

Show how project will deliver savings against the current service budget, will this be a saving or income generation. This must be profiled over each year implicated.

What savings are expected to be achieved?

Year	Proposed Savings (£)	Proposed income generation (£)
2018-19	£95,000	£0

3. Options appraisal

List all options that have/are being considered (further details on these may be required to inform scrutiny/decision making reports)

Option 1

Term time only employee work additional hours to make up the overpayment.

Reason why not progressed/progressed?

This is being considered currently, and will be considered with all the options.
Option 2
Correct the calculation for new employees only, and any changes in contracts.
Reason why not progressed/progressed?
This is being considered currently, and will be considered with all the options.
Option 3
Reason why not progressed/progressed?

4. Actions to deliver the project

Describe the key activities that will be undertaken to deliver the project and the action holders. This provides a further breakdown of the actions that need to be taken, each project should also be included in the service plan action.

Action	Timescale
Identification of savings for individual staff	December 2017
Full consultation – Employee services leading	Jan 18 – Aug 18
Implementation of new model	September 18

5. Additional resource/ business needs

Have you identified any resource / capacity required to carry out the project?

Area resource required	What will this be used for?
None for CYP	

6. Key Risks and Issues

Are there any initial barriers or risks that have been identified at this early stage. Any actions to mitigate risk should be included in section 4 and any ongoing risks include in the main service plan risk register.

Risk	Reason why identified	Risk Level (High, Medium or Low – see risk matrix)
Employee services will be able to assess the risks as these have been identified in their briefing to SLT.		

7. Evaluation

How will you measure the impact of the proposal? What are the measures that you expect to see change as a result of what you're proposing. This could be positive or negative. When will you evaluate the change?

Metric	Baseline
Cost savings	Base line April 2018

8. Future Generations Evaluation

The project must be assessed from the start against the equality impact assessment and sustainable development impact assessment using the [Future Generations Evaluation](#).

9. Additional comments

Budget Project Proposal 2018/19

This form should be completed in full for all proposals of £50,000 and over, and for proposals of less than where the impact will be felt directly by citizens. For proposals below this threshold you can complete questions 1 and 2 only and then use your service plan to capture your actions, measures and risks.

Form completed by	Nikki Wellington
Date	1 st November 2017
Reference Number	CYP S3

Service area	Central and Schools
Directorate	CYP
Savings targets (based on 17/18 budget)	
2018/19	£178,000
2019/20	
2020/21	
2021/22	

Project lead & Key project team members	Nikki Wellington, Sue Hall and CYP DMT members.
--	---

1. Vision and outcomes of the project

Give a business context for the project. Include what the new / improved / reduced service will look like in the future. Consider the impact in the service area and on any other services provided by the Council. From the service user and service provider perspective.

What does the project propose to do?

The proposal is to charge £1 for pupils attending before school clubs for childcare. There will be no charge for pupils entitled to FSM, or for the breakfast time of the before school club. Most clubs run for an hour, with the first half hour as childcare and the remaining for breakfast. Any non-FSM pupils will be charge £1 for the first half hour. If they wish to attend just for breakfast there will be no charge.

Expected impact of the project?

Some authorities are already charging, but a number keep their clubs free. Parents may object to the proposals and there may be a reduction in the numbers of pupils attending. There could be adverse publicity but by consultation with all stakeholders this could be minimised.

2. Savings proposed

Show how project will deliver savings against the current service budget, will this be a saving or income generation. This must be profiled over each year implicated.

What savings are expected to be achieved?

Year	Proposed Savings (£)	Proposed income generation (£)
2018-19		£178,000

3. Options appraisal

List all options that have/are being considered (further details on these may be required to inform scrutiny/decision making reports)

Option 1

Reducing clubs to run for ½ hour, therefore reducing staff costs and no charges will be made. This will just cover the statutory breakfast time.

Reason why not progressed/progressed?

This is being considered currently, and will be considered with all the options.
Option 2
Reason why not progressed/progressed?
Option 3
Reason why not progressed/progressed?

4. Actions to deliver the project

Describe the key activities that will be undertaken to deliver the project and the action holders. This provides a further breakdown of the actions that need to be taken, each project should also be included in the service plan action.

Action	Timescale
Consultation	December 2017 -2018
Implementation	April 2018

5. Additional resource/ business needs

Have you identified any resource / capacity required to carry out the project?

Area resource required	What will this be used for?
None for CYP	

6. Key Risks and Issues

Are there any initial barriers or risks that have been identified at this early stage. Any actions to mitigate risk should be included in section 4 and any ongoing risks include in the main service plan risk register.

Risk	Reason why identified	Risk Level (High, Medium or Low – see risk matrix)
Numbers attending before school clubs reduce. This will reduce the income achieved.	If there is a charge parents may wish to only take their children for the free element	Medium

7. Evaluation

How will you measure the impact of the proposal? What are the measures that you expect to see change as a result of what you're proposing. This could be positive or negative. When will you evaluate the change?

Metric	Baseline
Income achieved	Income is currently nil

8. Future Generations Evaluation

The project must be assessed from the start against the equality impact assessment and sustainable development impact assessment using the [Future Generations Evaluation](#).

9. Additional comments

Budget Project Proposal 2018/19

This form should be completed in full for all proposals of £50,000 and over, and for proposals of less than where the impact will be felt directly by citizens. For proposals below this threshold you can complete questions 1 and 2 only and then use your service plan to capture your actions, measures and risks.

Form completed by	Nikki Wellington
Date	1 st November 2017
Reference Number	CYP S4

Service area	Schools
Directorate	CYP
Savings targets (based on 17/18 budget)	
2018/19	£132,000
2019/20	
2020/21	
2021/22	

Project lead & Key project team members	Nikki Wellington and CYP DMT members.
--	---------------------------------------

1. Vision and outcomes of the project

Give a business context for the project. Include what the new / improved / reduced service will look like in the future. Consider the impact in the service area and on any other services provided by the Council. From the service user and service provider perspective.

What does the project propose to do?

The proposal is to reduce the services and supplies budget by 5% for schools. The result will be that schools will need to seek efficiency savings to reduce their costs. All schools have been offered an opportunity to develop a cluster business manager, which is grant and match funded for 2 years. During this time, the business manager should be able to seek out these efficiencies to make the savings.

Expected impact of the project?

If schools do not make the savings expected then this could be a direct reduction in their funding and have an impact on their balances. If the savings are achieved the school balances will not be impacted.

2. Savings proposed

Show how project will deliver savings against the current service budget, will this be a saving or income generation. This must be profiled over each year implicated.

What savings are expected to be achieved?

Year	Proposed Savings (£)	Proposed income generation (£)
2018-19	£132,000	

3 Options appraisal

List all options that have/are being considered (further details on these may be required to inform scrutiny/decision making reports)

Option 1

No other options have been considered.

Reason why not progressed/progressed?

Option 2

Reason why not progressed/progressed?

Option 3

Reason why not progressed/progressed?

4 Actions to deliver the project

Describe the key activities that will be undertaken to deliver the project and the action holders. This provides a further breakdown of the actions that need to be taken, each project should also be included in the service plan action.

Action	Timescale
Roll out of business manager projects for all clusters	Now – with final cluster starting in April 2018
Reduction in the S&S element of the budget	April 2018

5 Additional resource/ business needs

Have you identified any resource / capacity required to carry out the project?

Area resource required	What will this be used for?
None for CYP	

6 Key Risks and Issues

Are there any initial barriers or risks that have been identified at this early stage. Any actions to mitigate risk should be included in section 4 and any ongoing risks include in the main service plan risk register.

Risk	Reason why identified	Risk Level (High, Medium or Low – see risk matrix)
Schools not making the savings and therefore the reduction impacting on school balances.	Some savings in the past have not been achieved and therefore balances have been impacted.	Low

7 Evaluation

How will you measure the impact of the proposal? What are the measures that you expect to see change as a result of what you're proposing. This could be positive or negative. When will you evaluate the change?

Metric	Baseline
Services and Supply reduction in costs	Current spend

Evaluation Date	September 2018
------------------------	----------------

8 Future Generations Evaluation

The project must be assessed from the start against the equality impact assessment and sustainable development impact assessment using the [Future Generations Evaluation](#).

9 Additional comments

Budget Project Proposal 2018/19

This form should be completed in full for all proposals of £50,000 and over, and for proposals of less than where the impact will be felt directly by citizens. For proposals below this threshold you can complete questions 1 and 2 only and then use your service plan to capture your actions, measures and risks.

Form completed by	Nikki Wellington
Date	1 st November 2017
Reference Number	CYP S5

Service area	Central CYP
Directorate	CYP
Savings targets (based on 17/18 budget)	
2018/19	£50,000
2019/20	
2020/21	
2021/22	

Project lead & Key project team members	Nikki Wellington and CYP DMT members.
--	---------------------------------------

1 Vision and outcomes of the project

Give a business context for the project. Include what the new / improved / reduced service will look like in the future. Consider the impact in the service area and on any other services provided by the Council. From the service user and service provider perspective.

What does the project propose to do?
The proposal is to reduce the premature retirement budget by £50,000. This budget supports teachers that retired prior to 1996. Over the last few years the spend on the budget has reduced resulting in an underspend.
Expected impact of the project?
The impact will be minimal, the only risk is if the budget does not continue to reduce as it has in recent years.

2 Savings proposed

Show how project will deliver savings against the current service budget, will this be a saving or income generation. This must be profiled over each year implicated.

What savings are expected to be achieved?		
Year	Proposed Savings (£)	Proposed income generation (£)
2018-19	£50,000	

3 Options appraisal

List all options that have/are being considered (further details on these may be required to inform scrutiny/decision making reports)

Option 1
No other options have been considered.
Reason why not progressed/progressed?
Option 2

Reason why not progressed/progressed?
Option 3
Reason why not progressed/progressed?

4 Actions to deliver the project

Describe the key activities that will be undertaken to deliver the project and the action holders. This provides a further breakdown of the actions that need to be taken, each project should also be included in the service plan action.

Action	Timescale
2018-19 notification of charges	October 2018

5 Additional resource/ business needs

Have you identified any resource / capacity required to carry out the project?

Area resource required	What will this be used for?
None for CYP	

6 Key Risks and Issues

Are there any initial barriers or risks that have been identified at this early stage. Any actions to mitigate risk should be included in section 4 and any ongoing risks include in the main service plan risk register.

Risk	Reason why identified	Risk Level (High, Medium or Low – see risk matrix)
Spend not reducing as it has in recent years.	This is the only risk with this proposal.	Low

7 Evaluation

How will you measure the impact of the proposal? What are the measures that you expect to see change as a result of what you're proposing. This could be positive or negative. When will you evaluate the change?

Metric	Baseline
Charge for 2018-19	Current spend

Evaluation Date	October 2018
------------------------	--------------

8 Future Generations Evaluation

The project must be assessed from the start against the equality impact assessment and sustainable development impact assessment using the [Future Generations Evaluation](#).

9 Additional comments

SCH PROPOSALS

Budget Project Proposal 2018/19

This form should be completed in full for all proposals of £50,000 and over, and for proposals of less than where the impact will be felt directly by citizens. For proposals below this threshold you can complete questions 1 and 2 only and then use your service plan to capture your actions, measures and risks.

Form completed by	Julie Boothroyd
Date	3 rd Oct
Reference Number	SCH S1

Service area	Adult Services
Directorate	
Savings targets (based on 17/18 budget)	
2018/19	£ 638K
2019/20	£ 536K across 19/20 and 20/21
2020/21	
2021/22	

Project lead & Key project team members	
--	--

1. Vision and outcomes of the project

Give a business context for the project. Include what the new / improved / reduced service will look like in the future. Consider the impact in the service area and on any other services provided by the Council. From the service user and service provider perspective.

What does the project propose to do?

Having scrutinised all budget areas in the Adult Services and analysed the potential for further services the following areas have been identified for further remodelling/reduction over the medium term.

- **Disability services – My Day My Life- remodel management arrangements, further practice change enabling people to achieve independence. Apply charging policy where gaps have occurred. Further review operating models to achieve alignment and savings.**
- **My Day My Life – respite opportunity service- review night time support, explore dormant weeks, review whole provision and option appraise alongside the potential and look at generating income on respite beds.**
- **Mental Health - practice change and remodelling of services and accommodation types.**
- **All age disability service- transport, practice change, accommodation remodelling.**

Expected impact of the project?

The proposals are in line with the direction of travel and are consistent with the approach we have taken to realise efficiencies in the existing service model.

Some aspects will require dedicated time and resource and have been planned over a 3 year period.

2. Savings proposed

Show how project will deliver savings against the current service budget, will this be a saving or income generation. This must be profiled over each year implicated.

What savings are expected to be achieved?		
Year	Proposed Savings (£)	Proposed income generation (£)
18/19	638K	
19/20 and 20/21	356K	15K

3. Options appraisal

List all options that have/are being considered (further details on these may be required to inform scrutiny/decision making reports)

Option 1
Considered not providing services e.g. Residential and care at home services, day services and buying all provision from the market.
Reason why not progressed/progressed?
The care market is extremely fragile in Monmouthshire, recruitment issues are significant, even with more favourable terms and conditions we are stretched to keep services going. Once all the costs are factored into the option of not providing the share we have in the market the savings are very small we would not have the ability to be the service of last resort or influence the quality required and costs would rise .
Option 2
Reason why not progressed/progressed?

4. Actions to deliver the project

Describe the key activities that will be undertaken to deliver the project and the action holders. This provides a further breakdown of the actions that need to be taken, each project should also be included in the service plan action.

Action	Timescale
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disability services – My Day My Life- remodel management arrangements, further practice change enabling people to achieve independence. 	18/19
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apply charging policy where gaps have occurred. Further review operating models to achieve alignment and savings. 	19/20
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> My Day My Life – respite opportunity service- review 	19/20
Night time support, explore dormant weeks, review whole provision and option appraise alongside the potential and look at generating income on respite beds.	19/20
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mental Health - practice change and remodelling of services and accommodation types. 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All age disability service- transport, practice change, accommodation remodelling. 	18/19 18/19 & 20/21

5. Additional resource/ business needs

Have you identified any resource / capacity required to carry out the project?

Area resource required	What will this be used for?
Staff time to lead the work from the existing staff group.	

6. Key Risks and Issues

Are there any initial barriers or risks that have been identified at this early stage. Any actions to mitigate risk should be included in section 4 and any ongoing risks include in the main service plan risk register.

Risk	Reason why identified	Risk Level (High, Medium or Low – see risk matrix)

Demographic changes	Already increased for certain aspects of delivery e.g. LD respite. Older people with dementia.	Medium
Transition issues	Decisions taken at Government level around residential Schools placement creates a cost burden we have no control over .	High
Increase in Section 117	Legislation changes are having significant impact on cost pressures.	High
Ability to create capacity for all work to deliver on time due to day job pressures.	The capacity to run services and transform for the future is always a challenge and why some schemes are spread over the medium term to enable current projects to be completed to release capacity to move to others.	High
Supported accommodation review	Housing benefit review and potential reduction and inability for people to meet costs.	High
Lack of availability in domiciliary care market to supply assessed care.	Current underspend is partly due to inability to secure all assessed care required.	High

7. Evaluation

How will you measure the impact of the proposal? What are the measures that you expect to see change as a result of what you're proposing. This could be positive or negative. When will you evaluate the change?

Metric	Baseline
Expect to see costs fall in the areas identified and the services that are to be remodelled.	
CHC tracker	
Expect to see a deduction in people using the My Day My life Hub as we remodel the offer	
Expect income to rise in areas where charging has not applied before	

Evaluation Date	
------------------------	--

8. Future Generations Evaluation

The project must be assessed from the start against the equality impact assessment and sustainable development impact assessment using the [Future Generations Evaluation](#).

9. Next steps for budget projects

- i. The project form will be subject to internal review, as well as scrutiny through the political decision making process, at which point further information may need to be provided.
- ii. An evaluation timescale will need to be set out to detail how and when the progress and impact of the project will be evaluated
- iii. In addition the project should be incorporated within service plan arrangements to monitor the progress and impact of the project on the service.

Budget Project Pressure and Savings Proposal Combined 2018/19

This form should be completed in full for all proposals of £50,000 and over, and for proposals of less than where the impact will be felt directly by citizens. For proposals below this threshold you can complete questions 1 and 2 only and then use your service plan to capture your actions, measures and risks.

Form completed by	Jane Rodgers
Date	05/10/17
Reference Number	SCH P3/S2

Service area	Children's Services
Directorate	SCH
Savings targets (based on 17/18 budget)	
2018/19	Savings = £112,564 (£357,217 off set by £244,653* workforce pressures) Anticipated Overspend b/fwd from 2017/18 = £561,000 Overspend c/fwd = £448,436
2019/20	Savings £189,294 Overspend b/fwd from 2018/19 = £448,436 Overspend c/fwd = £259,142
2020/21	Savings £189,294 Overspend b/fwd from 2019/20 = £259,142 Overspend c/fwd = £69,848
2021/22	Savings = £189,294 Overspend b/fwd from 2020/21 = £69,848 Net Savings = £119,446

* £244,653 is the worst case scenario taken from the business case for workforce pressures

CURRENT PROJECTED OVERSPEND for the Service @ M5 = £641,000 (based on dynamic forecasting model) of which £80,000 relates to pressure of agency staff = £561,000 (see business case)

Project lead & Key project team members	Jane Rodgers Rhian Evans Charlotte Drury Tyrone Stokes / Rob Long Claire Robins Craig Williams
--	---

1 Vision and outcomes of the project

Give a business context for the project. Include what the new / improved / reduced service will look like in the future. Consider the impact in the service area and on any other services provided by the Council. From the service user and service provider perspective.

What does the project propose to do?

Delivering Excellence in Children's Services

Monmouthshire Children's Services are currently implementing a 3 year improvement programme with inter-related work streams spanning areas of workforce, social work practice, commissioning, expanding placement provision, increasing our in-house fostering provision, edge of care and family support. The project aims to achieve sustainable change which is built on best practice foundations and within that to achieve a financially sustainable service that makes best use of resources both regionally and locally.

Expected impact of the project?

3 areas have been identified where savings could be achieved.

4. Increasing opportunities for children with more complex / specialist needs, currently placed in residential placements, to be cared for by MCC carers
5. Incentivising Independent Fostering Agency (IFA) carers **currently** looking after MCC children to transfer to MCC terms and conditions

6. Recouping the financial contribution from Health for a young person who meets the criteria for continuing care

2 Savings proposed

Show how project will deliver savings against the current service budget, will this be a saving or income generation. This must be profiled over each year implicated.

What savings are expected to be achieved?			
	Year	Proposed Savings (£)	Proposed income generation (£)
1	2018/19 and over each subsequent year	Unit Cost Residential = £194,096 Unit cost MCC carer (enhanced package / IFA) = £46,084 Unit Cost saving = £148,012	Bring back 1 child from residential to foster care
2	2018/19 Each subsequent year	Unit cost IFA = £46,084 Unit cost MCC carer = £25,443 Unit cost saving = £20,641 Proposed saving 2018/19 = £103,205 Proposed yearly saving over 3 subsequent years = £41,282	Transfer carers from IFAs to MCC carers, 5 placements in the first year and 2 in each subsequent year.

3	2018/19 only	7 months of 50% placement costs = £106,000	Achieve health contribution @ 50% for one placement where continuing health care is met

NB UNIT COSTS USED ARE BASED ON M2 FORECASTS YEAR 2017/18

3. Options appraisal

List all options that have/are being considered (further details on these may be required to inform scrutiny/decision making reports)

Option 1
Do Nothing
Reason why not progressed/progressed?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In line with national and local trends, demands for Looked After Services will continue to increase. To do nothing would increase cost to MCC through on-going reliance on IFA and residential placements Achieving Monmouthshire carers for Monmouthshire children is in keeping with intended strategic direction and should help us achieve better outcomes for our Looked After Children.
Option 2
Proposed ADM for fostering
Reason why not progressed/progressed?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional delivery models will be implemented in the medium term under the National Fostering Framework and through the Children and Families Regional Partnership. MCC require a short-term solution that will work in parallel with the development of regional ADMs

4. Actions to deliver the project

Describe the key activities that will be undertaken to deliver the project and the action holders. This provides a further breakdown of the actions that need to be taken, each project should also be included in the service plan action.

Action	Timescale
<u>Implementation of Fostering Project</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recruitment and Retention carers - Targeted care planning for individual children currently in residential settings - Targeted recruitment of carers specific to individual children - Increase 'bespoke' offers for 'therapeutic carers' - Development of family support within CS including foster carers - Target specific recruitment for individual children current with IFA carers - Development of enhanced fee structure and support packages for complex children 	Already commenced and on-going
<u>Continuing Care</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use existing mechanisms to implement dispute resolution for individual young person - Develop integrated CHC policy with ABUHB for shared decision making in complex cases and dispute resolution process 	Already commenced

5. Additional resource/ business needs

Have you identified any resource / capacity required to carry out the project?

Area resource required	What will this be used for?
Consultancy until March 2018	Project lead for the implementation of the Fostering Project

6. Key Risks and Issues

Are there any initial barriers or risks that have been identified at this early stage. Any actions to mitigate risk should be included in section 4 and any ongoing risks include in the main service plan risk register.

Risk	Reason why identified	Risk Level (High, Medium or Low – see risk matrix)
Carers will not be willing to transfer to MCC terms	Carers will not have sufficient motivation or incentive to leave the IFAs IFAs may ‘up their offer’ to counteract MCC attempts to bring carers over	Medium
Loss of good will with existing MCC carers	It has happened in the past	High
Carers with the skills required to meet the needs of identified children will not be found	There is a national shortage of skilled foster carers	High
Other young people not currently identified will need residential placements	We are working with a dynamic population both those within the LAC system and young people still living with their families. The situation can change quickly and is not stable or predictable.	High
There will be a breakdown in partnership relationships with health	The issue of health financial contributions has been a source of tension over a long period. There is a lack of national guidance or direction in respect of CC for children.	Medium

7. Evaluation

How will you measure the impact of the proposal? What are the measures that you expect to see change as a result of what you're proposing. This could be positive or negative. When will you evaluate the change?

Metric	Baseline
NET increase of placements per year	17 carers representing 23 placements
Numbers of MCC placements : IFA placements	23 : 48
Numbers of IFA carers transferred to MCC	0 representing 0 placements
# of children meeting criteria for CHC or Sec 117 funding and % proportion of funding received from health	TO BE DEVELOPED
# on CASP prevented from becoming LAC (WG indicator)	59.6% (Aug 2017)
# LAC	147
# CP	104

Evaluation Date	6 monthly intervals
-----------------	---------------------

8. Future Generations Evaluation

The project must be assessed from the start against the equality impact assessment and sustainable development impact assessment using the [Future Generations Evaluation](#).

9. Next steps for budget projects

- iv. The project form will be subject to internal review, as well as scrutiny through the political decision making process, at which point further information may need to be provided.
- v. An evaluation timescale will need to be set out to detail how and when the progress and impact of the project will be evaluated
- vi. In addition the project should be incorporated within service plan arrangements to monitor the progress and impact of the project on the service.

CHIEF EXECUTIVES & OPERATIONS PROPOSALS

Budget Project Proposal 2018/19

This form should be completed in full for all proposals of £50,000 and over, and for proposals of less than where the impact will be felt directly by citizens. For proposals below this threshold you can complete questions 1 and 2 only and then use your service plan to capture your actions, measures and risks.

Form completed by	D Jackson
Date	02/11/2017
Reference Number	OPS S1-OPS S5

Service area	Transport & Car Parks
Directorate	Operations
Savings targets (based on 17/18 budget)	
2018/19	5%
2019/20	
2020/21	
2021/22	

Project lead & Key project team members	Debbie Jackson, Amanda Perrin, Sara Edwards, Geoff Price, Shaun White, Michael Ford.
--	--

1 Vision and outcomes of the project

Give a business context for the project. Include what the new / improved / reduced service will look like in the future. Consider the impact in the service area and on any other services provided by the Council. From the service user and service provider perspective.

What does the project propose to do?

1. To introduce Car Parks Charging for Blue Badge Holders.
2. To increase Car Parking Charges by 10%.
3. To increase season permits by 10% in line with proposed tariff increase (2).
4. To increase residents permits from £40 - £60.
5. To increase parking penalties to £70 discounted to £35.

Expected impact of the project?

1. Introducing payment charges for Blue Badge Holders - The impact will be on disabled users of the car parks, who currently benefit from free pay and display. Under the Equality Act we have to make reasonable adjustments for disabled people when introducing policy changes which is why we have proposed introducing an extra hour's free parking for all blue badge holders paying to park in the car parks. An additional free hour will be allowed on top of tariff purchased.
2. Increasing the car parking pay and display charges by 10%, - The short term impact could potentially reduce usage in the car parks. The last increase in car parking charges were introduced November 2014. There is a need to increase car parking charges to compensate for the significant increase in the non-domestic car park rates.
3. Increase season parking permits by 10%. At present the parking permit charges are £390 per year, £200 half yearly, £100 quarterly. The increase to be in line with the proposed 10% charge increase. Season permits are the most cost effective payment solution for the customer, however, the impact being if they don't purchase the season permit then we have increased income into the car parks pay and display machines.
4. Increase residents permits charges from £40 - £60. We are seeing an increase in demand from residents for parking permits, and are currently at full allocation. An increase in costs could potentially impact towards additional residents parking allocations. (The authority has not statutory obligation to provide residents with parking.)
5. Increase Parking Penalties to £70 discounted to £35. At present the penalties for non-pay and display are £60 discounted to £30. These penalty figures are in line with neighbouring authorities. Impact hopefully will encourage drivers to pay and display and park appropriately when using the council's car parks.

2 Savings proposed

Show how project will deliver savings against the current service budget, will this be a saving or income generation. This must be profiled over each year implicated.

What savings are expected to be achieved?

Year	Proposed Savings (£)	Proposed income generation (£)
------	----------------------	--------------------------------

2018		£133K – (10% increase in car parking charges)
2018		£60K – (introduce charging for blue badge holders)
2018		£13k – (10% increase in season parking permits)
2018		£3500K – (increase in residents parking permits)
2018		£12500 – (Increase in penalties charges)

3 Options appraisal

List all options that have/are being considered (further details on these may be required to inform scrutiny/decision making reports)

Option 1

- Increase in Car Parking charges.
- Increase in season permits.
- Increase in residents permits charge.
- Increase in car parking fines.
- The introduction of charging for Blue Badge Holders.

Reason why not progressed/progressed?

Proposed income generation needed in order to meet substantial increase in non-domestic rate charges for car parks, on-going car park maintenance requirements, and in line with inflationary budget increases.

Option 2

Reason why not progressed/progressed?

4 Actions to deliver the project

Describe the key activities that will be undertaken to deliver the project and the action holders. This provides a further breakdown of the actions that need to be taken, each project should also be included in the service plan action.

Action	Timescale
Consult with members regarding the impact on proposed changes	01/2018
If the proposals are agreed for the increase in charges, permits and fines, notices advertising the increases would be displayed for 28 days in the parking locations and on line, this notices will also be advertised in the local press, advising of the new charges and the implementation date. Appropriate amendment to all signage will be made prior to implementation of the new charges.	01/2018
If the proposal is agreed to introduce charges for blue badge holders a notice advising the proposal will need to be advertised for consultation for 28 days, after which any representations received will need to be considered and reported back to members for consideration and decision. If it's agreed to proceed following this consultation the change will again be advertised as a change to the car parking order, with the notice again advertising the date this change will come in to effect.	01/2018

5 Additional resource/ business needs

Have you identified any resource / capacity required to carry out the project?

Area resource required	What will this be used for?
No additional resources required	

6 Key Risks and Issues

Are there any initial barriers or risks that have been identified at this early stage. Any actions to mitigate risk should be included in section 4 and any ongoing risks include in the main service plan risk register.

Risk	Reason why identified	Risk Level (High, Medium or Low – see risk matrix)
Complaints	Increase in complaints from all users of car parks. (Increase in fees, introduction of new charges.)	Medium
Possibility that blue badge holders would be reluctant to pay and find alternative parking on street.	Currently park for free.	Medium

7 Evaluation

How will you measure the impact of the proposal? What are the measures that you expect to see change as a result of what you're proposing. This could be positive or negative. When will you evaluate the change?

Metric	Baseline
Increase in the number of complaints	Current Data
Increase or decrease in penalties issued	Current Data/previous data

8 Future Generations Evaluation

The project must be assessed from the start against the equality impact assessment and sustainable development impact assessment using the [Future Generations Evaluation](#).

9 Next steps for budget projects

- vii. The project form will be subject to internal review, as well as scrutiny through the political decision making process, at which point further information may need to be provided.
- viii. An evaluation timescale will need to be set out to detail how and when the progress and impact of the project will be evaluated
- ix. In addition the project should be incorporated within service plan arrangements to monitor the progress and impact of the project on the service.

Budget Project Proposal 2018/19

This form should be completed in full for all proposals of £50,000 and over, and for proposals of less than where the impact will be felt directly by citizens. For proposals below this threshold you can complete questions 1 and 2 only and then use your service plan to capture your actions, measures and risks.

Form completed by	Dewi Lane
Date	
Reference Number	OPS S6

Service area	Waste and Street Services
Directorate	Operations
Savings targets (based on 17/18 budget)	
2018/19	5%
2019/20	
2020/21	
2021/22	

Project lead & Key project team members	Carl Touhig
--	-------------

1 Vision and outcomes of the project

Give a business context for the project. Include what the new / improved / reduced service will look like in the future. Consider the impact in the service area and on any other services provided by the Council. From the service user and service provider perspective.

What does the project propose to do?
Close Mitchel Troy and Usk HWRC's for two days per week. Usk – Tuesday and Wednesday

Mitchel Troy – Thursday and Friday

Expected impact of the project?

By closing the HWRC's for two days a week a cost saving will be made, this will be achieved by a reduction in staffing costs operating the site. The sites would close on two days mid-week, weekend opening would not be affected minimising resident impact as far as possible.

2 Savings proposed

Show how project will deliver savings against the current service budget, will this be a saving or income generation. This must be profiled over each year implicated.

What savings are expected to be achieved?

Year	Proposed Savings (£)	Proposed income generation (£)
2017-2018	£26,900	£0

3 Options appraisal

List all options that have/are being considered (further details on these may be required to inform scrutiny/decision making reports)

Option 1

Close Mitchel Troy and Usk HWRC for two days per week.

Reason why not progressed/progressed?

This is the preferred option to preserve the valuable HWRC resource in these areas. There is a reduction in the opening times, rather than closure.

Option 2

Close Mitchel Troy and Usk HWRC permanently.

Reason why not progressed/progressed?

This option will save more financially but will cause significantly more risks such as increased fly tipping and potential reduction in recycling rate. Residents will be hugely dissatisfied with the closure within the Monmouth, Usk and surrounding areas.

4 Actions to deliver the project

Describe the key activities that will be undertaken to deliver the project and the action holders. This provides a further breakdown of the actions that need to be taken, each project should also be included in the service plan action.

Action	Timescale
Communications program to be implemented to inform all residents of the changes proposed to the opening times	03/18
Consultation period with 3 rd party contractor (Viridor) for them to implement changes to their staff work pattern	12/17

5 Additional resource/ business needs

Have you identified any resource / capacity required to carry out the project?

Area resource required	What will this be used for?
No additional business needs or resource	N/A

6 Key Risks and Issues

Are there any initial barriers or risks that have been identified at this early stage. Any actions to mitigate risk should be included in section 4 and any ongoing risks include in the main service plan risk register.

Risk	Reason why identified	Risk Level (High, Medium or Low – see risk matrix)
Reduction of recycling rate from waste not passing through the site being disposed of elsewhere	The closure of the site will reduce the opportunity to dispose of waste correctly	Low
Increased fly-tipping	Residents who cannot dispose of their waste correctly due to the site being closed may turn to fly tipping to dispose of their waste	Medium
Resident anger and increased complaints	The closure will mean it is more difficult for residents to dispose of waste, when the site is open it will be busier to compensate for the days closed, leading to anger and complaints	High
Increased demand at Contact Centre	Residents may want to contact the Council to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) find out why the sites opening hours are being reduced b) complain about the changes c) find out when the site will be opened This will increase call volumes and therefore demands placed on staff. WSS will work with the team to determine if additional support will be required.	High

7 Evaluation

How will you measure the impact of the proposal? What are the measures that you expect to see change as a result of what you're proposing. This could be positive or negative. When will you evaluate the change?

Metric	Baseline
Decrease in recycling rate	Current waste data figures
Increased complaints	Complaint figures held in department
Increased fly-tipping	Current fly tipping figures

Evaluation Date	04/19
-----------------	-------

8 Future Generations Evaluation

The project must be assessed from the start against the equality impact assessment and sustainable development impact assessment using the [Future Generations Evaluation](#).

9 Next steps for budget projects

- x. The project form will be subject to internal review, as well as scrutiny through the political decision making process, at which point further information may need to be provided.
- xi. An evaluation timescale will need to be set out to detail how and when the progress and impact of the project will be evaluated
- xii. In addition the project should be incorporated within service plan arrangements to monitor the progress and impact of the project on the service.

Budget Project Proposal 2018/19

This form should be completed in full for all proposals of £50,000 and over, and for proposals of less than where the impact will be felt directly by citizens. For proposals below this threshold you can complete questions 1 and 2 only and then use your service plan to capture your actions, measures and risks.

Form completed by	Rachel Jowitt & Nigel Leaworthy
Date	27 th September 2017
Reference Number	OPS S7

Service area	Waste & Street Services
Directorate	Operations
Savings targets (based on 17/18 budget)	
2018/19	5%
2019/20	
2020/21	
2021/22	

Project lead & Key project team members	Nigel Leaworthy, Nick Bennett, Johnathan Wassal – all depots and frontline grounds colleagues
--	---

1 Vision and outcomes of the project

Give a business context for the project. Include what the new / improved / reduced service will look like in the future. Consider the impact in the service area and on any other services provided by the Council. From the service user and service provider perspective.

What does the project propose to do?

Reduce grass cutting on Council maintained land.

Background

MCC currently cuts open spaces 14 times a year, beginning in March and ending in October. The grass cutting teams work to a fortnightly schedule. The cuts are aligned to the MHA grass cutting contract to give synergies for local environmental quality and also for efficiency purposes.

The Proposal

In its simplest form the schedule will change to a three weekly cycle and cuts reduced from 14-11. The areas to be affected are MCC owned land and are shown on Appendix 1 (to be inserted).

Key areas that will be affected:

- MCC owned public land
- Parks
- Social services facilities such as Mardy Park
- Castles

The areas that will NOT be affected:

- Town and Community Council land we maintain on their behalf
- Schools
- Sport pitches which require a specialist form of maintenance
- Cemeteries

The way the work is organised will be changed to a three weekly cycle

Expected impact of the project?

Grass growth will be longer. The height of cut will be raised which allows existing flora to flower thereby encouraging biodiversity and pollination. This will have a visual impact on local communities and also their perception of their open space. Some will like it others will not. However for environmental performance it is far better to have fewer cuts and to allow the grass to grow.

This proposal does have a negative impact on staff with 3 posts being released from the establishment. Over the last few years manning levels in grounds have been slowly reduced as the service tries to do more with less. This latest proposal will deliver against the financial target set, but will be felt at the frontline and will have an impact on morale which could affect quality standards being achieved elsewhere in the service.

The base budget will be reduced as a consequence by £75,000 (3 posts @ £25k each (incl on costs)).

2 Savings proposed

Show how project will deliver savings against the current service budget, will this be a saving or income generation. This must be profiled over each year implicated.

What savings are expected to be achieved?		
Year	Proposed Savings (£)	Proposed income generation (£)
2018-19	£60,000	

3 Options appraisal

List all options that have/are being considered (further details on these may be required to inform scrutiny/decision making reports)

Option 1
Maintain status quo
Reason why not progressed/progressed?
No saving realised
Option 2
Reducing cuts even further
Reason why not progressed/progressed?
Aesthetic impact on the County Additional investment would be required in new machinery to cope with longer length of grass, would take longer and therefore saving might not be realised.

4 Actions to deliver the project

Describe the key activities that will be undertaken to deliver the project and the action holders. This provides a further breakdown of the actions that need to be taken, each project should also be included in the service plan action.

Action	Timescale
Engage with MHA as they need to agree to reduce their frequencies by the same amount	Oct 2017
Engage with staff to make them aware of proposals and seek their input into how the new rounds would work	Oct 2017
Engage with relevant departments (e.g. leisure etc.) so make them aware of the proposals	Oct 2017
Engage with Town and Community Councils once proposal published to make them aware of the changes	Jan 2018

5 Additional resource/ business needs

Have you identified any resource / capacity required to carry out the project?

Area resource required	What will this be used for?

6 Key Risks and Issues

Are there any initial barriers or risks that have been identified at this early stage. Any actions to mitigate risk should be included in section 4 and any ongoing risks include in the main service plan risk register.

Risk	Reason why identified	Risk Level
------	-----------------------	------------

		(High, Medium or Low – see risk matrix)
Impact on staff morale	Frontline staff numbers have been hit over the last few years and they are feeling the pressure of sustaining standards whilst numbers are reduced.	High
Lack of alignment with MHA timescales	The grass cutting teams cut MCC and MHA land at the same time for efficiency. To make the saving MHA needs to move on its contract requirement and reduce its number of cuts to 11. MHA appear amenable to the suggestion but have to engage with residents before finalising numbers.	Medium
Reduced MHA income	Currently MCC is paid for 16 cuts and this has a profit margin built in. With a reduction to 11 profit will also reduce therefore putting a pressure on the budget. It is intended to manage this pressure from within the service, but needs to be flagged up as a risk	Medium
Sports club impact on parks	The parks are used for sports activities e.g by football clubs. There is the risk that they request additional reactive cuts for their activities which the service may not be able to respond to due to reduced staffing numbers. Also reactive works are inefficient. This may have the unintended consequence of reducing activity in the parks and therefore having a detrimental impact on the Council's aspirations for increased activity.	high
Increased litter/dog fouling in longer grass	There is the risk that with longer grass we see an increase with litter and dog fouling as people will lose pride in their area. This will have a negative impact on the visual impact on the area, reduce people's pride in the area and increase the reactive maintenance of the sites	Medium

7 Evaluation

How will you measure the impact of the proposal? What are the measures that you expect to see change as a result of what you're proposing. This could be positive or negative. When will you evaluate the change?

Metric	Baseline
Staff saving	
11 cuts completed Mar-Oct	

Evaluation Date	Oct 2018
-----------------	----------

8 Future Generations Evaluation

The project must be assessed from the start against the equality impact assessment and sustainable development impact assessment using the [Future Generations Evaluation](#).

9 Next steps for budget projects

- xiii. The project form will be subject to internal review, as well as scrutiny through the political decision making process, at which point further information may need to be provided.
- xiv. An evaluation timescale will need to be set out to detail how and when the progress and impact of the project will be evaluated

- xv. In addition the project should be incorporated within service plan arrangements to monitor the progress and impact of the project on the service.

Budget Project Proposal 2018/19

This form should be completed in full for all proposals of £50,000 and over, and for proposals of less than where the impact will be felt directly by citizens. For proposals below this threshold you can complete questions 1 and 2 only and then use your service plan to capture your actions, measures and risks.

Form completed by	Rachel Jowitt & Nigel Leaworthy
Date	27 th September 2017
Reference Number	OPS S8

Service area	Waste & Street Services
Directorate	Operations
Savings targets (based on 17/18 budget)	
2018/19	5%
2019/20	
2020/21	
2021/22	

Project lead & Key project team members	Nigel Leaworthy, Nick Bennett, Johnathan Wassal – all depots and frontline grounds colleagues
--	---

1 Vision and outcomes of the project

Give a business context for the project. Include what the new / improved / reduced service will look like in the future. Consider the impact in the service area and on any other services provided by the Council. From the service user and service provider perspective.

What does the project propose to do?

Work with Bailey Park Bowls Green to remove the Council subsidised maintenance

Expected impact of the project?

Reduce expenditure on staff and materials. However there is the potential that the cut in base budget could be offset by income from the Club if MCC wins the maintenance work like has happened with other clubs within the County

2 Savings proposed

Show how project will deliver savings against the current service budget, will this be a saving or income generation. This must be profiled over each year implicated.

What savings are expected to be achieved?		
Year	Proposed Savings (£)	Proposed income generation (£)
2018-19	£10,000	

3 Options appraisal

List all options that have/are being considered (further details on these may be required to inform scrutiny/decision making reports)

Option 1
Carry on as now
Reason why not progressed/progressed?
There would be no financial saving and doesn't follow the strategy that has been applied to other bowls clubs
Option 2
Partnership model and phased implementation of saving
Reason why not progressed/progressed?
Full saving would not be realised.

4 Actions to deliver the project

Describe the key activities that will be undertaken to deliver the project and the action holders. This provides a further breakdown of the actions that need to be taken, each project should also be included in the service plan action.

Action	Timescale
Finalisation of internal data to confirm expenditure of staff and materials on Bailey Park Bowls club	Oct 2017
Engagement with the Bowls club to make them aware of the proposals	Dec 2017 once Members have been sighted

5 Additional resource/ business needs

Have you identified any resource / capacity required to carry out the project?

Area resource required	What will this be used for?

6 Key Risks and Issues

Are there any initial barriers or risks that have been identified at this early stage. Any actions to mitigate risk should be included in section 4 and any ongoing risks include in the main service plan risk register.

Risk	Reason why identified	Risk Level (High, Medium or Low – see risk matrix)
Bowling Club cannot afford to pick up maintenance costs and closes removing the ability for many people to play bowls and interact	The health of the club's finances are unknown at this stage	Medium
MCC doesn't win maintenance work	There are other providers in the market	high
Staff morale	Staff take pride in the work they do, can see the benefit and could feel this is targeted at the quality of their work rather than it being a purely financial proposal	Medium

7 Evaluation

How will you measure the impact of the proposal? What are the measures that you expect to see change as a result of what you're proposing. This could be positive or negative. When will you evaluate the change?

Metric	Baseline
££ budget saving	2017-18 expenditure

Evaluation Date	June 2018
------------------------	------------------

8 Future Generations Evaluation

The project must be assessed from the start against the equality impact assessment and sustainable development impact assessment using the [Future Generations Evaluation](#).

9 Next steps for budget projects

- xvi. The project form will be subject to internal review, as well as scrutiny through the political decision making process, at which point further information may need to be provided.
- xvii. An evaluation timescale will need to be set out to detail how and when the progress and impact of the project will be evaluated

Budget Project Proposal 2018/19

This form should be completed in full for all proposals of £50,000 and over, and for proposals of less than where the impact will be felt directly by citizens. For proposals below this threshold you can complete questions 1 and 2 only and then use your service plan to capture your actions, measures and risks.

Form completed by	Rachel Jowitt & Nigel Leaworthy
Date	27 th September 2017
Reference Number	OPS S9

Service area	Waste & Street Services
Directorate	Operations
Savings targets (based on 17/18 budget)	
2018/19	5%
2019/20	
2020/21	
2021/22	

Project lead & Key project team members	Nigel Leaworthy, Nick Bennett, Johnathan Wassal – all depots and frontline grounds colleagues
--	---

1. Vision and outcomes of the project

Give a business context for the project. Include what the new / improved / reduced service will look like in the future. Consider the impact in the service area and on any other services provided by the Council. From the service user and service provider perspective.

What does the project propose to do?

To undertake a trial on how shrub beds are managed and maintained

Expected impact of the project?

Reduced expenditure on shrub bed maintenance and improved environmental performance

2 Savings proposed

Show how project will deliver savings against the current service budget, will this be a saving or income generation. This must be profiled over each year implicated.

What savings are expected to be achieved?		
Year	Proposed Savings (£)	Proposed income generation (£)
2018-19	£12,000	

3 Options appraisal

List all options that have/are being considered (further details on these may be required to inform scrutiny/decision making reports)

Option 1
Do nothing
Reason why not progressed/progressed?
Will see no change and potentially will not see an improvement in environmental performance we are proposing to test
Option 2
Remove all shrub beds
Reason why not progressed/progressed?
Aesthetical impact in local areas. Poor impact on the environment as would be replaced by concrete

4 Actions to deliver the project

Describe the key activities that will be undertaken to deliver the project and the action holders. This provides a further breakdown of the actions that need to be taken, each project should also be included in the service plan action.

Action	Timescale
Review current schedules and working practices for the 142 shrub beds within the Council	End Oct
Finalise proposals for a new maintenance regime	
Confirm number of shrub beds that will be included in the pilot	
Identify fully how the saving can be quantified and assessed	
Develop the measure for monitoring environmental improvements	
Engage with staff and undertake appropriate training on the changes being introduced	

5 Additional resource/ business needs

Have you identified any resource / capacity required to carry out the project?

Area resource required	What will this be used for?
No additional resource needed	

6 Key Risks and Issues

Are there any initial barriers or risks that have been identified at this early stage. Any actions to mitigate risk should be included in section 4 and any ongoing risks include in the main service plan risk register.

Risk	Reason why identified	Risk Level (High, Medium or Low – see risk matrix)

Very low risk process		

7 Evaluation

How will you measure the impact of the proposal? What are the measures that you expect to see change as a result of what you're proposing. This could be positive or negative. When will you evaluate the change?

Metric	Baseline
Maintenance schedules and reduced work input on their management	
Environmental impact	

Evaluation Date	
-----------------	--

8 Future Generations Evaluation

The project must be assessed from the start against the equality impact assessment and sustainable development impact assessment using the [Future Generations Evaluation](#).

9 Next steps for budget projects

- xviii. The project form will be subject to internal review, as well as scrutiny through the political decision making process, at which point further information may need to be provided.
- xix. An evaluation timescale will need to be set out to detail how and when the progress and impact of the project will be evaluated
- xx. In addition the project should be incorporated within service plan arrangements to monitor the progress and impact of the project on the service.

Budget Project Proposal 2018/19

This form should be completed in full for all proposals of £50,000 and over, and for proposals of less than where the impact will be felt directly by citizens. For proposals below this threshold you can complete questions 1 and 2 only and then use your service plan to capture your actions, measures and risks.

Form completed by	Victoria Camp
Date	29/09/2017
Reference Number	OPS S10

Service area	Waste & Street Services
Directorate	County Operations
Savings targets (based on 17/18 budget)	
2018/19	5%
2019/20	
2020/21	
2021/22	

Project lead & Key project team members	Victoria Camp/Carl Touhig/Nigel Leaworthy
--	---

1 Vision and outcomes of the project

Give a business context for the project. Include what the new / improved / reduced service will look like in the future. Consider the impact in the service area and on any other services provided by the Council. From the service user and service provider perspective.

What does the project propose to do?

This project aims to rationalise the number of mechanical sweeper positions across the County to a total of 3 from the current total of 4. This will also result in the reduction of vehicle hire costs as a full year hire will no longer be required. There will be 1 mechanical sweeper running between Caldicot and Chepstow, whereas currently each town has their own.

Expected impact of the project?

The impact of the project will be the reduction of staff and vehicles which will result in an overall cost saving. We will be required to provide short term coverage during the autumn months to ensure the fallen leaves are swept. Impact will be a less desirable street scene across the south of the county.

2 Savings proposed

Show how project will deliver savings against the current service budget, will this be a saving or income generation. This must be profiled over each year implicated.

What savings are expected to be achieved?

Year	Proposed Savings (£)	Proposed income generation (£)
2018/2019	£52,956	0
	<p>Full cost of running a mechanical sweeper. £65k</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• hire £25k• insurance, fuel £15k• staff £26,086 (Band D rate) <p>Seasonal hire to ensure leaves are swept during summer and autumn months</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 3 months hire @ £60 per day (92 days) £5520 – ACTUAL• 3 months of agency staff to backfill MCC substantive staff who would go onto sweeper $= (26096/12) \times 3$ £6,524	

3 Options appraisal

List all options that have/are being considered (further details on these may be required to inform scrutiny/decision making reports)

Option 1
Do nothing
Reason why not progressed/progressed?
Savings proposals need to be made in order to meet budgets for 2018/2019.

Option 2
Try and cover existing operational costs with external income
Reason why not progressed/progressed?
Discussions have taken place previously with town councils and there has been an unwillingness and inability to find this level of resource.

4 Actions to deliver the project

Describe the key activities that will be undertaken to deliver the project and the action holders. This provides a further breakdown of the actions that need to be taken, each project should also be included in the service plan action.

Action	Timescale
Consult with members of affected areas regarding the impact	01/18
Reschedule sweeping across the county to try and maintain service levels	01/18
Staff consultation	10/17
Continual monitoring of cleanliness of streets to develop baseline to be to assess the impact of the reduction	

5 Additional resource/ business needs

Have you identified any resource / capacity required to carry out the project?

Area resource required	What will this be used for?
Contact centre	Additional resource may be required if the number of complaints increases
Impact assessment	Waste and Street Services will need to be reactive to complaints will increase demand when resources have been reduced

6 Key Risks and Issues

Are there any initial barriers or risks that have been identified at this early stage. Any actions to mitigate risk should be included in section 4 and any ongoing risks include in the main service plan risk register.

Risk	Reason why identified	Risk Level (High, Medium or Low – see risk matrix)
Stress service in operations leading to an increase in sickness levels	As a result of static work load but with decreasing numbers of staff the pressure on operations will be higher than the current year. The more reactive the service has to become the more stress levels are increased amongst staff.	High
Complaints	If the service levels are not consistent with previous years residents, Cllrs and local business may complain	Medium
Stress in contact centre	If the number of calls increases as a result of the reduction in visits of sweepers?	Low
Decline in overall view of county	If the current standards are not able to be maintained then a reduced schedule will need to be offered – this will directly impact the overall view and cleanliness of the county	High
Discrepancy in overall view of the county	Town or Community Councils may decide to pay for this separately – this will mean certain parts of the county look better kept than others creating social injustice.	Medium
Reduction in performance indicator	MCC performs well on the PI for street cleanliness it is anticipated that standards will slip and performance will drop putting us out of the higher quartile	High
Alignment of tourism and economic strategies with reduction in service	We would be at risk of failing to enable the county to continue to be an area for investment and growth	Medium
Fear of crime	Cleanliness of streets is linked to fear of crime	Low

7 Evaluation

How will you measure the impact of the proposal? What are the measures that you expect to see change as a result of what you're proposing. This could be positive or negative. When will you evaluate the change?

Metric	Baseline
Number of complaints?	Current baseline data
Current PI Performance?	2017 performance

Evaluation Date	October 2018 and April 2019
-----------------	-----------------------------

8 Future Generations Evaluation

The project must be assessed from the start against the equality impact assessment and sustainable development impact assessment using the [Future Generations Evaluation](#).

9 Next steps for budget projects

- xxi. The project form will be subject to internal review, as well as scrutiny through the political decision making process, at which point further information may need to be provided.
- xxii. An evaluation timescale will need to be set out to detail how and when the progress and impact of the project will be evaluated

In addition the project should be incorporated within service plan arrangements to monitor the progress and impact of the project on the service.

Budget Project Proposal 2018/19

This form should be completed in full for all proposals of £50,000 and over, and for proposals of less than where the impact will be felt directly by citizens. For proposals below this threshold you can complete questions 1 and 2 only and then use your service plan to capture your actions, measures and risks.

Form completed by	Carl Touhig
Date	
Reference Number	OPS S11

Service area	Waste and Street Services
Directorate	Operations
Savings targets (based on 17/18 budget)	
2018/19	£40k
2019/20	
2020/21	
2021/22	

Project lead & Key project team members	Carl Touhig
--	-------------

1. Vision and outcomes of the project

Give a business context for the project. Include what the new / improved / reduced service will look like in the future. Consider the impact in the service area and on any other services provided by the Council. From the service user and service provider perspective.

What does the project propose to do?
Postpones refilling the Head of Waste and Street Services post.
Expected impact of the project?
Duties of Head of Service will be shared between Head of Operations and the Interim HoS WSS post created.

2 Savings proposed

Show how project will deliver savings against the current service budget, will this be a saving or income generation. This must be profiled over each year implicated.

What savings are expected to be achieved?		
Year	Proposed Savings (£)	Proposed income generation (£)
2018-2019	£40,000	£0

3 Options appraisal

List all options that have/are being considered (further details on these may be required to inform scrutiny/decision making reports)

Option 1
Fill the post of Head of Service
Reason why not progressed
Service area is in latter planning stage stage of recycling and grounds review and Interim HoS from existing management team offered the consistency and stability needed to successfully implement the reviews
Option 2
Create Interim post
Reason why not progressed/progressed?
Consistency and stability of service area during this crucial period of implementation. Saving of £40k towards MTFP for 2018/19.

4 Actions to deliver the project

Describe the key activities that will be undertaken to deliver the project and the action holders. This provides a further breakdown of the actions that need to be taken, each project should also be included in the service plan action.

Action	Timescale
Monitor with Head of Operations	6mth, 12mth, 18mth

5 Additional resource/ business needs

Have you identified any resource / capacity required to carry out the project?

Area resource required	What will this be used for?
Create opportunities within WSS team for additional duties and honoraria where necessary	To ensure the full range of duties and the implementation of the reviews are resourced sufficiently.

6 Key Risks and Issues

Are there any initial barriers or risks that have been identified at this early stage. Any actions to mitigate risk should be included in section 4 and any ongoing risks include in the main service plan risk register.

Risk	Reason why identified	Risk Level (High, Medium or Low – see risk matrix)

7 Evaluation

How will you measure the impact of the proposal? What are the measures that you expect to see change as a result of what you're proposing. This could be positive or negative. When will you evaluate the change?

Metric	Baseline

Evaluation Date	April 2018
-----------------	------------

8 Future Generations Evaluation

The project must be assessed from the start against the equality impact assessment and sustainable development impact assessment using the [Future Generations Evaluation](#).

9 Next steps for budget projects

- xxiii. The project form will be subject to internal review, as well as scrutiny through the political decision making process, at which point further information may need to be provided.
- xxiv. An evaluation timescale will need to be set out to detail how and when the progress and impact of the project will be evaluated
- xxv. In addition the project should be incorporated within service plan arrangements to monitor the progress and impact of the project on the service.

Budget Project Proposal 2018/19

This form should be completed in full for all proposals of £50,000 and over, and for proposals of less than where the impact will be felt directly by citizens. For proposals below this threshold you can complete questions 1 and 2 only and then use your service plan to capture your actions, measures and risks.

Form completed by	Steve lane
Date	1/11/2017
Reference Number	OPS S12 Highways - Road Traffic Incident recovery of costs

Service area	Highways Operations
Directorate	Operations
Savings targets (based on 17/18 budget)	
2018/19	Up to £15k

Project lead & Key project team members	Steve Lane, Andrew Welsh, Andrew Church
--	---

1. Vision and outcomes of the project

Give a business context for the project. Include what the new / improved / reduced service will look like in the future. Consider the impact in the service area and on any other services provided by the Council. From the service user and service provider perspective.

What does the project propose to do?

The proposal is to recover the expenditure, made by MCC Highways Operations, while undertaking emergency work that is directly attributable to third parties. E.g. RTI clear up, mud on road and fallen trees where they are traceable.

Expected impact of the project?

Impact will be noticeable for those who require our assistance, either requested by police or reported via stakeholders to remove hazards. These are powers under the Highway act 1980 for removal and charging in the event of third party costs being incurred by MCC.

2. Savings proposed

Show how project will deliver savings against the current service budget, will this be a saving or income generation. This must be profiled over each year implicated.

What savings are expected to be achieved?		
Year	Proposed Savings (£)	Proposed income generation (£)
2018/19		Up to £15k. This income requires technology within GPS and Smart phones which will help develop recovery and then peak at £15k.

Section 3 onwards left blank

Budget Project Proposal 2018/19

This form should be completed in full for all proposals of £50,000 and over, and for proposals of less than where the impact will be felt directly by citizens. For proposals below this threshold you can complete questions 1 and 2 only and then use your service plan to capture your actions, measures and risks.

Form completed by	Steve lane
Date	1/11/2017
Reference Number	OPS S13 Highways - Improved Plant utilisation/recovery

Service area	Highways Operations
Directorate	Operations
Savings targets (based on 17/18 budget)	
2018/19	Up to £40k

Project lead & Key project team members	Steve Lane, Mark Watkins, Nathan Freeman
--	--

1 Vision and outcomes of the project

Give a business context for the project. Include what the new / improved / reduced service will look like in the future. Consider the impact in the service area and on any other services provided by the Council. From the service user and service provider perspective.

What does the project propose to do?
MCC has identified equipment that neighbouring Authorities do not have. The equipment is also lacking in the local private sector. We have managed to gain interest in this equipment and propose to hire to other local authorities on a need basis. It has proven difficult in recent years to develop this, budget restraints across other all Authorities, but more of a push will see benefits.
Expected impact of the project?
No impact will be seen by the public.

2. Savings proposed

Show how project will deliver savings against the current service budget, will this be a saving or income generation. This must be profiled over each year implicated.

What savings are expected to be achieved?		
Year	Proposed Savings (£)	Proposed income generation (£)
2018/19		Up to £40k. This income requires others to engage with MCC to hire equipment. We will be able to offer lower charge rates than competitors. The proposal should be seen as favourable by other Authorities.

Section 3 onward left blank

Budget Project Proposal 2018/19

This form should be completed in full for all proposals of £50,000 and over, and for proposals of less than where the impact will be felt directly by citizens. For proposals below this threshold you can complete questions 1 and 2 only and then use your service plan to capture your actions, measures and risks.

Form completed by	Richard Cope
Date	1 st November 2017
Reference Number	OPS S14

Service area	Passenger Transport Unit
Directorate	Chief Executive –Operations
Savings targets (based on 17/18 budget)	
2018/19	25,000/10,000
2019/20	
2020/21	
2021/22	

Project lead & Key project team members	Huw Jones & Richard Cope
--	--------------------------

1. Vision and outcomes of the project

Give a business context for the project. Include what the new / improved / reduced service will look like in the future. Consider the impact in the service area and on any other services provided by the Council. From the service user and service provider perspective.

What does the project propose to do?

Removal or Changes to Public Service route 65. The proposal would take off the existing bus service 65 from Chepstow to Monmouth via Trellech and Devauden and replace with demand responsive Grass Routes service. Option 2 would be to remove the poorly supported last services from Chepstow and Monmouth which would reduce running costs on the service.

Expected impact of the project?

The impact would be a reduction in the current service and changing the service to be pre booked 24 hrs in advance rather than turn up and go. Option 2 would remove the last timetables services from Monmouth and Chepstow which would reduce the running costs of the service but reduce any access to public services after 4:45p.m.

2. Savings proposed

Show how project will deliver savings against the current service budget, will this be a saving or income generation. This must be profiled over each year implicated.

What savings are expected to be achieved?		
Year	Proposed Savings (£)	Proposed income generation (£)
2018/19	25,000/10,000	

3. Options appraisal

List all options that have/are being considered (further details on these may be required to inform scrutiny/decision making reports)

Option 1
Remove the public bus service 65 and replace with a demand Responsive Grass Routes Service
Reason why not progressed/progressed?
This would remove access for citizens who are not frequent bus users and use the bus on an ad hoc or emergency basis with bookings being taken 24 hrs in advance. It would reduce access to tourism and services in both towns served. Passenger Data will be supplied
Option 2
Remove the last timetabled journeys from Monmouth and Chepstow
Reason why not progressed/progressed?
This would remove access to services after 4:45pm but these journeys are not well supported and are not sustainable with the numbers travelling. passenger data will be supplied.

Option 3
Reason why not progressed/progressed?

4. Actions to deliver the project

Describe the key activities that will be undertaken to deliver the project and the action holders. This provides a further breakdown of the actions that need to be taken, each project should also be included in the service plan action.

Action	Timescale
Stakeholder Consultation	December 17/January 18
Notice to Traffic Commissioner to reduce or cancel service	28 days

5. Additional resource/ business needs

Have you identified any resource / capacity required to carry out the project?

Area resource required	What will this be used for?
Advertising Consultation	To Consult with Stakeholders on proposals.

6. Key Risks and Issues

Are there any initial barriers or risks that have been identified at this early stage. Any actions to mitigate risk should be included in section 4 and any ongoing risks include in the main service plan risk register.

Risk	Reason why identified	Risk Level (High, Medium or Low – see risk matrix)

7. Evaluation

How will you measure the impact of the proposal? What are the measures that you expect to see change as a result of what you're proposing. This could be positive or negative. When will you evaluate the change?

Metric	Baseline
Access to services in towns will be reduced for citizens who rely on public transport	EQIA
Social Inclusion of citizens in rural areas	EQIA

Evaluation Date	January 18
-----------------	------------

8. Future Generations Evaluation

The project must be assessed from the start against the equality impact assessment and sustainable development impact assessment using the [Future Generations Evaluation](#).

9. Additional comments

Budget Project Proposal 2018/19

This form should be completed in full for all proposals of £50,000 and over, and for proposals of less than where the impact will be felt directly by citizens. For proposals below this threshold you can complete questions 1 and 2 only and then use your service plan to capture your actions, measures and risks.

Form completed by	Richard Cope
Date	1 st November 2017
Reference Number	OPS S16

Service area	Passenger Transport Unit
Directorate	Chief Executive /Operations
Savings targets (based on 17/18 budget)	
2018/19	£26,000
2019/20	
2020/21	
2021/22	

Project lead & Key project team members	Richard Cope/Richard Cook
--	---------------------------

1. Vision and outcomes of the project

Give a business context for the project. Include what the new / improved / reduced service will look like in the future. Consider the impact in the service area and on any other services provided by the Council. From the service user and service provider perspective.

What does the project propose to do?

The removal of Sunday & Bank Holiday Bus Services to all areas of Monmouthshire.

Expected impact of the project?

The removal of these services would mean no access to services in towns and villages served by these services, the services affected would be the 83 Abergavenny to Monmouth 45 Abergavenny –Llwynu estate, 60 Newport to Monmouth, 74 Newport to Chepstow and 69 Chepstow to Monmouth. This will also effect the tourism trade in the wye valley and surrounding areas.

2 Savings proposed

Show how project will deliver savings against the current service budget, will this be a saving or income generation. This must be profiled over each year implicated.

What savings are expected to be achieved?		
Year	Proposed Savings (£)	Proposed income generation (£)
2018/19	26,000	

3 Options appraisal

List all options that have/are being considered (further details on these may be required to inform scrutiny/decision making reports)

Option 1
To remove all Sunday and Bank Holiday bus services
Reason why not progressed/progressed?
This would leave all areas without any bus services on Sundays serving Monmouthshire Towns. Passenger Data will be supplied
Option 2
Partial removal of Sunday and Bank Holiday bus services.
Reason why not progressed/progressed?
This is another option but savings may not be achievable as these services are due to be retendered early in 2018 to be implemented from April 2018. The saving would depend on tender prices. Currently the services are linked removing some but not all services may not produce a saving as they won't all be linked. Passenger Data will be supplied
Option 3

Reason why not progressed/progressed?

4 Actions to deliver the project

Describe the key activities that will be undertaken to deliver the project and the action holders. This provides a further breakdown of the actions that need to be taken, each project should also be included in the service plan action.

Action	Timescale
Consultation with Stakeholders	January 2018
Possible retendering of service if option 2 is moved forward	February 2018
Withdrawal or award of contract/s	March 2018

5 Additional resource/ business needs

Have you identified any resource / capacity required to carry out the project?

Area resource required	What will this be used for?
Advertising Consultation	To inform stakeholders, may be done through budget consultation.

6 Key Risks and Issues

Are there any initial barriers or risks that have been identified at this early stage. Any actions to mitigate risk should be included in section 4 and any ongoing risks include in the main service plan risk register.

Risk	Reason why identified	Risk Level
------	-----------------------	------------

		(High, Medium or Low – see risk matrix)

7 Evaluation

How will you measure the impact of the proposal? What are the measures that you expect to see change as a result of what you're proposing. This could be positive or negative. When will you evaluate the change?

Metric	Baseline
Access to services on Sundays and Bank Holidays will be removed for citizens reliant on public transport	EQIA
Connections to other services will be removed	EQIA

Evaluation Date	January 2018
------------------------	---------------------

8 Future Generations Evaluation

The project must be assessed from the start against the equality impact assessment and sustainable development impact assessment using the [Future Generations Evaluation](#).

9 Additional comments

Budget Project Proposal 2018/19

This form should be completed in full for all proposals of £50,000 and over, and for proposals of less than where the impact will be felt directly by citizens. For proposals below this threshold you can complete questions 1 and 2 only and then use your service plan to capture your actions, measures and risks.

Form completed by	Richard Cope
Date	1 st November 2017
Reference Number	OPS S15

Service area	Passenger Transport Unit
Directorate	Chief Executive- Operations
Savings targets (based on 17/18 budget)	
2018/19	9,000
2019/20	12,000
2020/21	
2021/22	

Project lead & Key project team members	Huw Jones /Paul Diaper/Richard Cope
--	-------------------------------------

1. Vision and outcomes of the project

Give a business context for the project. Include what the new / improved / reduced service will look like in the future. Consider the impact in the service area and on any other services provided by the Council. From the service user and service provider perspective.

What does the project propose to do?

The Passenger Transport Unit is registered with JAUPPT as a CPC driver training agent. This is a mandatory training for PCV and HGV drivers. Five training modules need to be taken every five years and most PCV drivers will expire in 2018/19. The project proposal is to offer this to outside operators at a cost per driver for each module which will raise an income after costs of providing the training are taken into account.

Expected impact of the project?

The impact will be to offer PCV operators a competitive price per module for their drivers on courses that are tailored for school bus drivers and are mandatory without this training they cannot continue to hold a pcv licence.

2. Savings proposed

Show how project will deliver savings against the current service budget, will this be a saving or income generation. This must be profiled over each year implicated.

What savings are expected to be achieved?		
Year	Proposed Savings (£)	Proposed income generation (£)
2018/19		9,000
2019/20		12,000

3. Options appraisal

List all options that have/are being considered (further details on these may be required to inform scrutiny/decision making reports)

Option 1
Reason why not progressed/progressed?
Option 2
Reason why not progressed/progressed?
Option 3

Reason why not progressed/progressed?

4. Actions to deliver the project

Describe the key activities that will be undertaken to deliver the project and the action holders. This provides a further breakdown of the actions that need to be taken, each project should also be included in the service plan action.

Action	Timescale

5. Additional resource/ business needs

Have you identified any resource / capacity required to carry out the project?

Area resource required	What will this be used for?

6. Key Risks and Issues

Are there any initial barriers or risks that have been identified at this early stage. Any actions to mitigate risk should be included in section 4 and any ongoing risks include in the main service plan risk register.

Risk	Reason why identified	Risk Level
------	-----------------------	------------

		(High, Medium or Low – see risk matrix)

7. Evaluation

How will you measure the impact of the proposal? What are the measures that you expect to see change as a result of what you're proposing. This could be positive or negative. When will you evaluate the change?

Metric	Baseline

Evaluation Date	
-----------------	--

8. Future Generations Evaluation

The project must be assessed from the start against the equality impact assessment and sustainable development impact assessment using the [Future Generations Evaluation](#).

9. Additional comments

RESOURCES PROPOSALS

Budget Project Proposal 2018/19

This form should be completed in full for all proposals of £50,000 and over, and for proposals of less than where the impact will be felt directly by citizens. For proposals below this threshold you can complete questions 1 and 2 only and then use your service plan to capture your actions, measures and risks.

Form completed by	R Hoggins
Date	13 th November 2017
Reference Number	RES S1

Service area	Primary Schools Catering
Directorate	CEO/Operations
Savings targets (based on 17/18 budget)	
2018/19	5% - £23,000
2019/20	
2020/21	
2021/22	

Project lead & Key project team members	
--	--

1. Vision and outcomes of the project

Give a business context for the project. Include what the new / improved / reduced service will look like in the future. Consider the impact in the service area and on any other services provided by the Council. From the service user and service provider perspective.

What does the project propose to do?
An increase of 10p per meal rising from £2.10 to £2.20 in September to coincide with the start of the academic year.

This contributes to the recovery of costs (the service has a net cost to the authority of approx. £440k per annum and keeps abreast of budget modelling assumptions.

An increase to £2.20 places MCC primary sector meal costs at the average of Welsh school meal costs as at April 2017.

Expected impact of the project?

This increase falls upon parents and guardians (other than those entitled to free school meals). It is introduced at the start of the academic year (September) to ensure parents/guardians are well aware of the costs of the service during the school year rather than introduce to coincide with the financial year. There is a risk that meal numbers will drop temporarily as a result but experience suggests that this will recover as the increase seems a reasonable incremental approach.

2. Savings proposed

Show how project will deliver savings against the current service budget, will this be a saving or income generation. This must be profiled over each year implicated.

What savings are expected to be achieved?		
Year	Proposed Savings (£)	Proposed income generation (£)
2018/19		£23,000 (net of 2.5% budget model assumption)

3. Options appraisal

List all options that have/are being considered (further details on these may be required to inform scrutiny/decision making reports)

Option 1
No increase

Reason why not progressed/progressed?

Unrealistic as food costs increase so no increase extends the net cost of the service and ignores eth budget modelling exacerbating the gap between actual cost and budget cost.

Option 2

Increase by 20p per meal or greater

Reason why not progressed/progressed?

20p per meal would constitute an increase of nearly 10% in cost. Given the general concern about cost increases there is a risk that such an increase would reduce custom for an extended period with a detrimental impact upon unit costs with a subsequent increased budget pressure.

4. Actions to deliver the project

Describe the key activities that will be undertaken to deliver the project and the action holders. This provides a further breakdown of the actions that need to be taken, each project should also be included in the service plan action.

Action	Timescale
Advise schools and parents leading from budget approval but particularly in the lead up to the start of the new academic year	April – Sept '18

5. Additional resource/ business needs

Have you identified any resource / capacity required to carry out the project?

Area resource required	What will this be used for?
None at this time	

6. Key Risks and Issues

Are there any initial barriers or risks that have been identified at this early stage. Any actions to mitigate risk should be included in section 4 and any ongoing risks include in the main service plan risk register.

Risk	Reason why identified	Risk Level (High, Medium or Low – see risk matrix)
Loss of custom	Impact upon household budgets	medium

7. Evaluation

How will you measure the impact of the proposal? What are the measures that you expect to see change as a result of what you're proposing. This could be positive or negative. When will you evaluate the change?

Metric	Baseline
Custom levels and budget information	2017/18 data

Evaluation Date	quarterly
-----------------	-----------

8. Future Generations Evaluation

The project must be assessed from the start against the equality impact assessment and sustainable development impact assessment using the [Future Generations Evaluation](#).

9. Next steps for budget projects

- xxvi. The project form will be subject to internal review, as well as scrutiny through the political decision making process, at which point further information may need to be provided.
- xxvii. An evaluation timescale will need to be set out to detail how and when the progress and impact of the project will be evaluated
- xxviii. In addition the project should be incorporated within service plan arrangements to monitor the progress and impact of the project on the service.

Budget Project Proposal 2018/19

This form should be completed in full for all proposals of £50,000 and over, and for proposals of less than where the impact will be felt directly by citizens. For proposals below this threshold you can complete questions 1 and 2 only and then use your service plan to capture your actions, measures and risks.

Form completed by	Debra Hill-Howells
Date	10 th November 2017
Reference Number	RES S2-S3

Service area	Property Services
Directorate	Resources
Savings targets (based on 17/18 budget)	
2018/19	£24,000
2019/20	
2020/21	
2021/22	

Project lead & Key project team members	Debra Hill-Howells Mike Long/Mark Jones
--	--

1. Vision and outcomes of the project

Give a business context for the project. Include what the new / improved / reduced service will look like in the future. Consider the impact in the service area and on any other services provided by the Council. From the service user and service provider perspective.

What does the project propose to do?

Generation of additional income through the provision of services to MCC clients and third parties. Exploratory discussions are underway with partner organisations to ascertain whether savings can be realised through the procurement of a new provider for mail services.

Expected impact of the project?

Will increase income targets against a small team. We currently rely on the support of neighbouring authorities to assist in the delivery of these projects due to lack of capacity and skill sets. We will need to review the resources required to support MCC priorities as part of the corporate landlord.

2. Savings proposed

Show how project will deliver savings against the current service budget, will this be a saving or income generation. This must be profiled over each year implicated.

What savings are expected to be achieved?

Year	Proposed Savings (£)	Proposed income generation (£)
2018/19		19,000
2018/19	5,000	

3. Options appraisal

List all options that have/are being considered (further details on these may be required to inform scrutiny/decision making reports)

Option 1
Reduce staffing resources to make a saving
Reason why not progressed/progressed?
Limits capacity and succession planning. Already relying on neighbouring authorities to assist in the delivery of MCC schemes due to a lack of internal resources
Option 2
Implement a corporate landlord model that aggregates building costs and budgets, has a prioritised plan of works and a resources plan.
Reason why not progressed/progressed?
Corporate landlord model in development with the teams. It is intended that the model will be ready for implementation early in the new financial year.
Option 3

Reason why not progressed/progressed?

4. Actions to deliver the project

Describe the key activities that will be undertaken to deliver the project and the action holders. This provides a further breakdown of the actions that need to be taken, each project should also be included in the service plan action.

Action	Timescale
Working with neighbours to ascertain whether there is sufficient appetite and aggregation to jointly procure a new mail provider and make sufficient savings to quantify cost of undertaking against benefits received	12 months
Review charging mechanisms with neighbouring authorities and collaboration partners	6 months

5. Additional resource/ business needs

Have you identified any resource / capacity required to carry out the project?

Area resource required	What will this be used for?

6. Key Risks and Issues

Are there any initial barriers or risks that have been identified at this early stage. Any actions to mitigate risk should be included in section 4 and any ongoing risks include in the main service plan risk register.

Risk	Reason why identified	Risk Level (High, Medium or Low – see risk matrix)
Collaboration partner will not be prepared to accept uplifted costs and therefore arrangement may be terminated losing circa £400k in income	Charges to date have been on a cost recovery model, however original proposal was on the basis of design services being charged at a % ratio.	Medium
Costs of provision of support from neighbouring authorities is more expensive than recruiting directly, however this requires a guaranteed work programme	Recharges from neighbouring authorities are increasing and will be on a par to the costs being charged to collaboration partner eroding income streams	Medium
Not sufficient quantum to make the savings proposed for the mail service	At the initial stages of the project therefore no data to inform savings proposals or likely success factor	Medium

7. Evaluation

How will you measure the impact of the proposal? What are the measures that you expect to see change as a result of what you're proposing. This could be positive or negative. When will you evaluate the change?

Metric	Baseline
Increased income	17/18 budget
Workload demand increasing (potential increase in sickness and stress levels)	17/18 project outputs and Sickness reporting

Evaluation Date	March 19
-----------------	----------

8. Future Generations Evaluation

The project must be assessed from the start against the equality impact assessment and sustainable development impact assessment using the [Future Generations Evaluation](#).

Term Time Only Payments (RES S4) – Tracey Harry

Payroll has provided the following forecast of annual overpayments to staff working term time hours. Historically the calculation has overstated the amounts due to these staff.

Band	# Number of People Potentially affected	Average Weekly Hours (as at 09/10/17)	Average Week Per Year 39 working Weeks; 6 weeks A/L & 2 weeks BH	Max SCP for Band	Value of Max SCP FTE	Average Existing Calculation Amount %	Avg Existing Gross Cost (with No OnCosts)	Average New Calculation Amount %	Avg New Gross Cost (with No OnCosts)	Difference between Average Costs per employee	Potential Average Saving based on new calc
Band A	109	14	47	SCP 9	£15,375.00	0.3419	£5,256.71	0.3354	£5,156.78	£99.94	£10,893.19
Band B	351	12	47	SCP13	£16,491.00	0.2931	£4,834.16	0.2875	£4,741.16	£93.00	£32,642.15
Band C	174	24	47	SCP17	£17,772.00	0.5863	£10,419.34	0.5749	£10,217.12	£202.22	£35,186.32
Band D	270	27	47	SCP21	£20,138.00	0.6596	£13,283.02	0.6468	£13,025.26	£257.77	£69,596.93
Band E	63	28	47	SCP25	£22,658.00	0.6839	£15,495.81	0.6708	£15,198.99	£296.82	£18,699.65
Band F	91	26	47	SCP29	£25,951.00	0.6351	£16,481.48	0.6229	£16,164.88	£316.60	£28,810.80
Band G	4	34	47	SCP33	£29,323.00	0.8305	£24,352.75	0.8145	£23,883.58	£469.17	£1,876.67
Band H	6	28	47	SCP37	£32,486.00	0.6839	£22,217.18	0.6708	£21,791.61	£425.57	£2,553.40
Band I	2	37	47	SCP41	£36,379.00	0.9038	£32,881.02	0.8864	£32,246.35	£634.67	£1,269.35
Modern Apprentices	4	27	47	PT	£14,470.00	0.6596	£9,544.41	0.6468	£9,359.20	£185.22	£740.86
Soulsbury	1	37	47	Soul 8	£42,321.00	0.9038	£38,249.72	0.8864	£37,513.33	£736.39	£736.39
Totals	1075										£203,005.70

This analysis is based on a 12 month projection of savings, but pragmatically should the situation be rectified financially, it would be most likely to take effect from the start of the new academic year (so 7/12 of amount i.e.£118,420). CYP

colleagues predict their proportion of this sum to be £95k (CYP S2), leaving a predicted £23k (RES S4) to relate to staff outside of the school budget that work term time only, e.g. catering staff, bus drivers, cleaners etc.

Budget Project Proposal 2018/19

This form should be completed in full for all proposals of £50,000 and over, and for proposals of less than where the impact will be felt directly by citizens. For proposals below this threshold you can complete questions 1 and 2 only and then use your service plan to capture your actions, measures and risks.

Form completed by	Ruth Donovan
Date	1 st November 2017
Reference Number	RES S5

Service area	Revenues, Systems & Exchequer
Directorate	Resources
Savings targets (based on 17/18 budget)	
2018/19	£62,125
2019/20	
2020/21	
2021/22	

Project lead & Key project team members	Ruth Donovan, Richard Davies, Lisa Widenham, Sue Deacy & Wendy Woods
--	--

1. Vision and outcomes of the project

Give a business context for the project. Include what the new / improved / reduced service will look like in the future. Consider the impact in the service area and on any other services provided by the Council. From the service user and service provider perspective.

What does the project propose to do?

- Realign the service budget to reflect actual income received.

- Update the services DIP system
- Reduce MCC's contribution to the Shared Benefit Service to reflect a revised staffing establishment

Expected impact of the project?

- Improve how correspondence received from our tax payers is handled on a day to day basis, reduce the Authority's security risk and achieve value for money.

2. Savings proposed

Show how project will deliver savings against the current service budget, will this be a saving or income generation. This must be profiled over each year implicated.

What savings are expected to be achieved?		
Year	Proposed Savings (£)	Proposed income generation (£)
2018/19		£39,000
2018/19	£10,000	
2018/19	£8,000	

3. Options appraisal

List all options that have/are being considered (further details on these may be required to inform scrutiny/decision making reports)

Option 1 - £39,000 recharge income from MCC schools

The inclusion of this recharge income to the Financial Systems Support budget reflects the actual charge that schools paid for services in 2017/18. Combined with the existing recharge income budget this takes the total recharge figure for schools to £50,200.

Reason why not progressed/progressed?

Agreed to progress

Option 2 – Potential £10,000 reduction in system costs

Work to review and update the DIP system currently used by the Revenue Team has identified the potential to reduce future annual running costs.

Reason why not progressed/progressed?

Agreed to progress subject to being able to agree a suitable contract with the supplier.

Option 3 – £8,000 reduction in contribution to the Shared Benefits Service

This would be an employee saving, as a result of changes to a post within the Benefits Shared Service. The service is managed by Torfaen County Borough Council – this saving would be reflected in a reduction in the annual contribution that Monmouthshire County Council makes to the Shared Service. This change does not pose a risk to the service.

Reason why not progressed/progressed?

Agreed to progress subject to the Shared Service Manager providing full details and costings.

4. Actions to deliver the project

Describe the key activities that will be undertaken to deliver the project and the action holders. This provides a further breakdown of the actions that need to be taken, each project should also be included in the service plan action.

Action	Timescale
Option 1 – update the 2018/19 income budget to reflect the actual recharges and charge the schools.	April 2018
Option 2 – work with the system suppliers, SRS, Revenues Team and Shared Benefits Service to identify and implement a workable system solution	By September 2018
Option 3 – work with the Shared Benefits Service to identify achievable savings and to put the necessary arrangements in place	April 2018

5. Additional resource/ business needs

Have you identified any resource / capacity required to carry out the project?

Area resource required	What will this be used for?
To achieve option 2 we will require services from the SRS	This will be used to develop or implement the DIP system in line with our agreed course of action.

6. Key Risks and Issues

Are there any initial barriers or risks that have been identified at this early stage. Any actions to mitigate risk should be included in section 4 and any ongoing risks include in the main service plan risk register.

Risk	Reason why identified	Risk Level (High, Medium or Low – see risk matrix)
Option 1 – risk that schools decide not to purchase the service for 2018/19 onwards	Each year MCC schools have the option to decide which services they take from us.	Low
Option 2 – Early information provided by the SRS indicates that our preferred solution may not now be possible	Risk that we may be unable to release the savings identified due to system and contract restraints.	High

7. Evaluation

How will you measure the impact of the proposal? What are the measures that you expect to see change as a result of what you're proposing. This could be positive or negative. When will you evaluate the change?

Metric	Baseline
Income budget target for the Financial System Support Team met	£50,200
DIP system operating and affordable	Budget envelope
Shared Benefit service operating to 2018/19 budget	On budget

Evaluation Date	September 2018
------------------------	----------------

8. Future Generations Evaluation

The project must be assessed from the start against the equality impact assessment and sustainable development impact assessment using the [Future Generations Evaluation](#).

9. Additional comments

These savings will be managed internally in conjunction with the identified service pressures which are listed in a separate proforma. Pressures of £56,000 have been identified within this service, so even though savings delivering the 5% target have been identified these cannot be used to manage the budget gap.

In Summary:

5% savings identified £57,000

Pressures identified £56,000

Net Saving £1,000

Budget Project Proposal 2018/19

This form should be completed in full for all proposals of £50,000 and over, and for proposals of less than where the impact will be felt directly by citizens. For proposals below this threshold you can complete questions 1 and 2 only and then use your service plan to capture your actions, measures and risks.

Form completed by	Sian Hayward
Date	29/09/17
Reference Number	RES S6

Service area	Digital Programme Office
Directorate	Resources
Savings targets (based on 17/18 budget)	
2018/19	10% £30,000
2019/20	
2020/21	
2021/22	

Project lead & Key project team members	
--	--

1. Vision and outcomes of the project

Give a business context for the project. Include what the new / improved / reduced service will look like in the future. Consider the impact in the service area and on any other services provided by the Council. From the service user and service provider perspective.

What does the project propose to do?

1. Reduce the equipment budget by £30k
Or
2. Reduce staffing by £16k and equipment for the balance

Expected impact of the project?

1. The impact on the equipment refresh budget can be managed as we have some equipment in stock from last year. Ongoing we will need to supplement the budget by charging service areas for any additional equipment they may need to procure.
2. A reduction on the impact of delivering the programme plan, and on the savings generated across the authority through digitisation and process change management. This isn't an option I would like to take as it has an impact elsewhere.

2 Savings proposed

Show how project will deliver savings against the current service budget, will this be a saving or income generation. This must be profiled over each year implicated.

What savings are expected to be achieved?

Year	Proposed Savings (£)	Proposed income generation (£)
2018/19	£30k	0

3 Options appraisal

List all options that have/are being considered (further details on these may be required to inform scrutiny/decision making reports)

Option 1
Reason why not progressed/progressed?
Option 2
Reason why not progressed/progressed?

--

4 Actions to deliver the project

Describe the key activities that will be undertaken to deliver the project and the action holders. This provides a further breakdown of the actions that need to be taken, each project should also be included in the service plan action.

Action	Timescale

5 Additional resource/ business needs

Have you identified any resource / capacity required to carry out the project?

Area resource required	What will this be used for?

6 Key Risks and Issues

Are there any initial barriers or risks that have been identified at this early stage. Any actions to mitigate risk should be included in section 4 and any ongoing risks include in the main service plan risk register.

Risk	Reason why identified	Risk Level
------	-----------------------	------------

		(High, Medium or Low – see risk matrix)

7 Evaluation

How will you measure the impact of the proposal? What are the measures that you expect to see change as a result of what you're proposing. This could be positive or negative. When will you evaluate the change?

Metric	Baseline

Evaluation Date	
-----------------	--

8 Future Generations Evaluation

The project must be assessed from the start against the equality impact assessment and sustainable development impact assessment using the [Future Generations Evaluation](#).

9 Next steps for budget projects

- xxix. The project form will be subject to internal review, as well as scrutiny through the political decision making process, at which point further information may need to be provided.

- xxx. An evaluation timescale will need to be set out to detail how and when the progress and impact of the project will be evaluated
- xxxi. In addition the project should be incorporated within service plan arrangements to monitor the progress and impact of the project on the service.

Budget Project Proposal 2018/19

This form should be completed in full for all proposals of £50,000 and over, and for proposals of less than where the impact will be felt directly by citizens. For proposals below this threshold you can complete questions 1 and 2 only and then use your service plan to capture your actions, measures and risks.

Form completed by	Sian Hayward
Date	29/09/17
Reference Number	RES S7 – S8

Service area	Digital Programme Office
Directorate	Resources
Savings targets (based on 17/18 budget)	
2018/19	5% £106,670 SRS plus net £133,000 net PSBA saving
2019/20	
2020/21	
2021/22	

Project lead & Key project team members	Sian Hayward, Matt Lewis
--	--------------------------

10 Vision and outcomes of the project

Give a business context for the project. Include what the new / improved / reduced service will look like in the future. Consider the impact in the service area and on any other services provided by the Council. From the service user and service provider perspective.

What does the project propose to do?
<p>The project is to explore options for achieving £107k savings through -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reducing energy charges through out of hours use of SRS generators and reselling to the grid • Rationalising accommodation costs in Ty Cid 1 and 2 • Rationalisation of senior management staffing structures • Rationalisation of SRS partner suite of systems to identify collaboration opportunities or opportunities where Microsoft modules in the Enterprise Agreement can be used to replace systems.

- There are also savings of £155k on the core PSBA contract, but with increased costs as a result of changes to line requirements £22,000, net £133k saving.

There are pressures against this budget next year (discussed in more detail in RES P2)–

- **£9k Event Management software that alerts for any fraudulent cyber activity – this is a requirement of PSN accreditation**
- **Increase in the Enterprise Agreement pricing due to the dollar exchange rate £46,000**
- **Increase in the EA licencing for additional users and devices £40,000 Increase in price due to the O365 enhancement £40k (£60k offset by savings on The Vault e-mail archiving of £13k VPN savings of £7k which are no longer required when we have O365)**
- **£75k for enhanced email and internet security to mitigate cybercrime or attacks (There is potential for this to be reduced by 20 % as all partners are due to sign up to this software.**

Expected impact of the project?

The reduction in staff resources equates to 2 members of service delivery staff.

11 Savings proposed

Show how project will deliver savings against the current service budget, will this be a saving or income generation. This must be profiled over each year implicated.

What savings are expected to be achieved?		
Year	Proposed Savings (£)	Proposed income generation (£)
2017		

12 Options appraisal

List all options that have/are being considered (further details on these may be required to inform scrutiny/decision making reports)

Option 1

Reason why not progressed/progressed?
Option 2
Reason why not progressed/progressed?

13 **Actions to deliver the project**

Describe the key activities that will be undertaken to deliver the project and the action holders. This provides a further breakdown of the actions that need to be taken, each project should also be included in the service plan action.

Action	Timescale

14 **Additional resource/ business needs**

Have you identified any resource / capacity required to carry out the project?

Area resource required	What will this be used for?

15 Key Risks and Issues

Are there any initial barriers or risks that have been identified at this early stage. Any actions to mitigate risk should be included in section 4 and any ongoing risks include in the main service plan risk register.

Risk	Reason why identified	Risk Level (High, Medium or Low – see risk matrix)

16 Evaluation

How will you measure the impact of the proposal? What are the measures that you expect to see change as a result of what you're proposing. This could be positive or negative. When will you evaluate the change?

Metric	Baseline

Evaluation Date	
-----------------	--

17 Future Generations Evaluation

The project must be assessed from the start against the equality impact assessment and sustainable development impact assessment using the [Future Generations Evaluation](#).

18 Next steps for budget projects

- xxxii. The project form will be subject to internal review, as well as scrutiny through the political decision making process, at which point further information may need to be provided.
- xxxiii. An evaluation timescale will need to be set out to detail how and when the progress and impact of the project will be evaluated
- xxxiv. In addition the project should be incorporated within service plan arrangements to monitor the progress and impact of the project on the service.

Appendix 6 – Future Generations Assessment

Wellbeing of Future Generations Assessment – Budget Proposals for 18-19

Introduction

The Wellbeing of Future Generations initial evaluation for the emerging 18-19 budget proposals has been developed in narrative form, ahead of formalisation of proposals and the completion of the official assessment framework. This enables setting out of the backdrop to the emerging proposals, commentary on how the process has been developed; its various iterations and the picture it paints as a whole for the county of Monmouthshire. Presenting in this way at this stage provides an opportunity to demonstrate the dynamic and real-time nature of the approach. In addition, it helps to highlight application of continual learning and improvement.

In the past and notwithstanding the council's strong record on financial planning and delivery, achieving the goal of keeping frontline services going and strengthening commitments to sustainability and resilience, the budget has tended to be developed through the setting of targets, directorate-led approaches and a relatively uneven smattering of proposals. Whilst under this budget round, individual directorate's have still put forward proposals – this process has been more in keeping with our Future Monmouthshire programme and the design principles that guide how we keep our county 'going' and 'growing'. It signals very clearly, that money should follow purpose and priorities and not precede them.

It must be borne in mind that this WFG evaluation is an early one, applying to budget *proposals* only at this pre-consultation, pre-decision stage. The aim of the narrative is thus, to demonstrate the 'live' nature of the process and the application of robust and ongoing scrutiny and challenge as the proposals continue to be shaped and honed in line with what matters.

The process

Set within the policy mandate of the council and the emerging priorities and commitments framing the beginnings of a new Corporate Plan, features of the 18/19 budget shaping process have included:

- **Data driven approach.** Using data analytics, we have looked closely at the economy of our service provision as benchmarked against other councils. This has enabled the identification of areas where cost efficiency might be improved; where there is potential for knowledge transfer; and, how we might go about it. This has been accompanied by informal 'challenge' sessions - in which services give account of their development journeys and the work they are doing to sustain efficiencies whilst improving and advancing.

- **A more crosscutting** approach has been applied to understanding the intended and unintended consequences of proposals and their whole-authority impact.
- **An evidence based** approach has been taken, drawing heavily on information, data and responses from Our Monmouthshire and the Wellbeing Assessment; the work of the Public Services Board, future trends analysis, public events such as the Usk Show, pre-election doorstep surveys undertaken by Members and the wider direction being set by the new administration.
- **A focus on challenge-led approaches** including exemplars such as photocopying, that, as well as resulting in a new more cost-efficient contract, has stimulated different behaviours and practices; travel and transport, which again, has resulted in a successful submission to the Rural Development Fund to secure investment for innovative solutions to rural transport problems.
- **A new way of engaging Members and Select Committees** in shaping the priorities and projects, that will inform Future Monmouthshire. The Economy and Development Select Committee hosted a participative ‘challenge-based’ workshop in October 2017. The format was open and engaging and led to new opportunities and potential being highlighted. The E&D Select Committee has prioritised Procurement/ local supply change development and cross-border working as the areas in which they believe they can make a developmental contribution to getting to a new sustainable future state.
- **Targeted ‘horizontal’ service reviews.** In areas where it has not been possible to develop credible savings proposals – such as Enterprise – given the scale of the budget and the extent of past efficiencies – work has been carried out to identify the cross-cutting areas where focussed attention could make a big impact. Rather than the continual eking out of minor efficiencies for limited impact, the focus of these services and departments will be on big crosscutting transformational pieces. Areas of potential such as Democracy, Customer Service, Transport, Procurement and others have been identified. This work will include considering the impact of automation and artificial intelligence, future trends, the future of work and skills and will make a wider contribution to public service reform.
- **Alignment with the whole-authority Risk Register and the direction of Service Improvement.** This ensures that proposals are developed with regard to key levels of risk and ensuring opportunity costs are considered and embedded within more robust ‘options appraisal’ work. Budget proposals should not be ‘new’ – they should follow the natural course of service development and improvement – as already set out in Service Improvement Plans.

Our objectives

Aligned to the four enduring priorities set by the last Council, around the protecting the vulnerable, education, enterprise and maintaining frontline services, our published Wellbeing Objectives developed in response to some of the big issues identified from the Wellbeing Assessment work, are:

Provide children and young people with the best possible start in life to help them achieve better outcomes

Maximise the benefits of the natural and built environment for the well-being of current and future generations

Maximise the potential in our communities to improve well-being for people throughout their life course

Develop opportunities for communities and businesses to ensure a well-connected and thriving county

Our purpose and mission remains one of *building sustainable and resilient communities that can support the wellbeing of current and future generations*. We share this core purpose with our Public Service Board and it is our guiding force in working towards the Seven Wellbeing Goals:

- Globally Responsible
- Vibrant Culture and Thriving Welsh Language
- Cohesive Communities
- Equality
- Health
- Resilience
- Prosperous

The proposals

The proposals in the main, present a picture of continuing small efforts and endeavours that can be made in delivering a one-year budget as the Council moves into gear with a newly emerging Corporate Plan, into which the medium Term Financial Plan will be incorporated. At a high level, provision has been made to afford some safeguards to priority areas and to ensure we continually mitigate risks identified in the whole-authority Risk Register. These are:

- School budgets continue to have regard for cash flat line consideration – acknowledging specific pressures around Additional Learning Needs and ensuring our children are equipped to achieve their potential
- Additional resources into aspects of social care budgets – particularly in high-pressure areas of Children’s Services in supporting a significant service development and transition and in supporting transformational activity in parts of Adult Social Care. This ensures we continue to protect our vulnerable
- Ongoing drives for savings and efficiencies through programmes of review, challenge-led approaches, data-driven exercises and unit cost data investigations and a focus on income generation – to ensure we have the resources to sustain what matters

- The need to think differently and identify targeted areas for intervention and transformational work – to ensure we create the conditions for true sustainability and resilience

In addition to these headlines, specific provision has been made, to mitigating further pressures around: national living wage, safeguarding, supporting a new fit for future leisure facility in Monmouth, private leasing for effective homelessness prevention, place-based community development approaches, home to school transport and support through housing benefit. These emphasise commitments to making direct local investments in wellbeing and culture whilst at the same time enabling communities to invest in building their own resilience. Direct intervention is necessary to support examples of cases such as the withdrawal of the private sector homeless leasing subsidy. However, the service area has indicated that this will be a time-limited intervention that will enable the time and space to develop a sustainable and long-term solution.

In relation to budget proposals, key features include:

Children and Young People – in the context of the above cash flat-line commitment, the quest for greater efficiency where it can reasonably be found, continues. There is an emphasis on moving towards shared resources and systems to build greater resilience and integrated back office models – building upon cluster working and beginning the move towards federated alliances. This is key if our school system is to compete not just with the rest of Wales or the UK but also in the world. Demonstrating enterprise aptitude through some moderate-income generation, procurement efficiencies through achieving collective purchasing and economies of scale and strong financial management demonstrate a clear commitment to building resilience in the schooling system whilst ensuring that the learning experience and outcomes for young people grows stronger, setting them on a path for prosperous lives.

Social Care and Health – notwithstanding the above investments to allow for growth and developmental opportunities, the potential to consolidate processes, focus more on local 'in county' provision and make for a better health and wellbeing experience for service users - has been identified within Adult Disability services. This builds upon place-based partnerships and assets and is a demonstration of how community-wide resources can make a difference. In relation to Children's Service, investments in transitional and critical development work are paying off with progress being made around high-cost placements, fostering and early intervention. This is a medium-to-long term piece of work with a whole emphasis on better outcomes for vulnerable children, young people and families. Cross-departmental working features strongly with a mix of professions working to bring about the expertise such as the marketing campaign around fostering – required to make change that delivers a better outcome for the young person and a positive impact on the system.

Resources/ Enterprise and Operations – features in this area include in the main, continuation of small-scale ongoing efficiencies and back office improvements. In Resources, the emphasis is on smart support services, mainly brought about through the more targeted use of new technology and leveraging some of the benefits of lower cost IT infrastructure provision. In Operations, the focus continues to be on income

generation where it is deemed viable and is in keeping with other Councils, moderate rationalisation of maintenance, improved cost recovery and continued efforts around route optimisation. It is important to note that in terms of staying ahead, seeking out global best practice, and, new ways of working – this work will be complemented by assessments of the latest technological developments – automation, use of machine learning, new methods of real-time data capture and challenge driven approaches. Significant challenge has already been applied to this area. Initially it was felt potential existed to withdraw a small number of very poorly used bus rural bus services. However, given the big priority the community attaches to wider rural transport issues and solving the problem of poor rural infrastructure and connectivity – it is proposed that these funds are retained and re-directed to the areas where greatest impact might be made.

In relation to Enterprise – successive efficiencies and income generation have seen just staffing budgets remain in many areas. Given we need people resource to deliver on the big ideas and big impact projects – cutting posts would be counter-productive. Instead, the efforts of the service will be targeted at driving forward the Future Monmouthshire programme – demonstrating the new opportunities for public service reinvention and taking forward targeted pieces of work where potential is demonstrated: automation and AI, transport, procurement, back office and support services, democracy and transactional services such as customer care.

Resonance with Wellbeing Objectives

A Prosperous Wales – our budget proposals stem from and are embedded in development and delivery of our Future Monmouthshire programme. This asks the big and searching questions about what our county will look and feel like over the next 5, 10, 15 and 20 years and more and advises on how the Council can best enable the right changes to take shape. Beyond increasing economic productivity and growth, our goal is prosperity for all and a system that promotes radical inclusion and delivery of social justice. An example of this – and one, which demonstrates the ‘going’ and ‘growing’ balance to our work, is Housing. Currently, efforts in 18/19 are targeted towards direct support to maintain provision of privately leased properties through which to prevent homelessness, given that the critical subsidy once in place has now been withdrawn. However, this interim mitigation is in itself not a sustainable approach. A sustainable approach will be in addressing the fundamental mismatch between housing supply and demand. This leads in to wider work we are starting now, to develop proposals to review and re-create the Local Development Plan. This will ensure long-term sustainable solutions providing economic growth and homes for all – addressing the needs of an ageing demographic and positive retention of our young people. One intervention sets the course for the next.

A resilient Wales – our continual investments in areas such as Social Care are not ‘bail outs’ – they are targeted investments which create the conditions for transformational pieces of work that enable us to think differently about demand-side management. As this budget process shows, returns on such investments are already being demonstrated. Our clear goal is to enable communities by investing in building their own resilience. The introduction of a new cabinet brief focussed on Social Justice and Community Development reinforces the potential

around unlocking the significant social capital that exists in Monmouthshire and enabling people everywhere to make a difference. Our direct funding may be declining – but local assets, resources, ideas, social capital and social action is fast growing. Our role is to optimise and channel this to greatest effect.

A healthier Wales – one of the ‘pressures’ these budget proposals mitigates is the temporary loss of provision and income resulting from the replacement of Monmouth Pool and the re-creation of brand new leisure facilities. Rather than lose the existing facilities because of the comprehensive redevelopment of Monmouth Comprehensive School – an £8m investment has been made in creating new facilities that will help keep our people, children and communities, well.

A more equal Wales - enterprise, economic development and wealth creation is key to giving people the means by which to get on and provide for themselves and their families. No cuts are levelled against the Enterprise service area in this budget because we recognise that without continued investment in wealth and job creation at all levels – from the foundational economy through to the big disruptive technologies – the call on public services grows greater and societal divisions proliferate.

A Wales of Thriving Culture – Monmouthshire has a distinctive cultural offer and boasts country parks, castles, museums, theatres and attractions in every major town and settlement. This budget supports maintaining investment in these areas as a means promoting our identity, cultural distinctiveness and building upon the Abergavenny 2016 Eisteddfod Welsh Language legacy.

A Wales of Cohesive Communities – this budget provides for investment in the development of a new social justice agenda and the creation of a Community Partnerships Team that is rapidly developing the place-based approaches needed to unlock and inspire social action, volunteering and community resilience.

A Globally Responsible Wales – the cash flat-line proposal for schools as part of this emergent set of budget proposals, maintains a commitment to direct investment in our future generations. Beyond ‘playing our part’ for the county, Wales and the UK, our focus on Future Schools, Improvement, safeguarding and excellent learning outcomes, is on finding our place in the world. This means continuing investment to ensure our young people are equipped to engage and compete in industries of the future wherever they might emerge.

Summary

The emerging budget proposals for 18-19 are more than a standalone one-year budget. As a contributor to our wider Future Monmouthshire work, they help build a bridge between the present we have and the future we wish to see. With a blend of ongoing sustainable efficiencies; continued income generation and a focus on investing in areas such as education and social care – where returns in terms of service outcomes and financial benefits are starting to pay early dividends – the platform is building for the development of more targeted ‘big ticket’ interventions. We are not kicking the ‘too difficult’ problems into the long grass. As well as keep the Council ‘going’ – work is underway to keep it ‘growing’ – as these proposals clearly demonstrate. Proposals to review the development plan, as a means of addressing demographic and economic pressures is underway. Exploration of targeted procurement opportunities that save money and create local markets is taking shape. A ‘challenge-driven’ approach to tackling rural transport issues is being developed. Exploration of machine learning, artificial intelligence and automation are contributing to the ways in which we must re-imagine services and the positive impact they can have on the lives of people and communities in Monmouthshire - now and in the future.