

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

MEETING: STRONGER COMMUNITIIES SELECT

DATE: 4th January 2018

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. RECOMMENDATION (to be undertaken by Select Committee):

- 2.1 To consider and provide feedback upon the budget assumptions, pressures and savings proformas affecting this Select portfolio area.

2 RECOMMENDATIONS: (presented to Cabinet 22nd Nov)

- 2.2 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.
- 2.3 That Cabinet acknowledges the draft response to the Welsh Government on the provisional settlement (Appendix 3).
- 2.4 That Cabinet approves that the consultation period and opportunity to present alternative proposals ends on 31st January 2018.
- 2.5 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
- 2.6 That Cabinet approves the release of the draft budget savings proposals for 2018/19 for consultation purposes.

- 2.7 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.
- 2.8 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.
- 2.9 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 – 4.95% increase 2018/19, 3.95% increase per annum thereafter
 - 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	699	0	0	0
Resources	161	0	0	0
Chief Executives Unit	135	72	75	62
Corporate Costs & Levies	286	29	0	0
Unidentified Pressures	392	2,145	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	(309)	(23)	0	0
Social Care, Health & Housing	(751)	(725)	(189)	(189)
Enterprise	0	0	0	0
Resources	(376)	0	0	0
Chief Executives Units	(505)	40	0	0
Corporate Costs & Levies	0	0	0	0
Appropriations	(296)	63	113	(86)
Financing	(530)	0	0	0
Totals	(2,767)	(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. The Executive would like a continuance of this £300k extra resource to be modelled in the Capital MTFP for 2018/19. Its revenue consequence will need to be added to the MTFP during the budget process.
- 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 £530k income per annum, and is including in the savings table.

Summary position

- 3.35 In summary, the 2018/19 budget gap is now £243k, 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	50,069	50,101	50,139	50,178
Social Care & Housing	42,953	44,780	45,448	46,428	46,626
Enterprise	8,495	9,959	9,475	9,518	9,580
Resources	7,687	7,606	7,626	7,706	7,787
Chief Executive's Unit	15,860	16,541	16,736	16,893	17,037
Corporate Costs & Levies	20,273	20,607	22,948	25,485	27,989
Sub Total	144,897	149,561	152,333	156,170	159,196
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	156,546	160,038	163,927	166,735
Aggregate External Financing (AEF)	(91,799)	(93,000)	(91,326)	(89,682)	(88,068)
Council Tax (MCC)	(47,744)	(50,637)	(52,617)	(54,674)	(56,813)
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)	(156,303)	(156,791)	(157,391)	(158,106)
(Headroom)/Shortfall	0	243	3,247	6,535	8,629

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

- 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	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	Page Reference
	£000	£000	£000	£000	
OPS P1 Passenger Transport	47	72	75	62	22
OPS P2 Passenger Transport - Reduction of 18-19 pressure. Duffryn transport	(22)				22
OPS P3 Waste Grant pressure	110				28
RES P1 10% reduction in Housing Benefit Grant	26				32
RES P1 Summons income reduction	20				32
RES P1 Merchant Card Fee costs	10				32
RES P2 SRS Enhanced security (75k) & enterprise agreement (£30k)	105				39
CORP P1 Living Wage Foundation increase	142	29			51
CORP P2 Insurance Renewal Premia Cost Increase	124				52
CORP P3 Redundancy strain cost	20				62
Unidentified Pressures	392	2,145	2,276	2,368	

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 P3) 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?
This is required to fund known pressures within the Revenues, Systems & Exchequer budget and should be read in conjunction with the savings proforma. The pressures reflect current and anticipated service activity plus planned grant cuts from the Department of Works & Pensions.
How much pressure is there and over what period?
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).
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
OPS S2	Car Parks Net 7.5% increase in charges above 2.5% RPI (10% in total)	(100)				65
OPS S3	Car Parks 10% increase in permits	(10)				65
OPS S4	Car Parks Increase resident permits from £40-£60	(3)				65
OPS S5	Car Parks Penalties increase to £70 discounted £35	(9)				65
OPS S6	Grounds/waste - Close CA sites Usk and troy 2 days a week	(27)				71
OPS S7	Grounds/waste - Reduce grass cutting across authority	(60)				76
OPS S8	Grounds/waste - Stop Bailey park bowls maintenance	(10)				83
OPS S9	Grounds/waste - Rationalise shrub bed maintenance	(35)				87
OPS S10	Grounds/waste - Reduce 1 mini sweeper.	(50)				91
OPS S11	Grounds/waste - 1 year freeze of Head of waste post	(40)	40			96
RES S1	Property - School meals Price Increase (net after 2.5% RPI)	(23)				116
RES S2	Property income - External Fees (net after 2.5% RPI)	(19)				121
RES S3	Property - Council wide Postage savings	(5)				121
OPS S12	Highways - Road Traffic Incident recovery of costs	(15)				100
OPS S13	Highways - Improved Plant utilisation/recovery	(40)				102
OPS S14	Passenger Transport - Route changes	(51)				104&108
OPS S15	Passenger Transport - CPC Staff Training	(9)				112
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)				125
RES S5	Schools based Revenues SLA (to reflect actual)	(39)				127
RES S5	Comino system change	(10)				127
RES S5	Housing Benefit team savings	(8)				127
RES S6	IT Equipment budget saving	(30)				132
RES S7	SRS saving (5% of 17-18 budget £2.134 unestablished)	(107)				137

RES S8	Public Sector Broadband Agreement PSBA saving (£155k-£22k)	(133)				137
CORP P2/RES S9	Insurance staff saving	(26)				52
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	

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 S2-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 increase Car Parking Charges by 10%.
2. To increase season permits by 10% in line with proposed tariff increase (2).
3. To increase residents permits from £40 - £60.
4. To increase parking penalties to £70 discounted to £35.

Expected impact of the project?

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.)
4. 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		£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

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

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

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

- 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 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

- 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.

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

- 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	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

- 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

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

1 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	

2 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

3 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	

4 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	

5 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		

6 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	
-----------------	--

7 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](#).

8 Next steps for budget projects

- xii. 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.
- xiii. An evaluation timescale will need to be set out to detail how and when the progress and impact of the project will be evaluated
- xiv. 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

- xv. 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.
- xvi. 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

- xvii. 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.
- xviii. An evaluation timescale will need to be set out to detail how and when the progress and impact of the project will be evaluated
- xix. 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 JAUPT 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

- xx. 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.
- xxi. An evaluation timescale will need to be set out to detail how and when the progress and impact of the project will be evaluated
- xxii. 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?
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Reduce the equipment budget by £30k Or2. 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

- 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	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
--	--------------------------

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 project is to explore options for achieving £107k savings through -

- 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.

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		

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

- 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.

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.